CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Girish Karnad and Mohan Rakesh are both creative writers and modern dramatists. Their plays have been translated into English from original Kannada and Hindi, respectively. After comparing their plays, similarities and dissimilarities found by this researcher are as follows:

5.1 Similarities:

1. Karnad and Rakesh lived conventional lives in post-Independence India and focused on the socio-cultural norms of traditional Indian set of values. Besides, both playwrights exposed the duplicate and hypocritical attitudes of men and women in modern context and revealed the loopholes of modern ways.

2. A. Both have chosen themes depicting Indian lives (sometimes typically provincial) while unfolding their dramatic tales

   B. Karnad and Rakesh portrayed their female characters as dominating. They dominate their male counterparts and try desperately to lead a life of anti-patriarchal behaviour.

   C. These dramatists projected the theme of quest for identity and completeness of their women characters. Their women characters share a set of the universal predicament of feminine selves and their inner urge for freedom, self-assertion, loss and search for identity.

   D. Both dramatists subverted the traditional expectations from an Indian woman and demolished the traditional feminine roles not only in domestic life but also in social life in their selected plays.
3. A. Both Karnad and Rakesh delineated male characters in traditional backdrop of male-dominated society where in the characters try to have complete control over their female partners. Besides, male characters represent their behaviour and nature as complete individuals of male-dominated society where they are reluctant to accept that women have equal rights not only in familial life but also in social life.

B. Male characters in these plays fail to understand their wives and let them lead a loveless and alienated life. The traditional Indian woman always wishes her husband to provide not only physical but also emotional, economical security in the family life, but here in the plays husbands are unable to provide such things and even they could not understand love of wives. Love and needs of Vishakha, Nittilai, Binni, Savitri and Padmini are not understood by their male counterparts. Wives in the select plays of both writers are forced to lead a loveless and alienated life.

4. A. The portrayal of family in the selected plays of Karnad and Rakesh bears strong relevance to the present day family structures and explored the truth about family-life, relationships, religion and spirituality.

B. Failure in marital life and discontent in the relationship with husband is the common feature of Karnad and Rakesh while delineating the family. Rakesh and Karnad seem to illustrate man’s universal predicament futility in quest for perfection. In familial life Padmini, Vishakha and Savitri to get full satisfaction of loving persons, they just wonder from one person to another person but at the end they realize that the perfection is only illusion. It is noteworthy that Karnad and Rakesh want to give the message through conjugal life of Padmini, Vishakha and Savitri that quest for perfection remains unfulfilled. Both dramatists project reality of twentieth century which has been an age of great materialistic stress and finds problems such as confusion, frustration, disintegration and meaninglessness. The lure of materialistic life is very difficult to avoid because it seems that modern man pursues to get physical satisfaction from material things but inner satisfaction is (in real sense of the term) very important in life.
5.2 Dissimilarities:

The points on which Karnad and Rakesh differ as in this study can be summed up as under:

1. Girish Karnad belongs to category of folk theatre or folk plays. On the other hand Mohan Rakesh belongs to Urban realist drama. Karnad uses indigenous resources such as rich ancient Indian myths, folktale for the structural design of his plays for instance Karnad derives theme from a tale which belongs to the *Kathasaritasagara* for his *Hayavadana*. Besides, Karnad chooses an ancient Yavakri myth from the *Vana Parva* (Forest Canto) of *The Mahabharata* for the dramatic construction of his play, *The Fire and the Rain*. Whereas Mohan Rakesh uses not only historical characters but also modern Indian middle class setting to project the breakdown of communication in marital life in *Halfway House* and *The Great Swans of the Waves*. Besides, he uses contemporary situations and social problems to project the disintegration of family in *Halfway House*.

2. Mohan Rakesh presents significance of *Panchshila* and the philosophy of Buddhism in order to expose the nuisance of modern life and the conflict between tradition and modernity. Whereas Girish Karnad deals with the theory of *Purusharatha* and myth from *The Mahabharata*. In this respect, they differ. They are found to probe deeper into the principles as Buddhism and Hinduism respectively.

3. Unlike Mohan Rakesh who delved deep into the problems of the middle class man and has softly exposed human jealousy, frustration without bloodshed Girish Karnad broadly exposes such evils inherent in humans, jealousy taking revenge by shedding blood of opponents and succumbing to death.

4. Though Girish Karnad and Mohan Rakesh project quest for identity as far as women characters are concerned, there is difference between the two. Karnad’s women characters are in state of constant alert to become aware about their own identity. Therefore they raise questions about the problems related to low-caste people, about their pains, loveless life, alienation and frustration in the domain of male-dominated social
circle. We see that they are repressed by the power of patriarchal values of the ruling class though they are at inclined not to suppress their desires. Most of the time they remain within the framework of familial life. Whereas Rakesh’s women characters already made their identity not only in house but also in society as a modern woman who is aware about her equal rights. Even they do not shy to accept their extra-marital relationships. In this sense, it is seen that Rakesh assumes special importance in view of the rapid cultural changes that have taken place in recent years in developing countries like India. Modern factors such as cross-cultural influences and the dissemination of traditions through mass migrations and globalization have become increasingly prominent. Thus, the widespread influence of media and the information and communication technologies have contributed to a dynamic and hybrid culture. Therefore Rakesh’s women characters are dynamic, more energetic, showing self respect and ego unlike Karnad’s women characters.

5. Mohan Rakesh projects his male characters in state of transition to become aware about women’s identity as modern woman and her equal rights in the familial life as well as in social life whereas Karnad’s male characters are just men of patriarchal society and they are not willing to accept that woman has equal rights. On the other hand, Rakesh exposes the hypocritical nature of male characters directly. For instance, Singhania uses his status to exploit his women employees for immoral purposes.

6. As dramatists, Karnad and Rakesh project different kinds of women characters. Karnad portrays two types of women, traditional women who still retain their individuality and second, women who protest and cry against the domination of male-oriented social standards and they are as true representative of society on the way of cultural change. Karnad projects both types of women, a traditional one and other very much aware about her equal right. Whereas Rakesh portrays modern women who choose modernity for convenience and use modernity as a licence to act according to their will and they are daring, educated, unconventional, shrewd and self-absorbing with loose morals.
7. Though Karnad and Rakesh explore the theme of marriage as a social problem, yet they are very different as the context is concerned. Karnad exposes problems related to traditionally arranged marriage ceremony. Whereas Rakesh exposes problems related marriage system directly in the modern context. Karnad projects problem while tying couples into marriage life, for instance, in *The Fire and the Rain*, consent of Vishakha and Nittilai is not considered. Vishakha loved Yavakri but was forced to marry Paravasu and Nittilai loved Arvasu but was forced to marry another man who belongs to her tribe. Further, Vishakha and Nittilai reluctantly approve their will for getting married. Consequently their married life became completely disappointed. Whereas Rakesh in his *Halfway House*, presents that Binni without consent of parents got married and went away and consequently she became unhappy in her married life. It is noteworthy that she has married the erstwhile lover of her mother, Manoj. Therefore it seems that both dramatists want to convey that marriages must be arranged not on the considerations of wealth, status but on the considerations of character and love.

8. Girish Karnad made bold experiments in delineating man-woman relationship. Triangulation between two men and a woman reoccurs in the select plays, which is related to the present modern psychological and social scenario. Even he exposed the consequences of extra-marital relationship in his plays. We see the efforts on the part of literary writer are seen to bring out social change and to make people aware of the need to preserve all pervasive magnificent Indian culture and unique family system. On the other hand, Mohan Rakesh does not strongly advocate rich traditional Indian culture and ethos. For instance, in *Halfway House*, Mahendranath is aware about his wife’s extra-marital relationship. So he leaves his own house in frustration though at the end he returns to house. Mahandranath likes to adjust with his ill-mannered wife but he does not like to convey rich traditional cultural norms of familial life.