CHAPTER FOUR
SEXUAL MORES AND FAMILY

Sex perhaps has been one of the zealously guarded facets of human behaviour. For quite a long time, it used to be avoided from a direct discussion. It has always been only a part of the marital relationships and was taken for granted. But in the twentieth century, we have sex in all forms of art the way it had never been before. It has also started occupying the space in all kinds of discussion; at least, in the post-Freudian era. Against the obvious socialism of the twentieth century, a full discussion of Osborne's plays from this perspective is certainly required, because it has also a strong bearing on familial relationships.

Throughout history, societal attitudes to sex have always resembled a huge slow-moving pendulum, constantly swinging from total repression to outright license and back. Among the ancient Hebrews, homosexuals were meted out death penalty; but they were accepted and even admired by the ancient Greeks. The early Christians had faith in abstinence, the noblest form of sexual behaviour; but, about the same time, the Romans were indulging in their famous orgies in the Colosseum. Nearer in history, during the reign of the Queen Elizabeth in England, sex was treated with forthrightness and frequently with ribaldry that has no parallel in the Western history. A little later, at the time of the Queen Victoria, sex was treated with such a great circumspection that among some groups of these very Englishmen one would hardly have known coitus ever taking place, and any fall from propriety was the cause of great scandal and disgrace.

In the conventional society, sexuality was considered as a great iceberg, frozen by the command of custom, the need for social stability, and the dismal grind of daily life. Though the iceberg started thawing roughly between the middle of the eighteenth and the end of the nineteenth centuries, when revolution in eroticism took place in the direction of libertine sexual behaviour. As Theodore K. and Robert I. Rotberg,
comment: “One by one, great chunks—such as pre-marital sexuality, extra-and intra-marital sexual styles, and the realm of the choice of partners—began falling away from the mass and melting into the swift streams of modern sexuality.”

In the twentieth century, discoveries in the field of human psychology and ideological influences brought about drastic changes in the societal attitude to sex. Sigmund Freud, with his theories of psychoanalysis, shattered the conventional beliefs and taboos about sexual relations. He ascribed psychological disorders to the suppression of sex instincts and to the feelings of apprehension to sex. His theories located the existence of erotic feelings and desire for incestuous sex relations within the precincts of the institution of family. Philippe Aries, the French historian, is of the opinion that “the thought of sex education would have been considered an absolute illogicality, had not Freud revealed his theories of libido, family romance, etc.”

Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* (1859) had directly cast doubts on the Biblical account of origin of the world and of man. The hypocrisies of the past were replaced by new forms of cant and were not result of conviction. Reynolds and Brasher observe: “The particular conception that our character and actions are conducted by hidden influences over which we have no control pandered to the moral laxity which wartime conditions encourage.”

Freudian left thinker Brown Norman made a plea against the repression of sex. Norman argued that “civilization, on the brink of self-annihilation through nuclear warfare, must have itself through the abolition of repression, or the resurrection of body.”

On the other hand, Lord Patrick Devlin recognized the subversive potential of unbridled sex. He asserted: “Suppression of vice is as much the law’s business as the suppression of subversive activities.” It is evident that sex is divested of the moral function of the family. Besides, advancement in the field of science and technology also contributed remarkable changes to the societal attitude to sex. The application of scientific approach for a closer examination of the scriptures shook and refuted the long-established ideas. As Mary Farmer comments: “The application of scientific knowledge to the ailments of body and mind led to a questioning of traditional codes of conduct in relation to sex, chastity, marriage, and fidelity, all of which have been central to family life in communities subscribing...to the Christian ethic.”
Over and above, in the post-war Britain, liberal social legislations, (such as the Abolishment of Capital Punishment Act (1965), the Homosexual Act (1965), the Sexual Offences Act (1967), the Abortion Reform Act and the Divorce Reform Act (1969) universal contraception, and relaxed censorship of stage, screen and print inevitably affected the institutions of marriage and family. L.C.B. Seaman remarked: “Divorce ceased to be the privilege of the moneyed class, or the hazard of cinema stardom. Persons of modest birth could keep as many as love affairs, and as many as wives, as Bertrand Russell had.” In matters of sex, moralists whose cry had once been ‘woe unto you, ye rich,’ now found it necessary to denounce all the income groups. Changes in attitudes towards marriage and illegitimacy were often likened with the growth in what had become known as the ‘permissive society.’ David Punter calls it a “relatively free-wheeling society” of the late sixties and early seventies. We find a quite pertinent view of the permissive society in William A. Robson’s observation: “The permissive society is an attempt to satisfy some frustrated human needs and to liberate activities formerly restricted, but it does not necessarily bring nearer a world in which it is possible for human beings to experience feelings of admiration, hope and love.”

Though linked up with the decline of religion, the slackening of Sexual morality trailed by sexual promiscuity had a far-reaching effect on society in that it even pervaded the family. With no moral principles to guide man’s conduct, sexual promiscuity and moral laxity became widespread. Social control is very essential for the regulation of sexual activity. It is important “to ensure that reproduction takes place under circumstances that guarantee the responsible care and socialization of children.” The relaxed attitude to sex was in tune with the spirit of the time characterized by loss of faith in religious institutions and moral values. The decline of religion and the dissolution of the accepted moral code in a changing world were powerful agents in helping to radically transform the ideological and cultural constructs and in turn proved to be powerful forces in the evolution of the permissive society, in which premarital and extramarital sexual relations, homosexuality, lesbianism, illegitimacy, venereal diseases, drug addiction and possibly incest were seldom subjected to moral condemnation. Luc Gillemann remarks:
"Homosexuality...had become the passé word of a new liberal philistinism."\textsuperscript{11} Homosexuality came to be considered less an evil or a sin, and more a medical or psychological condition. David Thomson points out that homosexuality came to be discussed more openly and generally regarded "as an affliction, rather than a vice."\textsuperscript{12}

Consequent upon these developments, the family is declared to have failed in both primary function of caring for children and as a source of human happiness. Improved contraceptive techniques have affected the biological basis of family life by removing the age-old connection between sexual intercourse and bearing and rearing children. The view that premarital sex is immoral vanished quite rapidly and it coincided with a change in the societal attitude to sex. So much so that J. Slome, in his study of the unmarried women who had wanted abortion, states: "The kiss of the 1940s and 1950s has now become the sexual intercourse of the 1960s and 1970s....That is, intercourse is practiced where previously a kiss would have been appropriate."\textsuperscript{13} People started thinking of sex as an integral component of their humanity. For such people, sex was a way of expressing the wish to be free, for the egoism of unconstrained sexuality was a direct assault upon the institution of family. The sexual revolution brought in its tail broken homes with varied socio-economic and psychological maladies, putting adverse impact on the social fabric. The free pursuit of sexual pleasure jeopardized the stability of family.

In an age of all round permissiveness when sex on and off the stage was no longer a taboo. The obsession with sex could be discerned in the interest of the people in the literary books which had been banned for dealing with non-marital sex. What was widely referred to as 'dirty books' had to be imported surreptitiously from France, for example, D. H. Lawrence' \textit{Lady Chatterley's Lover} (1928). The interest roused by the novels of D.H. Lawrence was a sign of the growing obsession/ maturity (depending upon the perspective) with sex in literature. The cynicism of the traditional values is well-exemplified in Lytton Stracy's \textit{Eminent Victorians} (1918). Premarital sex theme became part of the standard literary books, theatrical repertoire, with concerns like 'free love' and 'free marriage' being endlessly embroidered. By the 1970s young people came more and more to feel that premarital sex was a personal matter and not something to be regulated by outside agencies, a view that
was championed by the movies and other mass media. The trend towards premarital permissiveness would seem to be irreversible.

Osborne’s attitude to sex is often taken to be a relaxed one by the critics. They view him liberal in respect of sex mores and conventions. They often mix his themes of class war and sex war. The playwright is often taken to be a cad and homosexual, but, as Lyn Barber asserted, Osborne “has never actually had sex with a man.” What irritated Osborne was “the current ideological exploitation of homosexuality.” The way he dramatizes the unbridled sex reveals that he is very critical of dishonest and irresponsible sex. Besides, he is equally critical of the conventional sexual mores that emphasize repression of sexuality. He has always been “a lifelong satirist of prigs and puritans, whether of the Left or the Right.” He believes in the honesty of feelings, and his plays become a holy sermon on the honesty of sex. In matters of sex, for Osborne, “judicious restraint is more becoming than embarrassing exhibitionism.” Osborne writes: “Art execute a delicate balancing act between veiling and unveiling. To stand absolutely naked is to be artless.” A close analysis of Osborne’s plays reveals the fact that the relaxed attitude to sex has contributed to the disruption of familial ties in the post-war era.

In the dramatic world of Osborne, almost all the characters, in their sexually active life, get involved in multi-faceted sex relations, but without any commitment, involvement, compatibility, love, procreative purpose and responsibility. The more they indulge in sexual pursuits, the more they get sexually frustrated, thereby leaving behind the wreckage of marital harmony and the debris of family life. The playwright does not try to eschew sex and sensuous passions; rather he treats faithfully and aesthetically the theme of sexual transgression in the context of family. It serves as a recurring motif and provides a tangible explanation of the character, psychology and behaviour of the dramatis personae. Sex, especially without wedlock plays a crucial role in the disintegration of familial ties in the dramatic world of the playwright. The tragedies that befall his heroes or heroines owe as much to their sexual aberrations as to the external social causes. Osborne treats man-woman relationships beyond marriage as something fragile if they are anchored merely on carnal gratification. The playwright dramatizes repression of sexuality, lust, premarital and extramarital sex,
adultery, homosexuality, lesbianism and sexual frustration undermining the sanctity and significance of marriage and family. He goes further and shows how different outlooks on sex breed sexual frustration between the husband and wife. He also highlights sexual frustration or incompatibility between parents putting a deadening impact on the psyche, sensibility and sexuality of children.

In the post-war period, we find a reaction and revolt against the conventional sexual morality. Now it is not in bad taste to call a person sexy; rather it has become a complement. Couples are no longer made guilty if they go to bed before marriage. Financially independent young children find opportunities to chase their natural preferences; it results in an unprecedented rise in premarital sex. Premarital sex becomes an accepted feature of life, and it is even presumed that it is parents' duty “to see that their children have proper accommodation in which to pursue their love affairs.”19 But the premarital sexual involvement often crushes the development of genuine love and relational growth as the couple spends most of their time in making love and not getting to know each other. The introduction of family planning methods and availability of contraceptives seem to have led to an increase in premarital intercourse. Gummer remarks that “it is not just that we have rightly thrown out the concept that its (sexual intercourse’s) only real purpose was to have babies, it is that we have swung to the opposite extreme and now act as if we believe that its only purpose is to have a fun without having babies.”20 Osborne responded to these changes and dramatized these faithfully and sensitively in his plays.

In the plays of the fifties, it is temperamental incompatibility, repression of sexuality and divergent outlooks on sex that mar the prospects of marital harmony between the husband and the wife, inducing sexual incompatibility and frustration in them. In Look Back in Anger, Jimmy and Alison get infatuated with each other at a party, disregarding the impact of their socio-cultural environments on their persons. Jimmy with fierce and virile energy gets drawn to Alison, anticipating in her “a wonderful relaxation of spirit.”21 On the part of Alison, it may be repressed sexuality, caused by her class conventions, that seems to compel her to seek man’s company in the form of marital alliance to give her sex-instincts a free play. Alison tells Helena:
I met him at a party....Everything about him seemed to burn, his face, the edges of his hair glistened and seemed to spring off his head, and his eyes were so blue and full of the sun. He looked so young and frail....I know I was taking on more than I was ever likely to be capable of bearing, but there never seemed to be choice....Whether or no he was in love with me, that did it. He made up his mind to marry me. (p.45)

Without recognizing and appreciating the deeper and divergent needs of each other they enter into a hasty marital alliance, but after a brief spell of time, these needs come to the surface as they come face to face with the harsh realities of their life. Alison, besides enjoying manly comfort, desires to relish the life of comforts and luxuries; whereas Jimmy wishes to possess her entire being. Physically, they live together, but temperamentally they stay poles apart. This temperamental incompatibility contributes to breeding of sexual incompatibility between them, leading to sexual frustration. It is obvious that the lack of temperamental compatibility contributes to marring the prospects of sexual harmony between Jimmy and Alison. Howse et al. comment: “Sexual intimacy is...a form of total communion between husband and wife, which communicates acceptance, trust, reconciliation.”

But in the case of Jimmy and Alison, it is the lack of communion that generates sexual incompatibility, leading to marital disharmony.

Divergent outlooks of the spouses on sex also contribute to sexual incompatibility between them. Jimmy seems to represent the new sexual morality; whereas Alison seems to represent the traditional sexual morality. Jimmy not only wonders, but also becomes furious to perceive that Alison has conserved her virginity till the marriage. Alison tells Helena: “He was quite angry about it, as if I had deceived him in some strange way. He seemed to think an untouched woman would defile him” (p.30). Jimmy keeps the view that Alison’s sexuality is not that of an ordinary human being: “Oh, it’s not that she hasn’t her kind of passion. She has the passion of python, she just devours me whole every time as if I were some over large rabbit” (p.37). He reinforces this discovery by uttering the words: “She’ll go on sleeping and devouring until there’s nothing left of me” (p.38). To authenticate her view of Jimmy, Alison further tells Helena: “Jimmy has his own private morality, as you know. What my mother calls ‘loose.’ It is pretty free, of course, but it is very
harsh too"(p.30). Stephen Lacey remarks that "repressive sexual morality" becomes "an object of Jimmy's satirical venom."23

Jimmy's view of sex is manifest in the way he looks at the lovemaking between Alison and Cliff. He does not mind it; rather he asks them to go with it comfortably in bed when he finds them locked in a passionate embrace in a standing position: "Why don't you both get into bed, and have done it" (p.31). Jimmy seems to be "a sort of right-wing deviationist"(p.36) who believes in the liberalization of cramping conventional sexual morality. Cliff observes that Jimmy "like a sexual maniac" treats sex "like food"(p.12). But it is Jimmy's sexual frustration with Alison that propels him to behave like this. It is obvious that Jimmy fails to find a nourishing channel to express his sexuality. He seems to hold the view that repressed sexuality frustrates the chances of wholesome sex, most often turning into pure lust.

The conflict between the traditional and new morality almost often leads to sexual incompatibility between the husband and the wife. It is obvious that repression of sexuality under the duress of social codes and conventions or fear can be detrimental to the health of spouses in particular and family in general. By treating this aspect of sex the playwright suggests that the feelings of commitment and cordiality; love and loyalty, and responsibility and responsiveness between man and woman are essential for happy and enduring relations. Only the relationship rooted in fidelity of body, heart and soul can lead spouses to have an enduring happiness.

In the post-war period, it is premarital sex that also contributes substantially to sexual disharmony between the husband and wife. Premarital affairs almost often put serious repercussions on marital life of spouses. In this play, both Jimmy and Alison had their respective premarital affairs which contribute largely to the marital discordant between them. Jimmy's premarital affairs with Madeline and his persistent, repressed infatuation for her obstruct the smooth course of his sexual life with Alison. The way Jimmy praises Madeline: "Her curiosity, about things, and about people was staggering....With her, it was simply the delight of being awake, and watching" (p.19) indicates that he is still obsessed with her. Jimmy thinks that Alison will sap his vitality; whereas Madeline, an older woman he used to be in love with, possessed the gift of energy: "even to sit on the top of a bus with her was like sitting out with
Ulysses" (p.19). Jimmy cries in desperation: "Oh, brother, it's such a long time since I was with anyone who got enthusiastic about anything" (p.15). On the other hand, Alison's affair with Webster, though sans sexual intimacy, seems to be a hurdle in the way of achieving sexual harmony with Jimmy, as she seems to have failed to dispel Webster from the lanes of her memories. It is believed that premarital affairs come to dispel the myth about sex, and prepare one for actual marital life, but it is not without unwanted repercussions. Emotional involvement with the former mate acts as a great hindrance in the development of emotional or sexual relations with the second mate.

Sexual frustration often leads to extramarital affairs. It is sexual frustration that seems to impel Jimmy and Alison to switch over to extramarital relations to escape boredom of the frustrated sexual life. Jimmy seems to be in homosexual relations with Cliff. Besides, he also forges sexual relations with Alison's actress-friend, Helena without displaying any hesitation and inhibition. It may be his sexual frustration that propels him to establish sexual union with her, but, whatever be the reason, he ceases to be faithful to his wife. On the other hand, Alison, being dissatisfied with Jimmy's apparently ruthless behaviour, turns to Cliff for emotional support or it may be manly comfort, as she finds him "kind and loveable" (p.42). Like a lover or husband, Cliff nurses Alison's burnt hand, and she, in response, seems to be relishing it: "She leans back, and closes her eyes...he kisses the top of her head."(p.27). Jimmy finds them "still have arms around one another" (p.31). But Alison admits to Helena: "...it's not exactly a consuming passion with either of us" (p.41). No doubt, they find a momentary relief in this relationship, but they consider it as a plaything. Alison tells Cliff: "I don't think I want anything to do with love. Any more. I can't take it on" (p.27). With Cliff, Alison is "too comfortable to bother about moving for the sake of some other pleasure" (pp.41-42). It is not that Jimmy is against their love drama, but he is against the way they make an exhibition of their emotional closeness. He seems to be in favour of sex within bounds. He mocks at the upper-classes for doing open discussion on sex: "They all sit around feeling very spiritual, with their mental hands on each other's knees, discussing sex as if it were the Art of Fugue" (p.49). The ongoing seemingly love drama or physical closeness, whatever it may be, furthers sexual incompatibility between Jimmy and Alison.
What lies at the root of Jimmy's sexual frustration is his view of sex. First, he wants to have complete allegiance from his wife to his beliefs, convictions and relations, and then he may find it possible to forge meaningful sexual relations with her. As A.E. Dyson remarks: "In Jimmy's feeling that sexual fidelity is less important to him than the moral and spiritual fidelity which he fails to find in Alison"24 Failing to find a healthy outlet to his energy, he becomes angry and crosses all the limits of indecency by resorting to invectives, taunts, tirades and sarcasm against Alison. She retaliates against his verbal assaults with the weapon of deadening silence or withdrawing herself from the situation. The more Alison drifts away from Jimmy, the more he becomes callous and angry with her. In the beginning of their marital life, they look happy, but for a short while. After that there start bickering and brawling, and the things get “steadily worse between” (p.46) them. She gets so much tired of his tantrums that she feels scared: “I’m tired. I dread him coming into the room” (p.46). They seem to be happy in the game of bears and squirrel, but the happiness is not lasting one. On the whole, Jimmy-Alison marital relations are characterized by bitterness, non-reciprocity, misunderstanding, frustration and selfishness. Thus, sexual incompatibility increases emotional void that eventually leads to sexual frustration between them. The play suggests that sexual harmony is the mainstay in the long-lasting marital relationships.

Jimmy's extramarital relations with Helena seem to take on a rather smoother route, which confirms the fact that he has been sexually frustrated with Alison. But the affair does not go a long way, as it is devoid of love, commitment and responsibility. It is obvious in what John Russell Taylor observes: “…he is bound to her by nothing more complicated than lust.”23 As a result, both of them lose interest in each other, failing to deliver what they need individually. Helena denies him what he actually needs—he needs ‘wholesome sex.’ John Russell Brown comments: “The affair between them has never touched her at the deepest level.”26 Helena comes to know that Jimmy “born out of time” and discovers: “There’s no place for people like that no longer—in sex, or in politics, or anything. That’s why he’s so futile” (p.90). She recognizes the fact that their temperaments are too different to be reconciled: “He wants one world and I want another, and lying in bed won’t ever change it!” (p.90).
Supporting Helena’s view, Alison comments: “He wants something quite different from us. What it is exactly I don’t know” (p.91). It is evident that divergent needs in sex lead to sexual frustration in the sex partners. The play suggests that sexual compatibility can be achieved if the sex partners come forward to understand and accept individual needs and differences.

It is manifest that Jimmy wishes to have wholesome sex, but he finds both Alison and Helena fraught with lust. For them sex is an end, not the means to achieve harmony. Martin Banham comments: “For Jimmy has changed nothing except the girl he takes to bed.”27 He frankly admits that he has never known the “great pleasures of love making” (p.37). He seeks in them honesty, frankness, genuineness and warmth but, to his consternation and annoyance, he finds affectation, coldness, dishonesty, hypocrisy and non-involvement. It is evident that sex bereft of genuine feelings of love and honesty leads to sexual frustration. Osborne suggests that sexual harmony can go a long way in shaping healthy marital ties.

In the end, they, once again, play the game of bears and squirrels to escape the harsh realities of sexual frustration. It may provide them with a momentary relief, not sufficient to cope up with the situation emerged out of the sexual incompatibility. Once again they are likely to be at loggerheads as the game is over. The game is just an illusion, and it can not be effective enough to hold them together in a true marital harmony. It is sexual frustration that prevents them from forging a harmonious marital relationship. Alison’s pusillanimity and nonplussed view of things might have had its reflection on their sexual life too. Katherine J. Worth observes: “Sexual passion, which offers Jimmy an intermittent escape, can not solve his problems. He alternates between sexual longing and loathing in a way that seems incomprehensible to the onlookers in the play.”28 In the absence of stable emotional ties, sexual frustration compels them to resort to extramarital affairs with the result of making the family wreck. Sex may provide relief to an individual from anxiety and tension, but it is momentary one. Sex with casual attitude breeds incompatibility between spouses. Jimmy-Alison relationship suggests that only a committed and responsible sex can help establish emotional stability between the husband and wife.
Jimmy and Alison seek a release from sexual frustration by indulging in fantasies of their own. The game of bears and squirrels accords a transitory relief to them from their persistent bickering and brawling. In the fantasy, Alison is attractive, grey-eyed squirrel with a "highly polished, gleaming fur, and an ostrich feather of a tail" and Jimmy a "really soooooooooooper marvellous bear" (p.34). But the fantasy does no last long, and reality breaks in with a bang. Eric Keown, in his assessment of the play, remarks that this is no end to the play: "...for the whole silly cycle of tortures and collapses will clearly begin again."2 According to Simon Trussler, "this fantasy level; of experience is the only level on which their marriage really works."3

But A. E. Dyson holds a different view: "It seems likely that this basis of warm animal level might, on the other side of real suffering and committal, lead to a happy and continuing relationship."31 James Gindin comments: "The game of bears and squirrels which Jimmy and Alison play seems, at first, a trivial evasion of the complexities found in any marriage. In the last, "Jimmy and Alison are united again in their idyllic dream world of bears and squirrels, content, perhaps, never to make it as human beings in the real world around them."32 At the end of the play, the game seems to assume the nature of human love---the willingness to submerge oneself absolutely in 'creatureness', to share the pains and the pleasures of the limited animal.

Once again we find the divergent outlooks on sex engendering sexual incompatibility and then marital disharmony between Archie Rice and his former wife in The Entertainer. She, being a lady of Puritan conviction, did not like the idea of having sex like animals; whereas he seems to be so much obsessed with sex that he needs "a jump at the end of the day---and at the beginning too usually"33 to get a relief from emotional insecurity. The puritanical association of sex with sin leading to the inadequate sexual relationship between the husband and the wife often results in her frigidity. Frigidity in women, according to R.D Laing, "is often the refusal to allow man the triumph of giving satisfaction. Her frigidity is triumph and torrement."34 Their temperamental incongruity resulted in sexual incompatibility which further sowed the seeds of parting. Being sexually frustrated, Archie turned to another woman, Phoebe, to drown his sexual frustration, but his wife could not tolerate his adulterous behaviour and left him in a huff. Archie tells Jean: "Your mother caught me in bed
with Phoebe,"(p.69) and "walked out, she walked out just like that, she was just you’d call a person of---a person of principle...she never forgive me anyway”(p.70). It was Archie’s liberal attitude to sex that caused the collapse of his former marriage. In the dramatic world of Osborne, sexual incompatibility between the husband and the wife inevitably induces sexual frustration in them, which often leads to estrangement or extramarital relations.

In the dramatic world of Osborne, premarital sex almost often puts a negative impact on marital life of the individual. It often induces sexual aversion or sexual frustration in the sex partners which puts undesirable effects on marital life of the individual. In the case of Archie-Phoebe sexual relations, the impact of premarital relations is conspicuously discernible in the way they get disillusioned with each other. After the departure and death of his former wife, Archie marries Phoebe, but their marital life comes out to be an utter failure, as he finds her highly incompatible: “My wife---not only is she stupid...but she’s cold as well. Oh yes, cold. she may look sweet, but she’s very cold woman, my wife is very cold” (p.59). On the other hand, Phoebe herself admits this fact to Jean. “...I think I’ve overdone it a bit....I never could stand too much excitement”(p.40). It is evident that Phoebe’s overindulgence before marriage seems to make her lose interest in sex in the way Archie needs. Her aversion to Archie’s sexual advances seems to be lying in both her premarital sex and great infatuation for Archie’s wealthy brother Bill. Phoebe tells Jean: “I like him because he’s a gentleman. He’s different from your father”(p.50).

Archie finds Phoebe too distracted and irresponsible to forge healthy conjugal relationships. His sexual frustration is manifest in the words: “She’s tired and getting old. She’s tired of me....All it’s given her is me, and by God she’s tired of that”(p.55). As a result of sexual frustration, Archie starts running after women to compensate the sterility of his sexual life with Phoebe, but she does not let any resistance and jealousy reflect in her behaviour towards his sexual forays. Phoebe tells Jean: “It’s never bothered me, that, so much. It never meant a great deal to me. not even when I was young. Still, I suppose men are different. It’s more important to them” (pp.47-48). Though Phoebe suspects minds Archie’s adulterous behaviour “very much,”(p.57) yet she can do nothing except that of drinking beer and creating noisy scenes at home.
She behaves unusually; it may be dislocation of her anger that can not be unleashed on a man who can no longer be shamed into respecting his wife, who no longer cares enough to hide his squalid behaviour.

Archie gets so much frustrated with Phoebe and her unusual habits that he resorts to extramarital relations with "a professional virgin"(p.80) who is half of his age, and intends to marry her after divorcing Phoebe, but his plans are thwarted by his own father who informs the parents of the girl that Archie is "a married man with three grown up children"(p.82). Critics like Katherine J. Worth and Alan Carter justify Archie's warning to divorce Phoebe. Katherine J. Worth keeps the view that Phoebe is irritating, unsympathetic and stupid with her fear of old age. Worth sympathizes with Archie: "We can well understand why Archie wants to leave her." Alan Carter expresses his view: "We can hardly blame Archie for seeking some relief even if it is a girl on a kitchen table." Archie tells the audience that his wife is "stupid and cold, a moron glacee"(p.69).

Archie Rice, the music-hall clown, keeps sexual affairs with many women, but only to get sexually frustrated, as all the affairs come to an abrupt end. The reason behind his sexual frustration seems to lie in the kind of sex he gets indulged. At the music hall he meets jaded audience with apathy which causes him a tremendous loss in terms of money and self-respect. Frustrated at the theatre, he turns to his family for comfort and consolation, but gets more frustrated, as they are found absorbed in their individual problems. In order to drown his frustration, he resorts to drinking and runs after women. Harold Ferrar says, "Archie's detached routines, his sex and liquor, Jimmy Porter's rants and the pervasive looking back are similar strategies to ward off the demons of awareness." The more he runs after women, the more he gets sexually frustrated and the more he gets alienated. Archie-Phoebe relations suggest that sexual frustration often creates a communication gap between husband and wife.

Archie being sexually frustrated stoops to the extent that he betrays no inhibition in projecting posters of naked girls on the stage: "A gauzed front cloth. On it are painted enormous naked young ladies, waving brightly coloured fans, and kicking out gaily"(p.12). Archie's use of nudes also indicates the debased tastes of the audience: "...all they're out for is cheap thrill"(p.45). The use of nudes underlies the
moral bankruptcy of the world at large where sex mystery and the sacred sanctions behind it are repudiated. Opposing the use of nudes in the road show, Billy Rice rues the degradation of the public taste: “Wish he wouldn’t get stick in that Rockliffe. Gets half of his posing girls in here....Well, why should a family man take his wife and kids to see a lot of third class sluts... in the nude?” (p.18). It is evident that Archie’s casual attitude to sex contributes to the fragmentation of father-son relationships.

In the post-war decade, different approaches to sex in the form of generation gap in the context of family constitute one of the leading factors of friction within family. On the broader plane, this signifies the friction between two ideologies—the conservative and the liberal. This friction is conspicuous between Billy Rice and his son, Archie who keeps no scruples about running after women, and betrays no inhibition while narrating his sexual exploits even in the presence of his young children. To him, it is not an ignominious and clandestine thing. About his anomalous habits, Billy says: “...he makes no secret of his perennial affairs with other women---real and fictitious. It’s part of his pity, part of his patronage. Part of his personal myth” (p.34). In drunken mood, Archie is joking about making love with a prostitute: “Have you ever had it on the kitchen table?” He asks his son Frank, “like a piece of meat on a slab. Slicing pieces of bacon”(p.56). He even seems to glorify sex as a heroic exploit, which is evident in his boastful recounting to Jean:

I have a marvelous time up here with all these posing girls, don’t you?...You’re dead right! You wouldn’t think I was sexy to look at me, would you? You wouldn’t think I was sexy to look at me, would you? Well, I’ve a go, lady. I’ve a go, don’t I? I do. I’ve a go. That barmaid in the Cambridge. That barmaid who upset poor old Billy in the Cambridge---I had her! When he was not looking....(pp.72-3)

As a result of Archie’s adulterous behaviour, his former wife leaves behind a little daughter Jean to develop into a selfish and self-centered being. She lives alone in London away from her family, resorts to heavy drinking and smoking, and develops aversion to males and marriage. She becomes so much egocentric that she does not think once before flouting her betrothal with Graham Todd. Parents’ sexual frustration unavoidability puts an unhealthy impact on the tender psyche of children.
Archie’s overindulgence and alcoholism is not the obsessive passion of a moral derelict, it stems from his inability to engage his mind in any meaningful way with the society. He wants to connect himself with society through sex with women, but except a solitary instance he has never found passionate women: “I think I’ve only slept with one passionate woman. What I’d call really passionate. And she was happily married” (p. 80). He moves from one woman to another, but gets no solace and support to balm his anguished heart. Katherine J. Worth Comments: “Like Osborne’s other heroes, he is involved with women incapable of responding to his needs.” But there is no denying the fact that Archie’s sexual frustration contributes to the severance of his marital bonds and familial ties.

Archie, consequent upon his sexual pursuits, loses a dignified place in the household affairs. His daughter, Jean calls him “a bastard on wheels” (p. 76). His father suspects his capabilities and holds that he is a great womanizer. Archie loses self-respect not only in his own eyes, but in the eyes of his family or in the eyes of the world also. Over and above, he is relegated to the background of the household affairs. Resultantly, he fails to have a healthy interaction with wife and other members of his family. Phoebe tells Jean: “He doesn’t have anyone much to talk” (p. 25). As a result, he suffers from an intense emotional insecurity.

In the end, Archie realizes the need of healthy communication and fidelity to forge a meaningful and lasting conjugal relationship. In drunken mood, he expresses remorse over the separation from his former wife: “I was in love with her….I don’t know….Anyway a months later she died and that was that, she felt everything deeply, your mother. Much more deeply than I did. Perhaps we could have worked it out between us” (p. 70). Finally, Archie recognizes the need of stable marital ties to escape the onslaughts of anxiety, frustration and loneliness of modern life.

In the sixties, with the advent of sexual revolution, premarital and extramarital marital sex have become common features of social life. Certainly it has produced an outburst of sex outside of marriage, among not only young people, but also the separated and the divorced. The sixties has represented a watershed in the modern British history in that it has posed a serious threat to complacency and filled the youth with a mood of rebellion. The period is marked by an incessant struggle for self-
expression, self-assertion and liberation. But this freedom has brought in its tail a marked lack of respectability and social responsibility in general. As a symbol of defiance of authority, the teenagers and students have their hair dressed after the Beatles, or the Rockers. The youthful movement has gradually petered into libertine philistinism. For them freedom means enjoyment of free sex, money, travel and drugs. This change in sexual attitude and behaviour is vividly recorded by L. C. B. Seaman in *The New History of England*:

> Our modern savages have no taboos of any sort. They copulate with the casual promiscuousness of dogs; they make use of every violent emotion-producing sensation for its own sake, because it gives a momentary thrill....What was new about the sixties was that these alleged ‘savages’ were no longer, as in the 1920s, a privileged minority....Aldous Huxley’s copulating ‘savages’ had been a very small size. But now the tribes had numbers in all parts of society.39

In the sixties, it has become widespread even for adults to use contraceptive devices at the age of sixteen. The young people, whether married or not, can obtain the pill from their doctors as a matter of right. A greater number of girls and boys get sexually experienced before their marriage. The Cultural Revolution is spreading a general acceptance of the notion that marriage is not necessary for life, and that there is nothing untoward in having several sexual partnerships, but this notion deprives children of legitimate position in the society, determined by parenthood in the social sense. In this context, David Popene’s assertion is quite significant: “Fatherhood and children are indispensable for the good of children and society.”40 Not the least of the new freedoms is the freedom to be honest to be free of the old conventions and circumlocutions. P. Marin laments “We have been liberated from the taboos of the past only to find ourselves imprisoned in a freedom that brings us no closer to our real nature and needs.”41 The more permissive atmosphere has replaced the uncomfortable set of guidelines with another equally demanding one.

In the plays of the sixties, Osborne highlights the unbridled articulation of sex in the form of premarital or extramarital affairs, homosexuality or lesbianism fracturing familial ties. In *Inadmissible Evidence*, Bill Maitland, the flopped lawyer, divorces his first wife, Sheila having failed to give her “a complete satisfaction.”42 He marries another woman, Anna, but with her also his sex-pitch does not run smoothly, as their reluctance to cross their cultural differences creates emotional void between
them. Frustrated with his present wife, he turns to his mistress, Liz to have comfort and solace, but finds her more exacting and indifferent to his genuine needs. Maitland's "one-sided dependence on these women" not only makes him cruel, "but also renders him vulnerable." In search of love and comfort, he moves from one woman to another, but none of them can provide him what he needs to balm his anguished heart and tortured psyche. The more he does sex, the more he gets frustrated and the more isolated he becomes. In search of human love in others, especially women, he himself becomes a beast. His insatiable lust is only a compensatory device for the want of "love and friendship" (p. 20). With the passage of time, for him, sex has become a commonplace thing like a peg of whisky. Hudson remarks: "... some people seem to use things like sex, for instance, as a place of escape, instead of objects, well—in themselves" (p. 35). He invariably abuses his lovers' trust and affection, cheating on his wife with his mistress and on his mistress with casual lovers.

The playwright highlights the life-denying feature of sex in the plays of the sixties. In the dramatic world of Osborne, non-marital sex is often found without honesty, commitment and responsibility. This manifestation of sex is exemplified through Maitland-Shirley relationship. They get involved in extramarital relations, but without any commitment and responsibility towards each other. Their casual attitude to sex is perceptible in the way they take each other. Maitland takes a cursory view of Shirley's pregnancy: "I haven't touched that girl for months....I've done no harm to her. If she's unhappy it's not my fault. Besides she's engaged" (p. 24). Moreover, he thinks that she is "on the pills" (p. 46). He has been her casual lover, but thinks only of himself and his business when persuading her to stay. On the other hand, she is leaving him now, as he is no longer lucrative in terms of money and manliness. In fact, their sexual relations are not grounded on genuine feelings of love and loyalty with a view to establish an enduring relationship, which becomes quite clear in Maitland's confession to Shirley: "...I don't think I let you think it was an enduring love affair---in the sense of well of endless, wheedling obligations and summonses and things" (p. 49). Healthy sexual relations need reciprocity and responsibility. Sexual relations without the genuine feelings of involvement and
honesty inevitably lead to sexual frustration. Sex is not merely a union between two bodies; it is a communion between two beings. The play shows how irresponsible and dishonest sex leads to sexual frustration in life. The playwright suggests that sex based on commitment, love, honesty and reciprocity can go a long way in establishing sexual harmony.

The fragmentary nature of sex is also discernible in Maitland-Joy relationship. Joy frankly admits: “I want to have sex constantly, I mean, I’m always wanting it” (p.72). She uses the words “I love you” (p.72) to seek sexual favour from Maitland. The scrappy nature of their sexual relations is conspicuous in the words of Joy: “You don’t love me. And I don’t love you” (p.72). It seems that he establishes sex relations with other women to seek love to tide over the emotional frustration, but he “succeeded in inflicting quite certainly...more pain than pleasure” (p.20). It is precisely this dependence on generosity of others, this complete lack of emotional mercantilism that leaves him an easy target for wounding accusations. Shirley asks him pointedly: “What have you ever done for me?” Maitland gives an honest answer: “Nothing. I suppose” (p.39). It is evident that they get tired of each other, for their relationship is devoid of commitment, love and responsibility. It is comprehensible that sex sans reciprocity and responsibility certainly fails to reach an enduring marital relationship. This Maitland-Joy relationship lacking on this count becomes an exemplification of this concept, and underscores the underlying proposition that sex with mutual involvement and trust can lead to happy and lasting sexual relationships.

Maitland, with the passage of time, gets so much frustrated that he lets not slip away any opportunity to give vent to his sexual frustration. He passes indecent remarks against Shirley when he finds her sulky in the morning: “Well, something’s made you bad tempered this morning, and I don’t believe that languid pipe cleaner of an accountant you’re engaged to has got that much lead in his pencil” (p.22). About Joy, Maitland asks Hudson: “Look at that beautiful bottom. Don’t go much on her face. But the way her skirt stretches over that little bum, you could stick a bus ticket in there” (p.31). His mind is so much obsessed with sex that he fails to understand what sort of thing it is: “But what sort of object is that? Is it an enjoyment, a duty, an obligation, a necessity or just an effort of fighting, of fighting off the end, whatever is
to come to you" (p.35). His sexual frustration touches the lowest ebb when he gets infatuated with his own daughter for her youthful body and wishes to enjoy it: "She’s got good youth, I’d never use anything if I could help it" (p.61). Martin Banham comments: "His obsession with sex and promiscuity of his life dominates his existence, the minor triumphs of his conquests offering a transient defence against the major failure of his life, to build true relationship with his family and himself." Maitland’s wild sexuality implies a compensatory device which provides him an ineffectual sense of heroism. Loveless lust corrupts not only his entire being, but also ruins his family life, and consequently both his image and credibility are lost. He fails to keep both his wife and mistress in a good mood, as he is not in a position to respond to them in a healthy way. It seems that they demand more love than they ever offer. Liz, his mistress, is too exacting in her demands on his attention to be satisfied. He, therefore, even feels scared of their telephonic calls: "It is even worse when they ring up. Not that Liz rings very often" (pp.34-35). It is Maitland’s extreme sexual frustration that contributes to the final disruption of his family life. In this play, one can discern a crumbled home, where there is no direct contact between the husband and the wife. Strangely enough, we never see his wife or mistress on the stage. Whatever we learn of them is from their long telephonic conversation with Maitland. He is torn between his wife and mistress, consequently misunderstood by both. His affairs with Joy and Shirley still worsen the situation. He seems to “retain very little” (p.18) of what he has achieved in life, as his powers and potentialities are so much declined that “he’s getting less and less any good at it” (p.18). At last, he becomes so much wrecked that he loses almost all human communications and becomes an isolated, tortured soul nowhere to go. The playwright highlights the destructive dimension of sex playing havoc with familial relations in the sixties.

Finally, Maitland is deserted by all the members of his family, staff and colleagues. His wife dislikes to staying with him, and his daughter and son wish to get rid of him as and when he happens to be in their company. Maitland admits to his daughter, Jane: “They all pretending to ignore me” (p.102). The scene where he is lecturing his daughter, Jane we see her listen to him in a hostile-silence and cut him dead, leaving him without speaking a word. Not only the members of his family
overlook his existence, but he himself is also afraid of being in any contact with them. Instead of coming home, he spends night in his office. He needs love and comfort from his family to escape further disintegration, but is afraid of them even on telephone. Alan Carter comments: “Finally his family and mistress desert, and unable to fight on, Bill throws in the towel and admits the obscenity of his existence.” Maitland’s sporty attitude to sex not only spoils his professional life as barrister, but also frustrates the prospects of happy family life. The play suggests that wholesome sex can provide emotional stability which is essential for conjugal harmony.

Maitland, now, recognizes the fact that “mistresses are less tolerant than wives...they’re also less patronizing but totally without generosity”(p.65). He is now fed up with Liz for her way of looking at him: “I’m tired of being watched. I’m tired of being watched by you, and observed and scrutinized and assessed and guessed about” (p.111). Having failed to find an honest and trustworthy mate to establish a lasting relationship; he wishes to escape this place: “Far away, as far away as possible from this place. There’s no place for me here”(p.113). Being isolated from all healthy human interactions, he recognizes the need of importance of “stable ties of the modern family life” (p.11) to escape the pains of nothingness. The telephonic conversation with his wife reinforces his dire need for family life:

Sometimes I think you’re my only grip left, if you let me go. I’ll disappear, I’ll be made to disappear, nothing will work, I’ll be like something in a capsule in space, weightless, unable to touch anything or do anything, like a groping baby in a removed, putrefying womb....No. I’ll not leave you....I’ve told you. I’ll not leave you...you are leaving me. (p.64)

Osborne highlights the unhealthy dimension of sex marring the prospects of marital harmony between the husband and wife through the law-suits that Maitland takes up. In the petition of Mrs. Maureen Sheila Tonks, Maitland finds reflection of his own life with his former wife Sheila. Tonks seeks divorce on the grounds of excess of sexual demand on the part of her husband. She alleges that he “on many occasions, occasions insisted on having intercourse three times and even four times a day....He refused to cease from having intercourse during the time of the petitioner’s menstrual periods”(p.79). But on the other hand, her husband denies these allegations, saying that his wife “failed to reach satisfaction”(p.79). Refuting the charge he
deposes to the lawyer (Maitland): “There were many times when I failed. Many times I failed in giving her a complete satisfaction” (p.81). They live separately, but without having legal divorce, as it is very difficult for them to prove the sexual cruelty and adulterous behaviour of her husband as required by the existing law of the land, as her allegations lack admissibility in legal terms. It clearly establishes the fact that sexual incompatibility between them leads to dissolution of their marriage. It implies that sexual compatibility can go a long way in establishing marital ties.

Another woman, Mrs. Audrey Jane Anderson seeks divorce from her husband on the similar grounds. Apart from this, she also alleges that her husband has “got mistresses all over London”(p.84). Refuting this charge, her husband accuses her “of going out with men” (pp. 83-84). She admits that “he is a kind man. He can be, and he has been kind to me,” (p.84) but the problem is that he does not express his love for her candidly: “He found it difficult to say I love you” (p.84). This relationship signifies how sexual incompatibility sows the seeds of mistrust, misunderstanding, suspicion and indifference between the spouses and it reaches the apogee where it becomes difficult for them to live together in an amiable way. The play suggests that mutual trust, tolerance and sympathy can forge sexual compatibility between spouses.

The last case is of that of a homosexual, Maples who seeks divorce from his wife, Hilda. Though he was not interested in heterosex, he was married to her: “I never wanted to marry Hilda or anyone else”(p.95). He admits: “I never liked girls, but I didn’t like men who didn’t seem like men either”(p.96). He regrets having married: “If I wasn’t married I’d have done it all the time, one to another”(p.98). He is in homosexual affairs with Denis and feels “better and relaxed” with him, as he is “being loved openly and attended on” (p.100). He wishes to continue his physical relations with Denis: “I don’t want to change. I want to be who I am”(p.96). The playwright seems to show sympathy for Maples, because the law harasses him instead of providing any relief. Maples suffers at the impersonal hands of the state. He has been compelled by the police to reveal his hidden homosexuality and is undergoing humiliation not only in his personal life, but also in his professional life. Through this case, Osborne highlights the problem of homosexuality bringing miseries to an individual and hitting hard at the reproductive function of family.
In the late sixties, with the liberal social legislations in background, it has become easy not only for the married people, but also for the unmarried who go by sexual indirections. Sexual morality has got loosened in such a way that the institution of family has almost ceased to be a haven of procreation, protection and nurturance. As nucleus of family and an integral unit of sane society, marriage is no longer a restrictive force on sex. The unbridled freedom that the youngsters enjoy has led them to treat sex as a casual thing and an open activity with obscenity and vulgarity. Without any restraining force to check, the unbridled form of sex has got shifted to sex without from sex within marriage. Young boys and girls are no longer afraid of the stigma and legal penalty that premarital sex used to bear, earlier, on the individual in particular and family in general. But both homosexual and heterosexual activities hit very hard at the roots of the institutions of marriage and family.

In *Time Present*, Pamela, the unmarried girl, is suspected to be in unhealthy relationships with her father, Gideon Orme. She is so much obsessed with the memories of her father that after his death she gets herself shut up in the Constance’s flat and mourns the death like a lover by wearing a black armband as a token of bereavement. Edith tells Constance: “You’re her friend. That’s enough. Without her father. Well, she’ll find it harder still.”\(^{46}\) In the case of Pamela, Freud’s theory of *family romance* seems to be relevant. Despite being strictly sexual in origin and erotic in implication, his theories of Oedipal and Electra complexes have a bearing on real life. These theories suggest that a child develop an unwholesome love for his parents. Nevertheless, Jung has propounded that “the principle motive in the child’s love of a parent is dependence or security motive rather than asexual motive.”\(^ {47}\) But it is explicit that an unwholesome affection for the mother or father inexorably puts an unpleasant effect on the psyche of the child. R.D. Laing comments: “Jesus spoke of having one’s parents. Did he mean, among other things, that one is not wise to cling for ultimate security to their system of reference, that not this way does one find oneself?”\(^ {48}\) Regarding this theory of *family romance*, Laing’s comments seem to be apt: “The “Family Romance” is a dream of changing the others who define the self, so that the identity of the self can be self-defined by a re-definition of the others. It is an
attempt to feel pride rather than shame at being the son or daughter of this father and this mother.\textsuperscript{49}

But Erich Fromm attributes these complexes to the forces of Western social structure, which is primarily rigid and patriarchal one. And this argument is testified by the anthropological evidence as referred in Paul Kilne's \textit{Fact and Fantasy in Freudian Theory}. The evidence shows that such complexes find no scope in the matriarchal society. In the patriarchal society, the authoritarian father engenders a sense of revolt and revulsion in the children. The origin of such a spirit of dominance can be traced to the sexual disorder of the parents. It is somewhat sexual frustration of the parents that puts a damaging impact on the tender psyche of their children. In this play, Pamela's frustration can be linked back to her cheerless childhood that she spent after her mother had deserted her father twenty years ago for his flirtation with actresses. Pamela tells Constance: "He adored actresses. But he did not like the idea of marrying them. At least, I think he did, but he did not meet her. That was the trouble with Mama" (p.80). Maternal deprivation seems to have turned Pamela into a gloomy person. Osborne highlights how parental disharmony puts devastating impact on the psyche, sensibility and sexuality of children.

Pamela rejects her own family and starts residing with her divorced girl friend, Constance. Their behaviour has clear lesbian overtones. Constance expresses her desires to Pamela: "Perhaps I've always wanted to be someone like you. To have long legs, and style. Instead of just making efforts. But I suppose what's saddening is that you make it sound like a rejection"(p.36). In the post-war British society, lesbianism is one of the manifestations of emancipation of woman to assert sexual freedom, but this new relationship not only hits hard at the root of the family, but also engenders frustration in the individual in the long-run.

Pamela, frustrated with Constance, establishes sex relations with Murray, but this physical union seems to be for the sake of recreation, not for the sake of procreation, which is evident in the way she looks at her pregnancy and its termination. Their relations are bereft of any sense of commitment and responsibility towards each other as well as society. Neither Murray nor Pamela seems to be serious and sincere about the affair and its consequences. As a womanizer, Murray is
involved with Pamela and Constance at the same time, being committed and responsible to neither of them. Pamela becomes pregnant, but she gets her pregnancy terminated without expressing any repentance and displaying any inhibition and hesitation. The Abortion Reform Act 1968 has enabled women to get their unwanted pregnancies aborted. In this context, the observation of Judith Ryder and Harold Silver is quite authentic:

The availability of legal abortion, after April 1968, was for some women a further defence against unwanted pregnancies....By the mid-1970s the climate of opinion towards conception and childbirth had changed so dramatically that a number of women’s groups were even demanding 'Do it yourself abortion kits''

Abortion does mean destruction of the results of the indiscretion of sex partners. The Abortion Reform Act has given an administrative sanction to it, but it has its sordid side as well: it unshackles the girl from the unwanted pregnancy, but it puts an adverse effect on her health and sensibility. Moreover, the abortion amounts to denunciation of the primary function of woman, and through it, that of family. The availability of the means to shrug off responsibility and obligations towards family makes people resort to them in order to lead a carefree life. The conversation between Murray and Pamela reveals how the latter looks at abortion:

Murray: You can’t be serious about ladies services?
Pamela: My dear, it’s like going to the crimpers. (p.64)

Prior to establishing sex relations with Murray, Pamela had sexual relations with Alec and they stayed like husband-wife without any commitment and responsibility towards each other, but she forsook him, finding lack of a needed emotional involvement on his part. Pamela tells Murray: "...When he was making love to me. He never said anything. He was too reticent"(p.65). Disgusted with irresponsible sexual affairs, Pamela denounces sex-hungry young males who do not let slip away any opportunity to have orgies to satiate their degraded tastes: "It’s probably some man sniffing around. The moment you’ve been detached, they’re on the doorstep seeing what the chances are. Especially for you---married women on the self. Wanting to be taken down and given a bit of what they need”(p.45). Pamela finds
a great lack of honesty in sex scattered all around. This affair shows how sexual relations sans commitment and responsibility lead to sexual frustration and boredom.

On the other hand, Constance, Pamela’s flat-mate, does not have any scruples about having sex with Murray, but is averse to the idea of being tied to him in any lifelong relationship. After divorcing her husband, she does not bother to remarry for sex, as it is easily available in the social market without marriage. Not only she establishes physical relations with Murray, but also creates an atmosphere for Pamela and Edward to have an orgy. Viewing that Constance and Murray are sharing bed, Edward also feels tempted and expresses his desire to have sex with Pamela, but she puts him off by putting “the lights out and get rid of Edward,”(p.51) as Pamela finds Edward “the greatest knock out a woman had ever laid eyes on”(p.45). Pamela, craving for wholesome sex, gets frustrated with vulgar and irresponsible sex.

Pamela holds a sane and sober view of sex contrary to that of Constance: the latter is very vulgar and rough in sexual matters, and has no belief in the sex within bounds. Pamela tells Murray: “She’s also rather coarse when she talks about sex. Oh, I know what you think. Lust is O.K. by me. But not when it’s ambitious and gluttonous, then it’s vulgar indeed…”(p.66). Pamela finds Constance very greedy and opportunist in sex matters because she can stoop to any extent to satiate her sex instincts without assuming any responsibility and obligation to the sex partner. But the way Constance rationalizes her view of sex seems to show that she has been brought up on the norms of fulfilment in sex. Pamela tells Murray:

She was brought up on the principle of fulfillment in as many spheres as possible. As a statutory obligation, I’m only saying don’t always give in to her, and not now. There isn’t any statutory level of fulfillment we’re entitled to. I’ve tried to explain it to Constance. I’ve told her it leads to excess and deception. It’s difficult to talk to her about a lot of things. She either reduces them to worthy sounding principles or theorizes them to say they relate to any old thing. She’s very coarse woman, I’m afraid. (pp.65-66)

Pamela does not find herself good at sexual garbage that is scattered all around: “I don’t think I’m probably particularly good at it”(p.40). The reason is that she, with the passage of time, has developed an aversion to sex. Being disgusted and disillusioned with sex, she abhors going for sex either with Murray or Edward.
Pamela snubs Edward for his adulterous behaviour: “Why don’t you go to your famous bachelor pad. Sue’ll be in state if she doesn’t know where you are”(p.51). By falsely praising her with the words that she “is a very sexy kid,” he tries to coax her into an orgy, but she does not give in to his sugar-coated talks. Pamela retorts: “You told me the other day week for about five hours. Well, I’m rather disappointing I believe, and I’m twenty-six and I’m no kid”(p.52). But, on the other hand, Constance takes Pamela’s disinclination towards sex otherwise, thinking that she is not pacing up with the times and expects that she should be well-versed in sex matters at this age. To her astonishment, Pamela is lagging behind the times in respect of sexual frankness. Constance is very adept at sex, but her view of sex is not sane and sound; rather it is fraught with vulgarity, irresponsibility and dishonesty.

Pamela gets sickened with the kind of sex that is available in the present times. She likes to have healthy sex, but she finds vulgarity and irresponsibility strewn all around. Besides, her long association with her father has put an adverse effect on her emotional development, thereby cramping her sexuality to the point of egocentricity. As a result, she gets sexually disillusioned and disenchanted with each person she establishes sex relations, as she seeks wholesome sex, but finds utter depravity, vulgarity and ingenuity with them. She seeks sanity, solace, sincerity and sobriety in sex with men, but to her dismay and disillusionment, it is fraught with life-denying features such as depravity, greed, hypocrisy, treachery and vulgarity. It develops in her disgust and aversion to the notion of sex in the present times. Pamela tells Murray:

You’re all bent on incest or some cosy hysteria. She’s bound to bulb. You’re above it, and we’ll end up on the floor embracing and comforting and rationalizing and rumpled and snorting and jammed together and performing autopsies and quite disgusting all of it. You both are. Don’t indulge her. Just she demands it. (p.65)

Pamela, now, turns to heavy drinking and makes her life somewhat messy. In the end, she resolves to accompany her homosexual friend, Bernard to France to have a change. Pamela tells Constance: “...My nice coloured gentleman will be back soon. You will like him. He’s frightfully New Statesman. Nice though fastidious”(p.67). She holds that Bernard is a gentleman, as he continues to stay with her selflessly. She establishes sexual relations with Murray and others to have wholesome sex, but she
finds it a filthy affair divested of commitment, reciprocity and purpose. Osborne is well aware of the fact that sex without love, commitment and responsibility is detrimental to the health of individuals as well as that of family.

In the plays of the seventies, it is primarily sexual frustration that severs familial relationships. It is acute sexual frustration that leads to marital disharmony between Sir Jock Mellor and his wife Lady Mellor in Very Like a Whale. Jock, the business magnate, suffers from an acute sexual frustration. The roots of his frustration seem to lie in his over-absorption in the commercial pursuits and overindulgence in sex. It is because of sexual frustration he loses interest in his wife and life. He often tries to avoid any intimate contact with his wife, overlooking her wifely needs. During the day time, he most often stays away from his wife, and comes home late at night. On the other hand, bored at home, his wife, Lady Mellor wishes to have his company for the maximum time of the day to have outings together to enjoy life to the full. Being frustrated with the kind of life that he lives, she misses no opportunity to taunt him for his dreariness and indifference to the lively things of life. Sir Jock’s sexual indifference to his wife seems to be the result of haunting memories of his former wife, Barbara who left him a long ago. He seeks love and warmth from his wife, but she seems to be more interested in his body than his frustration, disregarding his human needs. The different needs in bed deepen their sexual frustration, leading to boredom. Jock’s sexual frustration is reflected in the following conversation:

Jock : No. I must go. (At nude.) Is it for sale?
Stephen : When it's finished.
Jock : She reminds me.
Stephen : I wonder if you remind her!
Jock : I'm sure not. Still---Where would she be? 51

Jock is alleged to have been unfaithful to his present wife. The following conversation indicates his possible infidelity:

Lady Journalist : Are you faithful to your wife?
Jock : None of your business. Whatever your name is. (p.16)

Jock's seemingly involvement with his office secretary deepens the emotional void between the spouses. As a result, both the husband and the wife feel lonely and suffocated in bed at night, as they are highly incompatible in respect of conjugal
harmony. Their sex-pitch is so much fraught with boredom, coldness, animosity and dryness that they find it rather difficult to have emotional harmony necessary to establish sexual harmony. Jock most often remains silent in the presence of his wife, but that is a great source of impatience and irritation for his wife. With the passage of time, emotional void between them increases so much that their sex-pitch seems to be washed off for ever:

Lady Mellor: Then why don’t you do something? Why don’t you do something about it?

Jock: I don’t know... What? And if I did, I doubt I would do it (p.27)

They are utterly dreary and indifferent to the needs of each other. He tries to conceal his anguish and anxiety, but she becomes bitchy and violent. She tries to extract response from him, but he thinks it better to keep mum than to respond to her bitchiness. They often fall in arguments with each other, invariably a violent one, but most of the time they choose to defer fighting. To avoid the pains of emptiness of sexual life, Lady Mellor takes pills to induce sleep. They fail to deliver what they need individually in respect of sex in particular and life in general. She tries to attract him sexually, but goes to bed immediately, leaving him to watch her asleep. On finding her indifferent to his genuine feelings, he gets up and goes out stealthily. Jock gets bored with his wife, which is reflected in the following conversation:

L. Mellor: You’re bored with me, aren’t you?
Jock: Yes.
L. Mellor: How much?
Jock: Enough. (p.30)

Sexual frustration between the spouses not only causes marital disharmony, but also puts adverse impact on the psyche of the children. Jock loses interest in his little daughter, Myra also. The daughter also remains silent in the company of the father. We find a reflection of parental frustration on the psyche of the little child:

L. Mellor: You don’t care about that child at all.
Jock: Um?
L. Mellor: Do you?
Jock: I’m sure you’re right. (p.31)

It is, again, acute sexual frustration that leads to marital disharmony between Ben Prosser and Sally in Watch It Come Down. Ben Prosser, the ex-film director,
divorces his first wife, Marion and marries another woman, Sally, but his frustration does not come to an end. His sexual frustration seems to be rooted in his cheerless childhood. About one of his bitter experiences in the childhood, Ben tells Jo: "Senior asked me one what I think of 'young people' and I was more or less pilloried for it... When I was a little boy. I didn't know much about other little things." Parental deprivations have also stunted his emotional growth, thereby complicating his sensibility and sexuality. He is in an urgent need of love and warmth to make his life cheerful, but neither his former wife nor the present one recognizes his needs. Ben laments that he is "neither loved or nor loving" (p.10). Ben's sex life with Marion proved a fiasco. It was his sexual incompatibility that led to their separation. Marion tells Ben: "We became islands at the edges of the bed. You’re on your own....I followed you like a dog when you wanted to be left alone." (p.53). Dissatisfied with each other, they took recourse to divorce. Marion left her daughter in the impersonal hands of nannies to work outside to win bread. The daughter grows into an egocentric adult and loses interest in her parents in particular and the world in general.

In the plays of the seventies, sexual frustration often leads to divorce or remarriage, but the former marriage finds a reflection on the second one. Ben marries Sally with a view to diffuse his sexual frustration, but he finds her arrogant, egocentric, exacting and violent in the assertion of her sexuality. Finding her "barren in spirit," Ben remarks: "You only accept love. You can’t respond to it..."(p.14). Sally makes fun of him for seeking love in marriage: "Why? People marry for love. You don’t have to like ‘em. That’s Ben’s mistake"(p.11). She finds him sexually bankrupt: “There’s always been a tiny fuel in the tank. Or a dribble in the can to crawl home”(p.11). The following conversation reflects their sexual frustration:

Sally: It’s men-o-pause. All right. Male menopause...
Ben : Good. Clearly suits you.
Sally: Were you going to say something? What was it? My complexion, my hair, my tits? Let me tell you I wear the same bra I wore twenty years ago.
Ben : What were you---in the Brigade of Guards?
Sally: You mean I’m flat chested?
Ben : Flat-headed.
Sally: I’m not your cuddly little armfuls.
Ben : No, you’re not. But some people like to embrace pythons round their necks. (p.29)
Both Ben and Sally are emotionally dry and alien to each other. This is why their sex life is bereft of any warmth and involvement. Finding that their “sex pitch has been washed,” Sally prefers to be “a real nun” (p. 11). In frustration, she makes his life unbearable with her continuous bitchiness. She is pretty spiteful in her crude attacks on Ben’s mother, his ex-wife and his daughter. The end result of sexual frustration is lesbianism on the part of women, adultery on the part of men and most tragic of all, the turning of child into introvert at the tender age.

The spouses seek love and comfort in their respective extramarital relations. Sally “tired of the bodies of men,” (p. 45) gets infatuated with Jo for her “strong, thriving body” and “sturdy legs and hard arms” (p. 44). Jo cohabits with Glen who is in homosexual affairs with the “young guardsmen” (p. 23). Dissatisfied with Glen; she turns to Sally for emotional fulfilment. Their mutual attraction is evident in the following conversation:

Sally: Yes, I want to kiss you. On the mouth. My tongue between your bright teeth. I want to hold you in my arms a whole night with our bodies like twin fortresses, lap in lap.

Jo: As long as you want. I want you to. (They kiss, gently, forcibly.) (pp. 44-45)

For Sally, lesbianism is one of the ways of relief from the highly incompatible marriage. No doubt, lesbianism provides an emotional support, but not lasting one. But one thing is certain that it smacks very hard at the reproductive function of the family. Sally seeks warmth and comfort in Jo, and the latter also responds with equal warmth, and consents to the plan of elopement of the former. But Jo breaks down and commits suicide when the doctor announces that Glen is dying. It is evident from the break-up of this affair that unhealthy sex leads to frustration.

Likewise, Ben tries to compensate for the sterility of his marriage by lusting after his ex-wife Marion, his unmarried sister-in-law, Shirley and Jo. Ben wants to establish sex relations with unmarried Shirley. Not only Ben, but Shirley is also ready to share bed with Ben: “I’m not going to discuss Sally. That does not mean that I might not go to bed with you” (p. 35). Fed up with Sally’s constant tantrums, he comes
to rely more and more on his ex-wife for company and emotional support. Marion reciprocates quite candidly, rushing to his side to soothe him when all the others have deserted him, assuring him of offspring's love. Remembering their "relaxing forgetful happiness" in the past, Marion seems to be regretting the decision of divorce: "We should have trusted each other then, instead of going our ways---Oh Ben, come now. Before they all come back and she starts smashing the place up"(p.53). It shows that they agreed upon divorce in a moment of weakness. Very often divorces are rash acts of indiscretion and the partners regret it later; it leaves one to wonder whether people would have resorted to it so often, had it not been so easily available. Divorce can provide relief to the affected parties, but it has a sordid side as well. It puts deadening impact on the emotional development of children. Not only the children, but also the spouses most often fail to develop strong marital relationships to tide over the frustration received earlier, as they fail to get themselves fully liberated from the haunting memories of the former marital relations.

In End of Me Old Cigar, sexual frustration assumes gigantic dimensions in such a way that sex becomes mockery at the hands of a group of divorced, separated and unmarried women. Regine Frimly, Hackney girl in her late thirties, sexually frustrated after several marriages, runs "a call-girls establishment for randy, big names weekends" to challenge the view of the conventional sexual morality. She keeps the conviction that the conventional morality is the main cause of their frustration, as it is, to her, of arbitrary, discriminatory and contradictory nature, based as it is on the norm of inequality between man and woman, supporting man and discriminating woman. She finds religion, morality, marriage and family as great obstacles in the realization of her sexual freedom and individuality. Hitherto man has exploited woman to his tastes and whims, but now Regine intends to abuse man sexually at her own place: "I have run this 'establishment', if that's the word, to have enticed almost every man in England"(p.20).

Most of the women-participants engaged in the unbridled sex at this establishment nurse their respective grievances and grudges against man. Stella Shrift, the journalist, is very cross with the choir boys: "I hate these angelic little, well brushed dirty little devils....Two of them jumped on me and ripped my gym-slip off
and all but raped me” (p.16). She develops so much aversion to man that she abhors even the idea of marriage with him. Another woman character, Mrs. Gwen Mitchelson, a divorcee with three children, marries another man, but lives separately, finding him sexually incompatible. She seems to be sex-hungry and wants to enjoy orgy as early as possible. Jog Fienberg, a crazy woman, is so much critical of man that she advocates “compulsory vasectomy for all men with or without the option of the death penalty”(p.30). She seems to be exhausted of entertaining men at the country house: “I want a lover and it isn’t a man and it isn’t woman”(p.32). Still another woman character, lady Isobel Sands is so much excited that Stella calls her “a sperm vampire”(p.28). Her sexual frustration seems to be stemming from her unhappy marital and family life, which is reflected in her description of her husband to Regine: “He really goes pale and damp with fear an irritation with me. I can watch it. It’s like a boiling migraine. You need to put in the dark, alone as long as possible, while I sit and stare at nothing well, our house walls, the walls of our house”(p.29). Nor is she happy with her children, as they scare even her shadow. Isobel tells Regine: “I’ve been married nearly twenty years. I’ve three teenage children who don’t take notice of either of us much. They really scare both of us now and I suppose we avoid them most of the time and they us…” (p.28).

Regine does not believe in hiding her sexual malice toward man for enjoying sexual freedom: “I don’t believe in hiding one’s malice. I like women and some men; sex now and then, preferably in private; horses”(p.18). She thinks that man prevails over woman in sex matters for merely having phallus, so she hates him and wants to see the phallus in a deplorable condition:

...dangle, dingle dangle, jingle jangle in its usual petulant pendulance. A sorry, blue-veined pork sword looking like an unripe, yellowish Stilton. Lying against its horse-hair sack, wee bag, of a million million pestilent tadpoles looking for a muddy pool to rest in. Throbbing for all the world’s distaste like a turkey’s gobbling neck. (p.23)

Regiine holds the view that it is sex that compels women to submit to the wishes of men. She intends to apply the same ploy on men to make them crawl before her, begging for mercy. Her aim is not to create social equality, but to create social anarchy by spreading sexual garbage all around. She picks up fresh girls and
indoctrinates them to make them ready to go by her wishes and designs. She assures them that they will lose nothing in terms of morality if they go for orgies. She makes them believe that the act will, besides fun, provide them lasting power over man and his activities. Regine tells Stella: “Fresh picked. To them it doesn’t matter. If they go along with the principle, they have nothing to lose” (p. 22). Stella’s sexual frustration is clearly reflected in her peculiar notion of self-realization of girls by changing the them into high-class prostitutes to realize their worth and utility: “Give us a girl for the first time of her grooming, her indoctrination, and I’ll make first whore and then her whole self, her self for life” (p. 22).

Regine intends to revolutionize the existing moral order by establishing a domain of dirt and debauchery: “I create a very English cliché. The Country Weekend. This is the Garsington of lechery—instead of literature” (p. 21). She intends to establish ‘a paradise of women’ on the earth by making man incapable and impotent. She coaxes them into mass orgy by falsely assuring them of bright future, but she is tricked in the end once again, as her agent Stan flees with the films. Besides, as the mass orgy is over, almost all the women-participants find themselves more crestfallen than they earlier were, as they find their sex partners highly incompatible and rude. They, now, wish to go home back. Lack of emotional involvement, honesty and commitment has deepened their sexual frustration.

But the pair of Isobel and Len falls in love, as they are in search of love and warmth. On shedding all their pretensions and hypocrisies, they find some common grounds of similarity between them. Len tells Isobel: “Well, that’s something we have in common. The Gift of Tears. Let’s cherish that—and drink to it. (He kisses her eyes slightly, then her lips.) You can never be a man, you know” (p. 44). Osborne uses “the revelation of true identity at the moments of sexual intimacy in order to dissect and demolish the pretences and hypocrisies of a decaying society” (54). Recognizing the need of each other, Len tells Isobel: “We need love. Otherwise we would be alone. Frighteningly” (p. 45). Len tells Isobel: “…Marriage should be a vision of excellence. EXCELLENCE. The stuff they don’t make or want any more” (p. 50). Osborne is averse to the sexual garbage that makes the institutions of marriage and family cease to be havens of love and comfort. Besides, he seems to be mocking at the marriage
that binds two persons together physically, but fails to establish emotional compatibility between them. The playwright suggests that sex with love, warmth, mutual respect, understanding, and involvement can purge the institution of family of the ills such as suspicion, hatred, indifference, apathy, mistrust, dryness and monotony.

Osborne’s journey from Look Back in Anger to The End of Me Old Cigar---a period of two decade also a period of one generation----is also the journey of sex making slight but perceptible impact on the familial relations to the sex making deep and loud impact on the familial relations. It is casual attitude to sex that entails serious implications on the marital relations between Jimmy and Alison. Sex, being only subdued, falls short of breaking the institution of family completely, but leaves the familial relations full of bickering and brawling. Archie Rice and Phoebe were caught in bed by Archie’s wife and she walked out the wedlock. Archie-Phoebe sex relationship is devoid of all warmth, compelling Archie to indulge in numerous sex relations, but all meaningless and even perverse. This play explores another facet of sex and family relationships, which in a way complements the portrayal in Look Back in Anger. From this level of treating sex and family relationships in the sixties, Osborne goes on to explore another dimension of sex and family relationships. In Inadmissible Evidence, Maitland’s sexual relations with almost unaccountable partners debunk the concept of sex as panacea and also the way this concept will make the family relationships redundant and meaningless. Sex in Time Present dominates to such an extent that family as an institution ceases to be present in the play, and also in the life of the characters. Sex, thus, devoid of social dimensions becomes a mechanical means and an end itself. Sex and family relations in this way in the plays of the late sixties explore the concept of sex formulated by the hippie culture and extremes of sexual revolution. In the plays of the seventies, Osborne’s characters become an exemplification of sex within the gender category, and institutionalization of sex relations. Lesbianism or homosexuality usually considered being most satisfying and meaningful by the people and characters in literature ascribing to homosexuality/lesbianism are, surprisingly, presented by Osborne in a different way----all the characters favouring
homosexuality/lesbianism remain emotionally dry and sexually frustrated. This view underscores Osborne's traditional viewpoint of the need for stable and healthy family relationships.

The foregoing discussion reveals that it is not only the slackening of sexual mores, but the ravaging emotional frustration and sexual incompatibility lead to adultery, homosexuality, and premarital or extramarital sex which, in turn, contribute to the disintegration of familial ties in the plays of Osborne. Having lost the sanctity, sex has become a means of recreation, not of procreation. Sex relationships sans honesty, responsibility, involvement, and warmth breed sexual frustration in the partners. In addition, temperamental incompatibility leads to sexual incompatibility. Non-marital sex, homosexuality, and lesbianism are posing a serious threat to the institution of family. All the permissive tendencies in respect of sex tend to disrupt the long-established concept of the family. This drift is abetted by the liberal social legislations like legalization of abortion and homosexuality and simplification of the laws of divorce. Under the former divorce law, divorce had been an award accorded to the innocent spouse, a penalty forced on the one who had been guilty, and divorce by consent was not even thinkable. Though the Divorce Reform Act of 1969 retains adultery, desertion, harassment, and cruelty as matrimonial offences, it brings into legal consideration the ground that the partners can not get on each other. Irreconcilable differences, irretrievable breakdown, incompatibility, non-reciprocity, etc. are now taken to be grounds for seeking divorce; they are so close to being no grounds at all that the term 'no fault divorce' has come to stick to this type of divorce. The easy access to divorce has made it easier for a family to dissolve itself. The permissive traits of the time seem to exercise a crushing effect on the family. Bonds degraded into bondages and social legislative reforms make it unproblematic to dispense with bondages. Gordian knots are difficult to untie, easier to cut off. Marital relations are no longer a binding force. Adjustment and compromise become almost passé words; and the family undergoes the process of rapid disintegration partly due to liberalization of sex codes and mores.
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