

ISSN:0976-8165

# THE CRITERION

An International Journal in English



Vol. 7, Issue-I February 2016

7 YEARS OF OPEN ACCESS

[www.the-criterion.com](http://www.the-criterion.com)

Editor-In-Chief: Dr. Vishwanath Bite

About Us: <http://www.the-criterion.com/about/>

Archive: <http://www.the-criterion.com/archive/>

Contact Us: <http://www.the-criterion.com/contact/>

Editorial Board: <http://www.the-criterion.com/editorial-board/>

Submission: <http://www.the-criterion.com/submission/>

FAQ: <http://www.the-criterion.com/fa/>



ISSN 2278-9529

Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

[www.galaxyimrj.com](http://www.galaxyimrj.com)

## **Exploring the Aesthetics of the ‘Third Theatre’: A Study of Badal Sircar’s *Indian History Made Easy***

**Victor Mukherjee**

M.Phil. Research Scholar.

Department of English.

Rabindra Bharati University,

Kolkata, West Bengal.

### **Abstract:**

Badal Sircar (1925-2011) was one of the most important playwrights in the contemporary Bengali theatre, who made significant contributions to the form and content of the people’s theatre in the post-independent phase of Indian drama. Borrowing the Western influences of Jerzy Grotowski’s ‘Poor Theatre’, Richard Schechner’s ‘Environmental Theatre’, Julian Beck and Judith Malina’s ‘The Living Theatre’, Badal Sircar had theorized his concept of the ‘Third Theatre’. Sircar’s ‘Third Theatre’ is a departure from the urban, proscenium theatre (the ‘First Theatre’) and rural, folk theatre (the ‘Second Theatre’). Much in the manner of the plays of Utpal Dutt, Habib Tanvir and Safdar Hashmi; the egalitarian ‘Third Theatre’ of Badal Sircar with its audience-oriented, open-air, non-proscenium performances had initiated the development of an alternative form of theatre in modern Indian drama. This paper attempts to study Sircar’s *Indian History Made Easy (Sukhapathya Bharater Itihas, 1976)* and relate the concept of the ‘Third Theatre’ with the performative text of *Indian History Made Easy*.

**Keywords: Poor Theatre, Environmental Theatre, The Living Theatre, Third Theatre, Performative Text.**

According to the materialist conception of history, the determining element in history is ultimately the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I [Frederick Engels] have asserted... The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure – political forms of the class struggle and its consequences, constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc, – forms of law – and then even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the combatants: political, legal, and philosophical theories, religious ideas and their further development into systems of dogma – also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form. (Eagleton 8-9)

– Frederick Engels, *The Selected Correspondence 1846-1895* (1942)

The Second World War and the post-World War period in India saw the emergence of cultural movements like the Progressive Writers’ Association (PWA) and the Indian People’s Theatre Association (IPTA) that rallied against the emerging trends of capitalism, imperialism and fascism aligning themselves with the Communist Party of India, worker’s

associations and peasant movements while addressing the socio-political issues of its times. The 'Gana Natya Andolon' ('People's Theatre Movement'), the 'Naba Natya' ('New Theatre') and the group theatres who distinguished themselves from the commercially run star-centred traditional Bengali theatre, had initiated the beginning of the New Drama Movement in Bengal during the 40s and 50s. By this time, the eminent theatre personalities in Bengal like Sambhu Mitra, Utpal Dutt, Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay and Badal Sircar were experimenting with the form and content of contemporary Bengali theatre. The playwrights were moving away from the influence of the philosophical theatre of Rabindranath Tagore and Sri Aurobindo. They started to use the stage to explore the socio-psychological spectrum of the predicament of modern man in a country that was going through its cultural and ideological revisionary phase in the post-colonial era.

Badal Sircar (1925-2011) started acting and directing in the early 1950s. In the initial phase of his career, Sircar used the proscenium stage as a medium of communication. By the late fifties, he wrote plays like *Solution X* (1956), *Tom, Dick, Harry* (*Ram, Shyam, Jadu*, 1957), *Elder Paternal Aunt* (*Boro Pishima*, 1959) and *Saturday* (*Shanibar*, 1959). The second phase of Sircar's career constituted his experimental quest. During this phase, he started exploring serious issues about contemporary Indian society. In this period, Sircar's notable works were *And Indrajit* (*Evam Indrajit*, 1962), *Remaining History* (*Baki Itihas*, 1965), *Thirtieth Century* (*Tringsha Satabdi*, 1966) and *Mad Horse* (*Pagla Ghora*, 1967). Although Badal Sircar formed his own group, 'Satabdi' in 1967 and started writing, directing and producing for the proscenium theatre, he was becoming more and more aware of the limitations of the conventional stage. During the 70s, the group theatres in Kolkata were facing severe financial constraints. The people who were involved with theatre remained unpaid, yet they were completely committed to theatre. The proscenium productions were untenable financially as well as artistically. The groups could not afford to rent an auditorium to stage their performances. Unwilling to surrender to the growing adversities of his times, Sircar started interrogating the concept of proscenium stage. He continued asking himself a few questions like – What are the limitations of naturalistic theatre? How can actors communicate directly with the spectators? In the modern era of cinema, how can theatre survive to serve its social and artistic purpose? How can one overcome the financial constraints of a proscenium production? Badal Sircar's theorisation of the 'Third Theatre' was an attempt to find answers to all these questions. One may refer to Aparna Bhargava Dharwadker's observations in this context:

During the 1960s, Sircar became interested in developing minimalist theatre that could provide an alternative to urban realist drama as well as rural folk forms and attract audiences in both locations. His conception of this 'Third Theatre' in India was strongly mediated by Jerzy Grotowski's 'Poor Theatre' and Richard Schechner's 'Environmental Theatre', both of which he encountered while travelling in Europe and North America on a Nehru Fellowship. Since the early 1970s, these *avant-garde* influences have led Sircar to develop largely, body-centred vehicles for non-proscenium indoor performance, outdoor urban environments, such as large parks and open grounds, and extensive tours in rural areas. His theatre is intimate, emotionally intense, detached from political dogma, opposed to the commodification of art, and committed to communication –

between the performers and the spectators as well as within the members of each group. (Dharwadker 65-66)

During the 70s, Sircar employed the theorisation of the 'Third Theatre' during his theatre group, Satabdi's performances of *Procession* (Michchil, 1972), *Scandal in Fairyland* (Rupkathar Kelenkari, 1975), *Indian History Made Easy* (Sukhpathya Bharater Itihas, 1976), *Beyond the Land of Hattamala* (Hatamalar Opore, 1977), *Stale News* (Bashi Khobor, 1978) and *Bhoma* (1979). *Indian History Made Easy* was first performed at the Calcutta Theosophical Society Hall in Bengali on 17<sup>th</sup> December, 1976. While commenting on the title of the play, Rustom Bharucha in the book, *Rehearsals of Revolution: The Political Theatre of Bengal* (1983) opines:

The title of the play (*Sukhpathya Bharater Itihas*) is reminiscent of those innumerable "mug books" sold on College Street that advertise "short cuts" and "guarantees for success" in examinations. The mug book, which most students in Calcutta rely on to pass examinations, is the most glaring instance of what is wrong with education in Calcutta. (Bharucha 169)

Sircar's *Indian History Made Easy* deals with the most significant period in the history of India – the British colonialism. To establish a relation between the play's content and form, Sircar effectively uses the interesting device of classroom teaching. Teachers, students and the master constitute the different roles in the process of making the entire period come alive before the audience. With the teachers imparting history lessons to their students, Sircar could easily cover more than three hundred years of the British rule without the coherent structure of a plot. In the book, *On Theatre* (2009), Sircar writes:

Communication is essential in every art form; the artist communicates to other people through literature, music, painting, acting. But the methods of communication are different. A writer writes – he does not have to be present when his writing is being read. So it is with the painter and the sculptor. In cinema, the film artists do not have to be present when the film is being projected. But in theatre, the performers have to be present when the communication takes place. This is a fundamental difference. Theatre is a live show, cinema is not. In theatre, communication is direct; in cinema it is through images. (Sircar 11)

It is interesting to make a comparison between the effects of Sircar's 'Third Theatre' and Brecht's 'Epic Theatre'. Sircar's 'Third Theatre' involved direct communication with the spectators, making eye contacts with them, whispering in their ears and occasionally touching them to make them aware that they are watching a dramatic performance. Bertolt Brecht's concept of '*Verfremdungseffekt*' or 'V-effect' can be related to Sircar's strategy of making direct communication with the audience. While relating Sircar's dramaturgy with the Brechtian style, one may refer to the observations of Raymond Williams in the book, *Drama: From Ibsen to Brecht* (1968):

On the stage, the emphasis on an 'open' presentation gives the right stress. Brecht's methods varied, widely, but were

consistent in their intention to show the action in the process of being made: that is to say, to confront an audience with a performance, a deliberate action in a theatre, often with the machinery of effects visible and with the passing of time and place conventionally indicated rather than assumed and recreated: a continual and explicit contrast with all those means to a suspension of disbelief before an illusion of reality. What happens on the stage is not so much lived as shown, and both the consciousness of an audience and the distance between that audience and the deliberately played action, are made central to the style. (Williams 319)

Although the students are taught through a history lesson in Sircar's *Indian History Made Easy*, it is actually the audience who learns about the past episodes of colonial exploitation. In this respect, Sircar's *Indian History Made Easy* bears a close resemblance with Bertolt Brecht's notion of the '*Lehrstuecke*' or 'Learning Play'. Sircar's dramatic strategy makes one recall Martin Esslin's observations in the book, *Brecht: A Choice of Evils* (1959):

If social usefulness, however, was to be the new criterion of beauty, literature and the stage would also have to be didactic and to serve the community by teaching it how to live... The '*Lehrstuecke*' and 'School Operas' are meant to be 'teaching aids' rather than art, and their language is severely factual.

(Esslin 99-100)

The plot of *Indian History Made Easy* (1976) opens with three teachers, a master and two women characters namely, Britannia and Mother India. In the opening section of the play, the futility of the teaching process is parodied in the repetition of words and the modes of interrogation and response: '*Good... Very Good... Clear?... Yes sir*' (4-5). On the other hand, the prayer song skilfully mocks at the ineffective academic scenario in contemporary India, where institutionalized education intends to impart mere information in the name of knowledge. The students are not given the opportunity to ask questions during the class. They repeat all the words of their teachers with an appalling subservience. The effect, of course, is quite hilarious because the mechanical progression of the utterances: '*Rama... Shyam... Raj... Rajo... Ramrajo... Shyamrajo... Gramshomaj*' (4-5) epitomizes the ludicrous thought process of the teachers. Occasionally, when the students reply, 'Can't understand Sir' (22), the teacher shouts at them. In this context, one may refer to Rustom Bharucha's observations in the book, *Rehearsals of Revolution: The Political Theatre of Bengal* (1983):

With a hundred thousand students in Calcutta University, it is widely accepted fact that most students view a university education as the only alternative to unemployment. Apart from this frustration and the fact that results may not be published for six to eight months after an examination (among other administrative problems), the structure, teaching methods and curriculum of Calcutta University remain intrinsically colonial. This is the most disheartening aspect of education in Calcutta: its adherence to models prescribed by the British. (Bharucha 169-170)

As the class continues a woman carrying a Union Jack saunters on a platform at the end of the hall. The teachers reveal their colonial affinity as expressed in their jubilant cheer: ‘*Three cheers for Robert Clive!... Three cheers for the battle of Plassey!... Three Cheers for the East India Company! Hip hip hurray!*’ (11) The cheers serve to highlight their subservience to a dead past. They run towards the woman with the Union Jack and address her, ‘Mom, Mom *Britannia*’ (13). They enact the role of a dutiful son before their mother. They inform her about all the money that has been accumulated by the East India Company.

BRITANNIA: You had dewani of East Hindia for six years. How much did you send me, son?

TEACHER 1: Forty...

TEACHER 2: Lakh...

TEACHER 3: Thirty-seven...

TEACHER 1: Thousand

TEACHERS: Pound-s. Forty lakh thirty-seven thousand pound-s.

TEACHER 1: Whatever we accumulate...

TEACHERS (*sing*): Everything we’ll surrender to your feet  
Everything we’ll surrender to your feet.

(13-14)

The exploitative nature of the colonial rule in India has been reflected in the conversation between Britannia and the teachers. Britannia ceases to be a mother figure and acquires the sanctity of a Goddess. In response to her metamorphosis, the members of the chorus, including the teachers and the students form a make-believe palanquin by making use of few props like umbrella and move around the room singing, ‘Everything we’ll surrender to your feet’ (14). Some hold a ‘flywhisk’ (14), some hold a ‘fan’ (14), some play the tune ‘God save the King’ (14) by blowing imaginary trumpets. The woman with the Union Jack enjoys the celebration and responds to their obsequiousness most graciously.

BRITANNIA: Now my precious son’s bringing gold and silver from Hindia. My *bank-s* are swelling, investing money. What’s the worry about factories now? ...He’ll bring more! There’ll be more inventions! More factories will be set up! More industries – *London, Manchester, Dandi, Glasgow* – my son, my child, my lululululu! (16)

After the farcical episode, the playwright focuses on the history lesson, while the students are becoming restless in class. With the introduction of a new term in their lesson – ‘Industrial Revolution’ – the class breaks up and the teachers and the students form gigantic ‘machine’ with their bodies. While their legs and hands move rhythmically with pistons, a destitute woman rushes into the stage with a prolonged scream. The machine disintegrates, while the students are on the floor and the teachers stand encircling them. Sircar provides the audience with a commentary on the nature of the economic exploitation carried out by the British.

TEACHERS: Historical Mathematics. Mathematical History.

MASTER: *Stand at ease. Start!*

From 1766 to 1768 – how many years?

STUDENTS: Sir, three years.

MASTER: Materials worth how much came from *Britain* to *Hindia* in these three years?  
 TEACHER 1: Six lakh...  
 TEACHER 2: Twenty-six thousand...  
 TEACHER 3: Three hundred seventy-five...  
 TEACHERS: *Pound-s.* Say...  
 MASTER: Materials worth how much have gone from *Hindia* to *Britain* in these three years?  
 TEACHER 1: Sixty-three lakh...  
 TEACHER 2: Eleven thousand...  
 TEACHER 3: Two hundred fifty...  
 TEACHERS: *Pound-s.* Say...  
 MASTER: Who got more?  
 STUDENTS: *Britannia!*  
 MASTER: How many times more?  
 STUDENTS: Ten times. (16-17)

Badal Sircar situates the plot of *Indian History Made Easy* within a specific socio-cultural context that traces the evolving phases of Indian history during the colonial period. In the article, “The Theatre of Badal Sircar”, Sumanta Banerjee has analyzed Sircar’s use of ‘satirical skits based on historical and current social and political problems’ (Banerjee 113). Banerjee has opined that Sircar’s *Indian History Made Easy* ‘is a satirical exposition (in the form of school lessons) of the history of British colonial exploitation of India’ (Banerjee 114). In the play, the destitute woman in her spoiled clothes and dishevelled hair symbolically represents ‘Mother India’. She is an exact antithesis to the portrayal of Britannia. Ironically, the three teachers stalk around the room like petty British officers, chanting: ‘We want more! Want more! Want more?’ (19). The three teachers transform themselves into vultures. They represent the ugly, heavy creatures that move from one corpse to another. Eventually, Sircar shifts the attention of the audience to the reign of Cornwallis during the British Raj, as the audience learns that the ‘*Mercantile Capital is replaced by Industrial Capital*’ (22) in India. Juxtaposing the academic axiom spouted by the teachers, Sircar informs the audience that the British are suppressing the growth of the industries in India by forcing the natives to buy goods manufactured in Britain. The extent of the commercial exploitation has been exemplified by the playwright in the conversation between Britannia and the master which reveals the tragic scenario of the Indian industry during the colonial period.

MASTER: The money looted from India turns into Britain’s initial capital. The Industrial revolution is made possible. Factories. Commodities are being produced. Commodities! ... But what would have your lululu fed on if I didn’t provide Indian money?  
 BRITANNIA: Shut up! What if you provided money? My child has set up factories. He is bringing out excellent goods in large quantities. He needs a market for them.  
 MASTER: You’ve ruined my business to provide him with the Market, mom. You’ve imposed seventy-eighty per cent tax on the silk and cotton clothes I sent from India so that your younger child could sell the products of his factories in the domestic market.

BRITANNIA: He needed rearing during infancy. That's why I imposed tax. And you! Can't even produce a single thing, you take pride in selling goods made by others! Get lost! Now goods from my lululu's factories will hit India.  
 MASTER: All the skilful weavers, blacksmiths, and goldsmiths are here – what'd they do? (23-24)

The adverse consequences of the British colonialism have been tragically portrayed by Sircar in *Indian History Made Easy* through the struggle of the natives. It is interesting to refer to Badal Sircar's observations in the book, *On Theatre* (2009), in this context:

In the first phase of colonial exploitation, the products of the highly developed cottage industries of India were purchased at unfair rates by the East India Company and paid for by the money collected by taxing the Indian people; and cities like Calcutta, Bombay, Madras were created to serve as centres for collecting and exporting such products to Europe. The capital accumulated through such exploitation enabled Britain to complete her Industrial Revolution. Then, of course, it was not in the interest of Britain to import Indian products but, rather, to sell her own industrial products in India. Hence, firstly, the Indian cottage industries that tended to compete with the British industries were systematically destroyed and, secondly, India was converted into a backward agricultural country to serve as a gigantic market for British industrial goods on the one hand, and to supply raw material to the British industries on the other. The establishment of the zamindari system was a very effective means to achieve these ends. (Sircar 87-88)

In the meantime, the audience learns about the growing demands for foreign goods in India and a subsequent impoverishment among the people. As the chorus calls attention to this state of affairs by singing a song about mother's love; ironically, the destitute woman re-enters the stage with a scream. She helplessly informs the audience about her son's death. Sircar has juxtaposed the image of two mothers in this scene. While Britannia is being worshipped by the teachers in expectation of capitalist gain and material comfort, on the other hand, the destitute woman fails to protect the life of her son. The depth of her despair is revealed in her painful utterance: 'Child. My son's dead. Just now. He died earlier too. He died many times. Will die again. Will always die' (31). It is through such juxtapositions that Sircar's *Indian History Made Easy* transcends the mere realms of colonial history. In this context, one may refer to Sadanand Menon's opinions on the pedagogic contribution made by Badal Sircar to the modern Indian theatre:

Badal Sircar was no politician; neither was he a teacher. However when set out on the second phase of his theatre-making in 1972 with his group Satabdi in Calcutta, he was to inaugurate the most historic artistic programme in contemporary India of educating and "conscientising" theatre audiences on the travesty – nay absurdity – of their contemporary postcolonial deprivation. A significant section of his audiences came from the urban middle or working classes. But, he also made

unforgettable interventions with the rural poor, like in the Sundarbans and in the Santhal villages. His was a theatre that relentlessly and self-consciously chose to operate as a Paulo Freirean kind of 'pedagogy for the oppressed'. (Menon 16)

Throughout the play, *Indian History Made Easy*, the audience is made to feel the continuing ethos of colonial dominance in India. The most jarring reminders occur when the teachers demonstrate their use of English language: 'Yes sir. No sir. Very good sir. Good morning sir. Good evening sir. I remain sir, your obedient servant...' (30). These words epitomize the 'fundamental subservience of *babu* English' (Bharucha 172) which is the most pervasive legacy of the British rule. It is the kind of language, most Indians use when they apply for jobs. Adapting the British culture and ideology seems to be the only way for the natives to rise in life. Sircar creates a farcical episode through a song of the teacher and the students:

TEACHERS-STUDENTS (song): *Jami Jamjami Jam Zamindar*  
*Jami Jamjami Jam Zamindar*  
 A B C D E F G H I J K L  
 A B C E F I J  
 A B E I  
 Zamindar.

MASTER: *Thank you Nawab. Thank you King. Thank you Babu.*

TEACHERS: *Most welcome sir.* (31)

The song satirically represents the 'zamindari' system that was deviously strengthened and consolidated under the British Raj. In the meantime, the turbulent Indian history makes the class more disorganized and riotous. The students can no longer tolerate the history lesson. With the outbreak of the First World War and subsequently, the emergence of the Quit India Movement; even the teachers abandon their former roles as the sycophants of the British. Ironically, they become the emerging national leaders of India. The master continues to support the British Raj, while the teachers demand for capitalist wealth and material satisfaction:

MASTER: What do you want?

TEACHER 1: I mean... if lunch, dinner at a hotel in Park street...

TEACHER 2: I mean... if two more suit-s and wife's jewellery...

TEACHER 3: I mean... if air condition-er, fridge and a car...

TEACHER 1: I mean... if English medium school for my son and a foreign degree...

TEACHER 2: I mean... if change in Kashmir and the cost of treatment in a nursing home...

TEACHER 3: I mean... if golf, billard-s at the club and night club at hotel...

MASTER (*laughs*): Job. Money. Fame. Power. Commodity. Commodity. Commodity. (40-41)

In the second phase of the Quit India Movement, their demands become more aggressive, although they are more difficult to meet. While the negotiations for freedom are discussed by the national leaders, the destitute woman rouses patriotism amongst the natives.

Sircar's anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist ideology is revealed in the destitute woman's words: 'Kill Capital! British Imperialism...' (45). In this context, one may refer to the observations of Sadanand Menon in the article, "Badal Sircar (1925-2011): A Curtain Call for Political Theatre":

Badal Sircar's fifty odd productions, cumulatively performed over a thousand times by his own group and multiplied many more times by other theatre groups in other linguistic regions of India – setting up a sort of relay transmission from the 1970s through to the 1990s – almost all dealt with the continuing asphyxiation caused by 'colonial violence' in a free nation. Frantz Fanon, in his *The Wretched of the Earth* had described most artists and professors as *disorientateurs* (obfuscators) who continually propagated 'respect for the established order', thereby separating and insulating the exploiters from the exploited. Fanon had proposed that a true artist, rather than concluding with this order, could only contest it – turning theatre, for example, into a site for resistance. This was a strategy most consistently explored in postcolonial Indian theatre by Badal Sircar. (Menon 16)

In the final moments of *Indian History Made Easy*, the students and the teachers march around the room chanting slogans against the supremacy of the British Raj. With a sudden and violent movement, the master grabs the destitute woman and throws her on the floor. He holds the woman by her hand and kicks on her body several times. After this violent display of loyalty to the British, the master leaves the room declaring, 'The class is over! History is over! over!' (46). The members of the chorus re-enter the stage to participate energetically in a freedom chant. On the other hand, the destitute woman informs the audience that they are to anticipate more deaths. Gradually, the freedom chant loses its intensity. It merges into cries of despair, pleas for food and intense lamentation. Significantly, Sircar juxtaposes the celebration of India's independence with the images of the world of destitution and famine. The students march forward encircling the destitute woman.

STUDENTS: Independence. Prosperity. Progress...  
*(Marching slows down. At last, they are tired)*  
 I-n-d-e-p-e-n-d-e-n-c-e.  
 P-r-o-s-p-e-r-i-t-y.  
 P-r-o-g-r-e-s-s.  
 Foondependence.  
 Foonperity. Foongress.  
 Food. Give us food.  
*(They fall down on the floor)*  
 MA (whispers): My son's dying. (47)

As the dispersed cries continue to sound in various parts of the stage, the teachers make a sudden reappearance. While they are taking the roll call, the plot reaches its climax with the orchestrated eruption of violence, as the actors converge on the teachers who disappear in the mass of bodies that surrounds them. At the end of the play, the students are lying on the floor, while the greedy teachers demand for more.

STUDENTS: Give us food. Give food us.

TEACHERS: Give us more. Give us more. Job. Money.  
Fame. Power. Commodity. Commodity.  
Give us more. Give us more. (50)

The audience gets reminded by the end of the play that the spirit of colonialism still persists in India. Thus, the ending of *Indian History Made Easy* is an insidious reminder of the emergence of the bourgeois class and the omnipresence of the capitalist culture in the post-independent phase of India.

Dismantling the conventional constructs of naturalistic theatre with its illusion of reality, Badal Sircar has evolved the concept of the 'Third Theatre', which is a critique of the ideological assumptions of the proscenium stage and the bourgeois theatre. In the book, *Rehearsals of Revolution: The Political Theatre of Bengal* (1983), Rustom Bharucha makes a comparative study of Sircar's 'Third Theatre' and Augusto Boal's 'Forum Theatre'. It is interesting to observe that both these playwrights resisted the influence of any political ideology, rejected the concept of commercialization of theatre and refused to play the role of a propagandist. Significantly, both Sircar and Boal have neither provided a script nor any ideology in their plays, but they presented a situation where the people can confront their own problems and question their possibilities for solution. To put the conclusion of this paper in perspective, it needs to be said that in *Indian History Made Easy*, Badal Sircar has explored the significant phases of Indian history in order to trace the impact of British colonialism and staged the plot in the form of a 'collage of various episodes where the underlying thread running through them provides the message' (xviii). As Subhendu Sarkar in the "Introduction" to Sircar's *Two Plays* (2010) has noted that:

No doubt, Badal Sircar was ultimately influenced, in writing *Sukhapathya Bharater Itihas*, by Marx's writings on India. But that does not mean that Sircar's play is just a blind imitation of Marx's analysis. In fact, *Sukhapathya Bharater Itihas* survives on its own merit as a play where the playwright uses a number of dramatic and theatrical devices to make it both effective and memorable. Besides, it encompasses Sircar's vision of progress that can be achieved through the people's movement. (xxxix)

### Works Cited:

- Sircar, Badal. *Two Plays: Indian History Made Easy, Life of Bagala*. Trans. Subhendu Sarkar. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010. Print.
- Banerjee, Sumanta. "The Theatre of Badal Sircar." *Theatre India*. 2 (1999). Print.
- Bharucha, Rustom. *Rehearsals of Revolution: The Political Theatre of Bengal*. Kolkata: Seagull Books, 1982. Print.
- Dharwadker, Aparna Bhargava. *Theatres of Independence: Drama, Theory and Urban Performance in India since 1947*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.
- Esslin, Martin. *Bertolt Brecht: A Choice of Evils*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1959. Print.
- Menon, Sadanand. "Badal Sircar (1925-2011): A Curtain Call for Political Theatre." *Economic and Political Weekly*. 46.22 (2011). Print.

Sircar, Badal. *On Theatre*. Kolkata: Seagull Books, 2009. Print.

Williams, Raymond. *Drama: From Ibsen to Brecht*. London: Penguin Books, 1952. Print.