Edward Bond: The Development of a "Rational Theatre"

Shaista Sonnu Sirajuddin

Edward Bond's statement 'Events as rational history preceded by causes and succeeded by consequences, seem to entail a technique of writing about the past,[1] touches on two important aspects of his work, and is particularly relevant for the plays from *The Sea* (1973) onwards, in which time and location are more positively specified than in the earlier plays. These are: the concern with defining the relationship between dramatic form and dramatic issues within the framework of 'a rational theatre'[2] and the development of such a theatre through a 'reinterpretation'! of the past as 'a part of learning to understand our own age'[3]. In fact, as early as *Narrow Road* (1968) the relating of ideas with structure becomes increasingly significant in the ' search' for 'clarity'[4]. Rationality in Bond's drama, signifies an ideological and philosophical approach to man in society. This is based on the view that quite contrary to the absurdist school, neither existence nor events are either arbitrary or absurd, and that not only is it possible to apprehend one's social condition and situation, but that even the irrational can be grasped rationally, and so remedied. Even's reassurance to Willy at the close of *The Sea*. Don't give up hope. That's always silly. The truth's waiting for you, it's very patient, and you'll find it,[5]" expresses the spirit of Bond's optimism, and his affirmation of the potential for change and development. Dramatically, one of the methods of articulating the concept of rationality is through a pattern of cause and consequence. This has proved problematic in terms of the relationship

between form and ideas, particularly in plays like *The Popes' Wedding* (1969) and *Saved* (1966). Indeed, and recurring difficulty in the plays has been the establishing of a convincing rationale that gives coherence to the nature of some of the main action and events. In *Bingo* (1974), the problem of transmuting the concept into dramatic terms deepens.

The play and its Introduction, give an insight into certain significant features of Bond's moral vision, in which the idea of 'rationality' is linked with social justice, and culture. The latter he uses both to signify society, and in its more specific association with art (and by extension the writer/artist). The linking of these concepts is in turn, integrally related with the process of creating a just social system. The writer and his work can contribute to establishing, developing and affirming this connection, which forms a part of Bond's basic theoretical model, so to speak. In *Bingo* and *The Fool* (1976), Bond attempts a closer analysis of the relationship between the writer and his social context, his life and his work. The more active dramatic emphasis is on the 'fundamental disharmony' between 'aspirations and activities[6]' *(Bingo)* and between 'imagination and the practical economic basis of life'[7]. *(The Fool)* which has to be resolved if a 'rational culture[8]' is to be achieved.

A consequence of Shakespeare's incisive 'perception' and 'judgement', as Bond explains[9], it that 'you feel the suffering you describe and your writing mimics that suffering'[10]. Such empathy involves a responsibility: 'When you write at that level you must fell involves a responsibility:' When you write at that level you must tell the truth. A lie makes you the hangman's assistant. So if you lie, the world stops being sane, there is no justice to condemn suffering, and no difference between guilt and innocence....[11] The moral issue in the play centres around

Shakespeare's decision not to support the townspeople against the enclosures, in return for a guarantee of his own financial security. As far as he himself is concerned, signing the contract merely sets into motion a process of bitterly critical self-appraisal. For him the 'right question'[12] is not 'why did I sign one piece of paper?'[13] but the corroding knowledge that 'he could have done so much'[14] and did not. Consequently, for all his wisdom and understanding, he has always been 'a hangman's assistant, a gaoler's errand boy.'[15] Given the structure of the dramatic action as a whole, however, his signing the 'one piece of paper'[16] is inevitably pulled into significance. Like Basho's choice at the opening of *Narrow Road,* it symbolizes and represents the lie, the essential contradiction between the type of imagination and humanity that his work bears witness to, and what he has actually done in his life. But whereas in Basho's case, his original decision based on mixture of ignorance, irresponsibility, and an eye for personal convenience, captures the gist and basic trajectory of his politic maneuverings in the course of the play, Bond's handling of Shakespeare's action is dramatically less consistent, and presents a paradox. On the one hand, the main thrust of the criticism of the writer as 'a corrupt seer',[17] whose 'behaviour as a property owner[18] implies a betrayal of the insights of his own Lear, 'the most radical of social critics'[19] focuses on his signing the paper which is not a neutral document.[20] All this is condensed in the two scenes with Combe. On the other hand, the action in these scenes remains curiously muted, so that the full weight and import of the gesture is never really forcefully established. The very atmosphere, particularly in scene I, seems to contribute to the weakening of dramatic impact. The scene conveys the 'emptiness and silence.[21] eloquently. The inertia and stagnation are reiterated visually in small details of behaviour and gesture, and in the various stage effects: Shakespeare sitting silently in his garden, letting his 'hand hang down with the paper still in it'[22] and

the repeated stage directions: 'silence'[23] and 'Shakespeare doesn't react'[24]. There is also the transforming of a state of mind and feeling into an audible landscape, in the peals of the chapel bell which only accentuate the stillness. While these details help to underline the general mood, they none the less, infect the tone and rhythm of everything connected with him.

In scene 2, when he actually signs the contract with Combe, the dramatic interest shifts to the people around him, and to their various contrasting relationships. There is the Old Woman being 'mother and wife'[25] to the Old Man, a suggestion of which carries over into her relationship with Shakespeare as well, and Judith's deeply resentful attitude to her father, which links back to her remark to the Old Woman: 'It was harder for your son. He had a child for a father' [26] a situation with which she obviously identifies herself. Set against this, is the child-like innocence and spontaneity shared by the Old Man and the Young Woman. The scene ends with the Old man's vivid account of public hangings as public entertainment, prefiguring what lies in store for the girl when the law gets hold of her. The vision of this stark reality that completes the picture of 'the Goneril Society with its prisons, workhouses, whipping...' and 'mutilation' [27] is juxtaposed with Shakespeare's deal with Combe, and comments unambiguously on the implications of his compromise. However, the underplaying of significance in the way the action is conceived, impairs the incisiveness of the critical point being made. At one level, of course, the element of understatement in the structuring of the scenes enables Bond to locate the particular act of signing the document within the wider context of Shakespeare's life as a 'property-owner'[28] (and presumably other compromises that have been 'totally corrupt') thus extending the specific issue to his concern with 'the relationship between any writer and his society'[29] Nevertheless the dramatic

effectiveness of his approach remains questionable, since it appears to contradict the very selection of the incident as representative, in the first instance. This aspect of the play is particularly significant as it touches on another question of form: how is the degree of restraint and discipline in Bond's demythologizing of Shakespeare to be retained, simultaneously with preserving the acuteness of his criticism? An acuteness incidentally, which was blunted by 'vehemently emotive' [30] caricaturing in *Early Morning* (1968).

Bond has been criticised for his gratuitous 'assassination of Shakespeare's reputation'[31]. One reviewer's sense of outrage is disguised in the facetiousness of the remark: 'a writer who lived a blameless life, happened to be gifted with genius and probably believed in original sin'[32] The dearth of positive and humane qualities in the play's general vision together with its humiliating and undignified portrayal of the writer, have also been attacked.
Shakespeare is led through a guignol of sordid, unredeemed social and personal misery. Gielguid's performance is wracked: bald dome sweating and crimson with embarrassment and strain, boldly trying to endow Bond's character with nobility, with love and compassion, but doomed because these qualities do not really exist in the part, or in the play.[33]

But in the light of Bond's own point of view, articulated quite clearly in the introduction to *Bingo*, and in his comments about the play elsewhere, a more valid criticism would appear to be that he does not go far enough, ironically justifying the claim that 'his account rather flatters Shakespeare'.[34] Nothing that the character says or does in the course of the play, quite sustains the weight of Bond's indictment. In fact his behaviour (albeit tainted by ownership of property) only throws Judith's intolerant morality (linking her with the Son) into relief, just as in scene 3, where the gibbetted body of the Young Woman dominates

the stage, it is the Son's distorted piety that contrasts sharply with Shakespeare's quiet musings, and prompts an affinity with the violence suggested by the image. In Shakespeare's two major speeches in the scene, the dead girl is indirectly associated with the baited bear, whose plight and vulnerability is poignantly evoked in the midst of a scene of extreme and graphically described brutality:

> Flesh and blood, strips of skin. Teeth scrapping boon... Howls. Roars. Men baiting their beast. On and on and on. And later the bear raises its great arm. The paw with a broken razor. And it looks as if it's making a gesture- it wasn't only weariness or pain or the sun or brushing away the sweat but it looks as if it's making a gesture to the crowd. Asking for one sign of grace, one no....[35]

and with the swan in his lyrically wistful:

> In went to the river yesterday. So quiet.... No fishing, no boats. Then a swan flew by me up therefor. On a straight line just over the water. A woman in a white dress running along an empty street. Its neck was rocking like a wave. I heard its breath when it flew by sighing. The white swan and the dark water. [36]

> The striking, limpid quality of the images is perfectly balanced by the single, fluent movement of the bird before the 'quiet and the silence' return. [37]

In his Ms. Notes on *Bingo,* Bond remarks that Shakespeare's 'crime isn't a very bad crime - he doesn't willfully exploit anyone...It is all only part of his security and prosperity' [38] and that his pact with society is in a sense, inevitable, since he is acting 'within the restraints of his world view... imposed on him by his time and place'[39]. The

particularly restrained tenor of these comments not only conflicts with Bond's own more strongly worded criticism of Shakespeare in the Introduction, and in his observations on the play elsewhere, but more significantly, touches on the original tension between dramatic structure and approach on the one hand, and the critical analysis, on the other. As discussed earlier, Shakespeare's compromise is representative of the 'discrepancy' between the ideas and values affirmed in his writing and what 'he did (or did not do) over the Welcome enclosures'.[40] As such, it has a special connotation within the overall structure and action. Moreover, since Bond's emphasis on aligning the writer's private and moral,[41] decisions with his social and political responsibility[42] hinges on this incident, the way in which his activities are presented in relation to the other characters and the action as a whole, has to be dramatically forceful enough to balance and sustain the significance given to the issue. This is not fully achieved in the play, and consequently the underlying critical argument tends to remain at an abstract level.

Moral earnestness in the theatre in general, seems to evoke a certain embarrassment and unease in reviewers and critics. With reference to Bond's work, where moral truths are at times expressed in a baldly direct manner, this reaction tends to become a blanket condemnation of his diadactism. His whole tone is viewed as a mixture of naivete and arrogance. John Worthen's criticism however, does not fall in this category, and his discussion of <u>*Bingo*</u> has a bearing on an important aspect of the play. He has commented on the 'moral fable'[43] element in the play as being a difficult one, largely because of Bond's 'handling of the secondary characters, whose function'[44] or role according to him, is given more importance than their 'dramatic presence'[45]. This last point is particularly significant as it applies to Shakespeare more than to any of the other characters. Yet,

although he criticises Bond with reference to these characters for presenting 'states of mind which do not respond to our questioning',[46] he does not discuss Bond's portrayal of Shakespeare in relation to the structure as a whole, Bond's portrayal of Shakespeare in relation to the structure as a whole, an aspect which is closely linked with the problem he has alluded to. In this context, it also seems worth nothing that inspite of the overall critical rigour of John Worthen's[47] observations about the play, his own attitude to Shakespeare, as a dramatic character, remains relatively unquestioning.[48]

Apart from the distinctive poetic quality of much of Shakespeare's language, Bond's fine manipulation of dramatic speech is evident in the rhythm and almost physical texture of the dialect spoken by the common people in the play. This gives them individuality and richness as characters which goes beyond their role as merely representative types, as suggested by their titles. There is the down to earth, if proasaic realism of the Old Woman, expressed in her simple "I don't afford arks questions I don't know Y' answers to....[49] reminding one of Patty's matter-of-fact pragmatism *(The Fool)*, and in her comments about the Old Man to Judith, her speech is unexpectedly expressive: "he's a boy that remembers whats like t'be a man....Hard, that is like being tied up to a clown"[50]. Besides synthesizing the various images of child, madman, fool and clown in his person, the Old Man also has a concrete dramatic presence. He possesses the instinctive vitality of a wild creature, but this is matched by an equally spontaneous cruelty, just as his innocence and helplessness. (He yont more'n a wounded bird in a road')[51] is closely linked with a sensuality that his son finds so repellent: 'Hev Yo' no shame? God and man see you in the daylight. Yo'm drag creation downt' the beast the best.... Loike an animal ugly.[52] He is both stunted child ("he yont even a proper child")[53] and' 'savage innocent'[54]. The

Son, in particular, marks a significant stage in Bond's series of victim-persecutor characters.

While he shares the general discontent of the youths in the early plays, he is distinguished from them in so far as his anger has a conscious political basis, and he looks ahead to a character like Darkie in *The Fool.* This development however, has its dynamic contradiction, since juxtaposed with his awareness, is a sensibility still conditioned by its own oppression. His fanaticism has something in common with Hatch's madness, but he is a much less in *The Sea* sympathetic character than either Darkie, or even Hatch. Darkie in spite of his surly rebelliousness that makes him taciturn with his own mates, is nevertheless aware at some level of his emotional solidarity with his group, and there is a certain quiet warmth in his relationship with Clare, in particular. The Son's religious fervour, however, makes him completely intolerant and isolates him from his companions. Neither is he allowed the special insight and truth telling power given momentarily to the crazed draper, during the funeral scene in *The Sea.*

What appears to make the moral fable element in *Bingo* problematic, is that the coherence of the rational argument, underpinning the central moral theme, depends almost entirely on the audience being prepared to take Shakespeare's word against himself, in a situation where his actions do not fully convince one of his guilt. The process of Shakespeare's awakening from a state of endgame-like existential weariness in the opening scene, shifts to a more acute sense of self disgust and recrimination (Prompted by the image of the gibbetted girl) in scene 3, culminates in the bitter recognition: 'To have usurped the place of god and lied....,[55] As the play draws to a close he is haunted by the question: Was any thing done?[56] and the process ends with a final statement of personal guilt and general responsibility:

> I could have done so much... I howled when they suffered, but they were whipped and hanged so that I could be free... if children go in rage we make the wind. If the table's empty we blight the harvest...[57]

All this has an internal logic and emotional consistency, but the play fails sufficiently to develop a less personalized, and more objective perspective against which his absolute self-condemnation can be tested and affirmed.

In Shakespeare's drunken rambling in the 'empty'[58] wasteland of snow, the deepening bitterness and despair is modulated by a quieter sense of loss and images of innocence:

> Writing in the snow a child's hand fumbling in an old man's beard, and in the morning the old man dies, goes, taking the curls from the child's fingers into the grave, and the child laughs and plays under the dead man's window... Now I'm old. Where is the child to touch me and lead me to the grave?[59]

Along with the particularly heightened quality of the language, there is also a certain tact and disciplining of emotion, (the element of restraint works best here) that distinguishes it from Arthur's rather self indulgent nihilism in early, or the high pitched note of self pity that fires Lear's early rhetoric morning in *Lear* (1972). However, in a sense the more finely this aspect of the play is developed, the greater too the need for the intensity of the speech and feeling to be supported by a more concrete link with the objective conditions contributing to it, and; with the characters actions, as they are actually presented.

The play's inadequacy in this respect weakens the dramatic conviction of its 'moral fable'[60] conclusion: that when Shakespeare realizes the 'implications' of his choice, 'the contradiction is so overpowering that he has to kill himself.'[61] This last statement's backed by Bond's own assertions that he had no reason to live... 'he had compromised himself so much,'[62] and that 'if he didn't end in the way shown in the play, then he was a reactionary blimp or some other fool.'[63] It is also the weakness of the objective rationale that draws one's attention to the discrepancy between 'material historical facts' and 'psychological truth,'[64] the two levels of reality the play is based on, and makes the end controversial more from a dramatic, than from a biographical point of view. The logic underlying the rightness of Shakespeare's final decision has to be externalized if the truth is to be made plausible on the stage,[65] and if Bond's claim, that the 'consequences' described, 'follow from facts' and are not simply 'polemical inventions',[66] is to be substantiated.

One of the factors that contributes significantly to this problematic aspect of *Bingo*, is Bond's failure adequately to develop the image of money, and its particular connotation in relation to Shakespeare. Possibly more than anywhere else in the play, the criticism of Bond as a dramatist of 'stark statements'[67] is most justified in Shakespeare's cold, cruelly honest appraisal of his relationship with Judith in scene 5, where brevity and directness tend to replace a fuller dramatization of ideas. Shakespeare's statements impose themselves, because the alienating and corrupting influence of money they speak of, is never actively incorporated into dramatic action. The very bluntness of his 'I loved you with money. The only thing I can afford to give you now is money. But money always turns out to hate... I made you vulgar and ugly and cheap. I corrupted you...' to Judith, not only reflects the limitations of Bond's method in this context,

but also remind one, that truths, when merely stated on the stage, can be dramatically least powerful.[68]

However, where the image, and the play's analysis of property and its implications is more fully developed, is when it is expressed obliquely, with reference to Jonson in scene 4, and in its association with poverty. For Jonson, Shakespeare's prosperity is linked not only with a certain dignified life style, but also with peace of mind, confidence, and an effortless goodness that comes with economic security he enjoys:

> You are serene....[69] Life doesn't seem to touch you, I mean soil you... I have seen you walking along the city streets, like a man going over his own fields... A simple stride... So beautiful and simple. Tell me. Will ... Please. How have they made you so good?[70]

In obvious contrast is his (Jonson's) own degraded existence, his social climbing and need to 'keep with the top,'[71] his compromises, and 'research'[72] in prisons and gutters. The intensity of his hate and envy of Shakespeare, pungently expressed in his: 'I hate. A short hard word. Begins with a hiss and ends with a spit: hate. To say it you open your mouth as if you're bringing uphate: I hate you, for example...'[73] compounds with bitter self mockery and disgust for his profession: 'I hate writing. Fat white fingers excreting dirty black ink...'[74] His conversation is barbed with references to his poverty. There are comments like 'I hope you're paying. I certainly can't afford to drink like this' [75], and about the poison he offers Shakespeare 'well, it's not the best. All I could afford...'[76] but towards the end of the scene, his wittily irreverent: 'In paradise there'll be a cash tree, and the sages will sit under it'[77] takes on a note of more serious bitterness, as counting the money Shakespeare has lent him, he remarks:

> You can't manage anything better? You wouldn't notice it. I had to borrow to bury my little boy. I still owe on the grave. (He puts the money in his pocket). I suppose you buried your boy in best oak.[78]

If Shakespeare portrays what ownership and financial advantage can do, Jonson exposes the other side of the issue.

Although one is given a more detailed analysis of the nature of Shakespeare's predicament, as property owner, by Anna and Lisa, two characters in Bond's latest play *The Worlds* (1980), 'the tone and structure of Shakespeare's stark statements'[79] foreshadows the expository quality of the language in the girls speeches in scene 11.[80] The truth in the one instance, and the political argument in the other, are instructive because the very mode of their expression obstructs dramatic mediation. Shakespeare shares to combination of awareness and articulateness with Anna and Lisa, but in the extracts from The World, quoted by Philip Roberts in a recent article, what makes this ability[81] in the later characters particularly significant, is that it reintroduces the conflict between structure / technique and thesis in Bond's work. The more articulate in a sense, these characters are and the more clearly defined the political ideas of the play, the greater too the tendency for explication and polemic to encroach upon dramatic discourse.

Among the plays so far referred to or discussed *The Fool,* like *The Sea,* structurally presents very few problems indicates a definite ability to overcome many of the statement and ideological problems mentioned one of the factors that contribute to this is the way the image of bread, in its extended connotation of food and eating is developed in the play and integrates with the overall structure, providing a nucleus for the analysis. The image works

almost paradoxically, and the constant references to food, and the actual eating of it in several scenes, far from suggesting plenty, sharply evokes and reinforces the atmosphere of raw poverty and blatant exploitation that defines the social situation. This technique in turn exposes the irrationality of the situation itself, where progress and the advance of civilization, the iron age[82] ushered in the Parson's ringing tones in scene 1, means destitution and misery for the rural workers. Their state of affairs is tersely summed up in Lawrence's 'Hard times all around'.[83] The image of bread is also associated with the working community, and in Clare's: 'Bread goo from mouth d! mouth an! What it taste of other mouths. Talkin and laughin. Thinkin people .....'[84], it is linked with the idea of comradeship and sharing in the play,[85] which is expressed in variations of mood and circumstance. Eating and drinking are presented as communal activities. In scene 1, there is the players' light hearted bantering (with the exception of Darkie) among themselves as the jug of punch is passed around. Later, the grim, tense scene in the prison cell, opens with the Warder distributing food among Darkie and his mates as they await sentence, and Bob's rebellious 'On't touch it,'[86] which is met by Mile's comradely realism: 'Eat, Sorry you starved when they let you out.'[87] His advice reminds one of Clare's 'Can't afford t! feel like that boy. Spite yourself...'[88] to Darkies: 'His drink'd choke me',[89] in the opening scene. And finally, in Clare's vision, there is a moment of unexpected tenderness as Mary, now 'a tramp' and described as 'grotesque, filthly, ugly',[90] in the stage directions, tries to feed the blind Darkie evoking in the midst of violence and ugliness, a note of gentlemen and. Mary's gesture in an oblique way, recalls Bond's special gift of a poignant sense of the vulnerability of all created things, whether living or destroyed; as in Lear's speech while he eviscerates Fontanelle,[91] or in Shakespeare's musings on the gibbetted girl,[92] and Clare's unheeded little poem:

> Seen a mouse once. Made its home in the heap a'bones an' shoulder blades stood outside the door. There'd bin some bellow in that day: Salughter a whole herd...O he were proud on his little house, Pop in an'out. Took seed in the hole.[93]

The political basis of their fellow feeling is the characters' common cause against the feudal hierarchy and the church. Although in the opening scene, overt conflict is kept at bay by the general mood of innocuous festivity among the peasants, and the confident, patronising attitude of their audience and masters, the confrontational nature of the situation is made quite clear by the way the scene is structured in terms of two distinct groups. There is the ragged band of mummers on the one side, and Lord Milton and his company on the other. The pattern of political allegiance is completed by the Parson who is placed in the middle. He acts as mediator between the groups, and as spokesman for the gentry, sanctimoniously justifying the existing social structure:

> Our rulers guide our affairs in such a way that each of us reaps the best possible reward for his labour. Without their guidance though you may not understand it there'd be chaos.[94]

While at this stage, there is little suggestion of any militancy among the workers themselves except in one character, we are kept aware of the bleakness of their condition both by the references to poverty from within the comic, mock heroic framework of the mummers' entertainment, and at a more serious level, by Darkie, who trenchantly voices the grievances of his community. His bitter truths about daily existence cut across the Parson's sermonizing, and his brooding presence and refusal to join

in the festivity set him apart from his own mates, colouring the mood of much of the latter part of the scene.

> Scene 3, presents a realization of the eloquent logic of: Reason is armed when men cast out reason. For if driven from her home in the human face she takes up refuge in the human fist...[95]

when the tension erupts in open conflict, with the peasants rioting and looting the property owners. In the beginning the action is fragmented, giving very much an impression of each man or woman for himself / herself as they run on and off stage meeting each other only briefly. Throughout, offsetting their activity and frantic exhilaration is the ghost like figure of the wounded Lawrence, wrapped in a blood soaked sheet, sobbing and crawling around the stage. But later, as the scene develops and events reach a climax with the assault on the Parson, what provides a sense of unity and distinguishes them from their counterparts in *The Pope's Wedding* and *Saved,* is their collective and vocal understanding of their oppression. This is eloquently summed up by Darkie when they are rounded up by Lord Milton's men: In single space you steal from us. Parson steal from us. What we doot parson? Make a mock. Took – what? Trinkets: When I steal from parson what you doot me? Law hang us. Thass the only difference 'tween you an' me: you on't think twice 'fore you use violence.[96]

Their violence is spontaneous and disorganized, but it does not have the random, unthinking quality of the boy's aggression in the early plays, which becomes a symptom of their conditioning by a hostile and impoverished culture. Unlike in *Saved,* where one of the main problems is establishing a pattern of cause and effect that explains the nature of the violence, in *The Fool* not only is the link between social context and motivation and conduct better

developed, but the rationale is more fully realized in dramatic terms. One of the ways in which Bond does this is by linking the actions of the character with the destruction of their community, culture and means of livelihood, which is introduced through the violation of their immediate physical environment. As they discuss the changes:

> Darkie: they're cutting the forest down' make fields...Ay, More. They'll drain the common fen an'turn off the river.....[97] their language vividly conveys a physical sense of violence.
> Patty (nervously)...They saw chaps goin' round the fields this morning with chains an writin book...Wrote the river down in the books.

Clare: How'd you get rid of a river turn the river off.

Patty: Dam her up an pump her out boy. [98]

Later, as the play continues, the theme of violation and the implications of change are extended. The Irishman's wry observations in scene7:

First Irishman: Buildin railroads every bloody where.

Third Irishman: You'd think they wanted travel away from
themselves. Iron trains, iron houses, iron
cannons. They sleep in iron beds.

Second Irishman: What do they think about when they poke their little women nails. [99]

Suggest the preparatory stage of D.H. Lawrence's diagnosis:

'And now the iron has entered into the soul and the machine has entangled the brain, and got it fast....[100]' *The Fool* is not a lament for a passing age, or an idealizing of rural communities, nor is it a plea for a return to Nature. Nature is significant in relation to human beings, and its violation is dramatized in social context. Bond's attitude to industrialization does not have the Lawrentian note of outrage against the Machine in general. The play is concerned with making a more political comment, on how technology is used in an exploitative and dehumanizing way, in a class society.

In *The Fool* there is a development of Bond's epic technique as a whole community becomes the protagonist, and conflict is presented on a scale not found in any of the other plays so far discussed. Bond's handling of group scenes is particularly effective. The dramatic identity of the various characters emerges out of their interplay with the group as a whole, and with the objective circumstances in each instance. This contributes to giving their actions dramatic conviction within the overall structure of events. The Crowd of poor in *The Woman* (1979),[101] by contrast, is not sufficiently developed. Their political significance is condensed in a single episode: their brief appearance, killing the heir to the Trojan throne and acting out the statue of good fortune, makes their action in the context of the play seem abrupt and perfunctory. Its radical import is implied rather than portrayed. Dramatically, the scene relies on the gestures of the crowd. While this technique fulfills Bond's emphasis on actors cultivating 'a graphic sense'[102] on the stage, so that their acting becomes illustrative, and reveals 'the salient features'[103] of a situation, it fails to substantiate the crowd's role. They remain an anonymous dramatic entity, the play depending largely on the character of The Dark Man, to represent the exploited and the oppressed.

The Fool also marks the beginning of the theme of violence being associated with the idea of struggle, although this is still at an incipient stage, and in no way romanticized by the dramatist. It is really not until *The Bundle,* where the spontaneous anger of the oppressed combines with an analytical ability and strategy that violence acquires a definite political connotation. Scene 3 of *The Fool* begins with the looter's childish exultation in their 'stolen goods.'[104] Their reaction resembles the behavior of the thieves in scene 5 of *The Bundle* (1978) as they sort out their loot, [105] but is without the latter's pettiness. Mary's animated word picture of robbing the rich:

> Tap front door, Say the poor's collection: Git off they seay!....Hould out your apron. Where's the silver under your floor? No silver here: Tap their heads with a stick. See the silver then jump out their pockets: Gold teeth out their heads:[106]

Looks ahead to the 'Story' of 'How Tiger lost hand'[107] 'with its short, staccato rhythm and interplay of words, gestures and visual images'. But their delight is tinged with a note of bitterness, as is suggested in little details like the tone of Betty's homely comments on the candlesticks she has stolen: 'Proper silver [looks at her reflection] See yourself in the side, twist up. On't need candles in 'em. Light the room up by themselves.'[108]

During the course of the scene, the mood becomes increasingly somber as their anger reaches a climax and they physically attack the Parson. There is, however, little sense of any gratuitous callousness in the incident. In fact, as they pull at the old man's naked, shivering body, their taunts have an emotive resonance, providing a lucid, though impassioned commentary on their actions:

Mile: Look: Handful a flesh:

Darkie: Our flesh. That belong t'us...You took that flesh off her baby. My ma. The on't got proper flesh on em now....Your flesh is stolen Goods....You call us thief when we took silver. You took us flesh.[109]

The whole scene has a highly emotional tone, something that is rare in Bond, and there is almost an element of helplessness in their anger; towards the end of the episode they are all in tears, over wrought by the events and their own feelings. Although the revolt is swiftly and effectively put down by the establishment and the group disbanded, so that in the second half, the play focuses more on Clare and his experience, neither spontaneous action nor the emotional aspects are disparaged . *The Fool,* does however direct one's attention to the necessity of politicizing one's sense of injustice, and channeling the force of anger in a rational and systematic way ----- a process realized in *The Bundle.* There is a depth and passion in the characters' response to their situation which gives them, and their actions a certain intensity, distinctly lacking in the youths in *The Pope's Wedding* and *Saved.* The acuteness of the human and social crisis in the plays, of course, contributes to this. It is significant that Bond's dramatic vision and method have greatest conviction, when he is dealing with situations where the issues are sharply defined, and the contradictions most extreme.

An example of the effectiveness of Bond's technique in such a context, is the brilliantly choreographed, almost surreal juxtaposition of dialogue and action[110] in scene 5 of *The Fool.* Here, upstage, an Irishman and a negro, ringed by their backers savagely beat each other up, while downstage, there is Clare as 'the centre piece of London's literary arena'[111]. This technique helps in creating 'a greater

awareness of the potential of the stage'[112] and extends the dramatic scope of the scene, simultaneously presenting several aspects of the situation. It also offers a combined verbal, visual and gestural representation of the various types of violence, defining this situation. There is the enforced brutality of the boxes, representatives of two traditionally oppressed communities, who is Clare's words 'git paid for bein' knocked about'. They are contrasted with the blood lust of their greedy, manipulating supporters, and finally set against all this, there is the more subtle, less direct use of force by 'Polite Society'[113] 'to control the beast in man.'[114] Contrast and juxtaposition work in an unusual way in this scene, since unlike the liberal tradition, their purpose is not to suggest varying interpretations of reality; (as Bond has pointed out 'the two actions together tell us the truth of the situation providing commentaries on each other'[115]). The point is to enable the drama to make clear, unequivocal statements. There is no ambiguity in the images, and the 'double centre'[116] improvisation in this case, has immediate dramatic impact, largely because the comment it makes is unambivalent. When the scene opens, Clare is uneasily poised between the company of his patrons, on whom he depends for his livelihood, and the boxers whom his state of dependence identifies him with. When it ends, his position is made quite clear; he is left with the defeated boxers.

An important aspect of the play's political vision is the concept of a rational society and culture as one in which the basic material and creative needs of human beings are fulfilled. The more specific relationship between 'artistic activity and the practical economic basis of life'[117] forms a part of this broader perspective. Bond's break from the traditional, individual-centred approach to character and drama, is one of the elements that facilitates the development of these interlined themes. The play is not about poetic identity or private anguish. Clare is portrayed

first and foremost as a member of society. While his vocation of poet, his insights and his mode of articulating his experience, distinguish him from his companions, his poverty and his essential needs and circumstances, are common and shared. These locate him firmly within the community. The image of bread, in its association with basic necessity, helps to develop and substantiate this aspect. It is significant that in Clare's speech to Lord Milton, the image of eating is used to express both moral choice and experience: I've eat my portion of the universe an' I shall die of it. It was bitter fruit. But I had more out the stones in your [Lord Milton's] field than you had out the harvest.'[118] It is the concrete, physical quality of the imagery, its total simplicity and directness, that introduces a positive and assertive note into what could have been, a statement of despair and defeat.

This sense of the concrete is brought out in a different context, in Clare's fantasy of being re-united with Mary and Darkie. His fantasy culminates in a vision of ideal fellowship between them (all three are social outcasts and victims of their 'irrational society')[119] 'She git the bread. He Crack the heads when they come after us. An I – I 'ld her teach him to eat. I am a poet and I teach men how to eat.'[120] Although he ends with 'No. No one there, Never was. Only the songs I make up on them...'[121]; there is nothing unreal or hopelessly romantic about the fantasy itself. It may be utopian in terms of the immediate circumstances, but it has a perfectly sound, practical base in which individual resilience combines with mutual responsibility and caring. The alternative it embodies is both humane and realistic, expressed in Clare's calm, lucid conclusion 'Then she on't goo in rags. He on't blind. And I – on't goo and in a madhouse.'[122] There is a fluency in the relationship between the dream element and the so called 'objective reality' of poverty and victimisation in the scene. While the contrast between Clare's experience

and the irrationality of the actual situation, summed up in the coarse, earthy wisdom of the Irish worker's observations is sharply delineated. There is also a structural cohesion between these levels. Unlike the worlds of Lear's parables that by virtue of being *different* from the 'autonomous world'[123] of the play are completely disengaged from it, and so unable to confront it, the strength of Clare's vision lies precisely in the fact, that while it suggests a reality that fundamentally opposes the given situation, it also retains a sufficiently firm grasp on the real. The vision, therefore, brings the idea of changing this given situation within the realm of the possible.

The idea of 'scenes of something'[124] which Bond first introduced in *The Sea,* and which is further developed in *The Fool,* combines a freedom from the structural and ideological constraints of the well made play. The latter can either 'reasure people about the condition of society,'[125] or suggest that there is no possibility of altering it, and so prompt cynicism or despair, and undermine any radical confrontation with it. In *The Fool,* Bond evolves a dramatic style through which he can articulate his social, political and moral ideas forcefully. Although the statements this play makes about Clare's society are unambiguous, and there is no ambivalence either in the moral values or the political ideas informing Bond's interpretation, they do not convey a sense of the discussion being closed and the truth fixed. The structure is open -ended enough for the audience to critically engage with what is presented, and to interpose their own judgements and so 'complete'[126] the statements.

The Bundle the last play to be discussed in this article marks a significant stage in Bond's search for a dramatic form that has range and flexibility, but which can also articulate his social and political ideas incisively. One of the main themes in *Narrow Road* was an exposure of how good

government, and concepts like morality and law and order are synonymous with force and repression a topic of concern that runs through Bond's work. In *The Pope's Wedding* and *Saved*, one is shown the human alienation and cultural attrition peculiar to more specifically, the capitalist system in contemporary Western society. One of the effects or consequences of such a society is the character's arbitrary and mindless violence. The drama however, focuses on registering this condition rather than its causes, which remain implied more than dramatised.

In The Bundle, the actual dynamics of exploitation in class society are fully presented, and Bond's technique in the play affirms his statement that 'When something works on the stage is isn't just a statement.'[127] In scene 5, when Wang meets Tiger and his company of thieves for the first time, using allegory and play acting (in which the group participates) he demonstrates in a clear, concrete way how the poor by virtue of their ignorance, dependence and basic needs, are caught in a complex system of double binds. These are set up by the landowner, 'the great thief,'[128] who is aided by his 'servant,'[129] the river which regularly floods the land and destroyed the people's means of livelihood. The poor steal and 'prey on themselves,'[130] not only to live, but in order to pay the taxes levied by the landowner. He, in return protects them by his law, the same law that also persecutes them. The irrational paradox of the situation is a more complicated, and subtle version of Shogo's city and its iron laws, created to prevent people from destroying themselves, or Lear's rationale for building the wall by force, in order that his subjects can 'live in peace.'[131] In being enacted however it helps Wang's audience'[132] to understand what is being shown,'[133] and through his to see itself in a new light.[134] Bond's technique of transposing analysis into dramatic terms modulates the expositional tone of the scene, and counteracts Wang's practical truths being expressed in

the flat prose of rational argument. It also vitalizes the allegorical element, giving it a clarity and an immediacy that is absent in Lear's fables, which in the context of the real world of the play, can be both remote and obscure.

Unlike Bingo, *The Bundle* is not structured around a single character articulating its main concerns. Wang's analysis is incorporated into the action as a while, and continues in scene 3, which take place in the 'village burial hills,'[135] where the villagers have set up a refugee camp to escape from the flood. In this scene, the dual aspect of the human and social predicament is further elaborated. On the one hand, in moral terms, there is once again the total in justice and irrationality of a situation in which basic survival involves bargaining and transaction. The people have to give up what they own by way of material possessions, in order to be ferried to safety by the landowner's keepers, and of course, relief is contingent upon how much they can offer. The exchanges range from coins slippery with years of sweat,'[136] and a padded jacket, to Wang who is sold by the Ferryman and his wife. The scene ends with a powerful, deeply ironic juxtaposition of visual and auditory images: Wang standing 'stiffly' by the edge of the water 'rooted to the spot,'[137] suddenly breaking the tense pause with shouts of 'Buy me!'[138] his desperate cries merging with the Ferryman's: 'We're going to be saved! Saved!

Wife: Our son. He saves us.
Feryman: Our son. [139]

On the other hand, one is also shown some of the characters collaborating in perpetuating their own misery through a combination of pathetic faith in the landowner, who they think will 'take' them 'in'[140] and 'won't let them starve,'[141] and superstition. In response to Wang's suggestion that the people should use the high ground

'instead of letting the dead have it'[142] is the Old Man's sense of outrage expressed in the ridiculous logic:

> We only live a short life...When we die we're here for ever. What respect is it when we can't house the dead who need it most! No wonder the flood's lasted six days. Our village! – swearing lying profaning, thieving! – no wonder heaven's not kind.'[143]

Scene 7 offers a further illustration of the poor preying on themselves, and participating in their own oppression. It opens with the ludicrous irony of a situation in which something as natural, and as basic a necessity as water is turned into a marketable commodity with the water sellers' cries of

> Water: Sparkling water:
> The moon shone on the snow
> As it fell on the muses, mountain
> I melted the snow at dawn
> Sparkling water
> Who drinks speaks truth: [144]

Their language almost parodies the hyperbolic distortions of the jargon of advertisement, and is backed up by an attitude of aggressive competitiveness. They are obviously cheating people, but at the same time are caught in a system they attempt to manipulate to their own advantage. The placards of untruths around their necks, proclaiming the wondrous properties of their 'good' are compared with the stone cangue around the Woman's neck. The first Waterseller is representative of characters acting out of their own instincts of self preservation. When he reprimands the Woman with an air of complacent justification, he is mounting the moral cliches of the

establishment 'No one will buy anything! If you had done one good deed - someone would care! The judge was right! Your'e an evil woman!'[145] But later, with the arrival of Wang and Tiger, disguised as priests, when he gauges the possibility of their taking pity and buying her some water to drink, he prudently changes his tune, and plays on their charitable impulses: "The woman's suffered all her life. A terrible home!.... The whole village pities her!'[146] The Second Waterseller joins in with his collection of pious inducements: 'Holy fathers' the woman has this sick husband. Their sons are ungrateful. They ran way as soon as they could. Thirst has tormented her three days. Buy her a little water!'[147]

The whole scene with its play-within-a-play structure is a dramatic rendering of Wang's more abstract analysis of his society. In the beginning, Tiger is the audience, 'Watch, Learn' Wang tells him. As the action continues, the Water sellers try to get Kung-Tu, the merchant to buy water for the Woman, and Kung-Tu pompously debates about whether he should give in'[148] to his natural pity'[149] and be charitable, Or to be stern for the good of the community. When he leaves shortly afterwards, and Wang sets about freeing the Woman, the other characters' from their role of participants in the drama, become an audience to it. Gesture and intruction synthesize as Wang proceeds from elucidating the situation by locating the source of oppression: Now see, who is the stone on the people's neck! [150] he says, as he begins smashing the cangue, to demonstrating effectively that things can be changed by the people themselves: 'And who is the stone breaker, 'as he strikes the final blow and the stone falls apart.'[151]

The play suggests that the concreteness of the world these characters inhabit is closely linked with the fact that it is in a perpetual process of change. Therefore, to grasp society in its concreteness, is to grasp what it is at particular

moment in time, simultaneously, with what it can become in the future. The image of the river both represents the given reality, as well as suggests a transformation of this reality. This is first articulated in scene 5, when one of the thieves suddenly interrupts Wang's little play with what is at once a question and a realization 'Why don't.... the people... build a wall round the river?.... Then they don't need your protection.'[152] The river is incorporated in the actual process and activity of bringing about change: Ferryman: 'The river kept me alive and almost killed me. Now it will carry the rifles...'[153] The significance of the people making it theirs' which is in response to Wang's 'So take the river and make it ours!'[154] is then extended. The practical steps they take to control it, become in a sense, a general metaphor for the 'new relationship'[155] between the characters and the organization of their society and the ways by which they live.'[156] In scene 1-, after the situation has actually been radically changed, this new relationship'[157] is given concrete expression in the conversation between the village people by the river bank:

Tor-Quo: My wife doesn't want to live by the river
San-Quo: When the banks are mended?
Wang: Is she afraid of the river?
Tor-Quo: (shrugs) perhaps
Lu: A lot are
Kaka: The banks won't break now
Lu: [to Husband] - are you afraid of the river?
Husband: I'm not afraid of anything
Lu: Aren't you afraid of the dark?....Tigers? .....Landowners?
Husband: I'm not afraid of anything, my dear. I try not to be.

Lu: Not even the water when the banks are broken?

San-Quo: Why should the banks break? We'll build them well, it's for our own sake. There'll be locks. A cut-off channel for the spring tides.. We're changing the river... you speak as if the old river was there.[158]

The image of the river also illustrates a development of Bond's dramatic technique in which the realistic and the metaphorical are held in a new balance. The river is both a physical cause of suffering and hardship, as well as a symbol of social and political oppression. The landowner needs to do one thing. Only one. Keep us in ignorance. The river does that for him.'[159] It is consciously and deliberately used in the play to suggest both these levels, and is not an aspect of the character's private mythologizing as Lear's wall and Shogo's city. However, in spite of the fact that it can be manipulated it retains its dramatic vitality as an image, and this is reflected in the haunting, mythic resonance of Wang's description.

> Every year this servant raids the land. Digs up the dead to steal coins from their mouths. East the fields. Strips trees. Takes men's lives. Then it's the day of judgement every day even when it goes back to sleep in its lair its breath stands in the fields like a white mist... [160]

This aspect, along with the more'suggestive'[161] and less concrete images, like the sound of the bell and the plaintive cry of the curlew that are a dramatic representation of 'feelings,'[162] have their roots in the poetic dimension in Bond's work. Such a dimension is specially significant in a play in which there is much emphasis on rational analysis,

and abstract concepts like right and evil. It brings a depth and wisdom to the drama, which unlike a purely cerebral investigation has an organic connection with human experience and human values, and these, according to Bond's are among the 'foundations of a true culture.'[163]

In scene, 7, Wang's comment 'We have not yet earned the right to be kind,'[164] explaining why he does not buy water for the Woman prisoner, is closely linked with Bond's critique of conventional morality in *The Bundle.* This is based on the conception that moral values are not absolute, in the sense that they do not refer to the relationship between an isolated individual and an abstract, moral idea Rather, moral issues are questions that emerge from the activity of human begins in society. This is the perspective in which we can understand Wang's statement: It's not easy to do good. You pick up one child. What about the tenth child? Or the hundredth child?[165]

....one little gush of sweetness and I pick up a child? Who picks up the rest? How can I hold my arms wide enough to hold them all? Feed them? Care for them? All of them?....[166]

Thus, what Wang implies is that when a moral act is conceived of in terms of society as a whole, then it has to be informed by an overall strategy of action that is in a rational sense effective in changing the structures of society, structures that in their normal functioning continually reproduce the inhuman situation.

> The ox bears the yoke. Break the yoke. Another is put on its neck. The farmer has fifty yokes in his store. Stop being an ox. What is the use of breaking a window when it has iron bars?
> The landowner still controls....[167]

When such a moral act however, is divorced from its social context, then doing good becomes at best benevolent charity; at worst it can be positively immoral in so far as it is a subtle, psychological device to assuage one's conscience, and release one from the responsibility of confronting the problem in a fundamental way: ('Today we should look on kindness with suspicion.'[168])

The maturity and richness of Bond's vision in this play, lies in the fact that while asserting the imperatives of a rational morality, he nevertheless retains a sensitivity to the specificity of human suffering. When the Ferryman chooses to save the baby in the opening scene, he also has to accept the very real privation and suffering this involves his decision means starvation for his wife. The dialectical contradiction inherent in the situation is reflected the Wife's speech in scene 6:

> If I'd eaten better and kept warm in the wet winters I'd still look young. I went without food till I was so weak I had to hold on to things to stand...I was grey so soon. He [Wang] got bigger and stronger. I heard him running on the bank. Shouting. What luck: to give my life and see him grow. Then I became his mother I died in this slow childbirth.[169]

Towards the end of the play, the Ferryman takes yet another decision, and this time has to pay for it with his life, while she has to endure being utterly helpless and hear him being killed by slow degrees, off stage. In Wang's case, the anguish of his inner conflict is expressed in the fragmented, incoherent, structure of his speech in response to the Women's pleas that he should save the child in scene 4, 'You don't know what I...I was going away....Tell me....Tell me.....how should I live?? [170] It is this tension between the

affirmation of the fundamental value of human beings through a violent act, while at the same time being deeply aware of the human cost at the moment of such an act, that prevents Bond's rational morality from degenerating into a crude ends-justify-the-man philosophy. Later in this scene, even when Wang has decided to abandon the child, the turmoil is still very much there, but this time it takes the form of an almost strident eloquence in justifying his decision.

> Why should I pick you [the child] up? Why do I hold you?... I live in his [Basho's] house so that you have a house? Give you the things I run away from? Nine years: I planned - no, schemed, plotted, dreamt: And now you're drowning me in the river? No: No: No: No: No: For how many centuries? Left - Rot: Eastern: Drowned: Sold: All waste: How many: Till when?.....[171]

Although earn offers a rational interpretation of his situation, he lacks the ability to combat it. He is driven to a 'kind of madness'[172] by the irrationality of his society and becomes a victim. By contrast, Wang is a character who develops from being a victim of his social circumstances, to someone who is able to grasp his situation in the sense of having an understanding of it together with an effective programme of action for changing it. This development at the level of characterization embodied in Wan, also occurs in the play as a whole. Whereas in *The Fool*, the experience of oppression is expressed in an essentially spontaneous violence, in *The Bundle*, violence forms part of a carefully considered plan of action in whose implementation the entire community is involved. It is designed to undermine the very structures of existing society and replacing them by an alternative in which Bond" concept of a "rational culture'[173] can be realized.

Notes

Malcolm Hay and Philip Roberts, Edward Bond. A companion to the Plays. Theatre quarterly publications, London, 1978. Karl-Heinz Stall. Interview with Bond. Twentieth Century Literature. Vol. 22, No.4, New York, 1974
The Sea: A comedy, Methew, London 1973
Narrow Road to the Deep North: Methuen,London, 1968
The Pope's Wedding: Methuen, London, 1969
Saved: Methuen, London 1966
Bingo: Methuen, London, 1974
The Fool: Methuen, London, 1976
Philip Roberts: British Council interview with Bond, March, 1977
Early Morning: Methuen, London, 1968
Howard Davis: Interview with Peter Hulton, Dartington Theatre Papers, January 1978, p.15

References

1. Bond, interview with Tony Coult, Plays and Players, Vol. 23, No.3, December, 1975, p.10
2. Bond, quoted in Companion, p.27
3. Bond, *Plays and Players*, 1, p.8
4. Bond, *Theatre Papers* (1973), p.5
5. Bond, interview with Philip Roberts, p.10
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Bond, Introduction to Bingo, p. vii
9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.
11. *Bingo*, Part 1, scene 3, p.27
12. Ibid. Part2, scene 6, p.49
13. Ibid. p.48
14. Ibid., p.49
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid. *Introduction to Bingo*, p. xiii
17. Ibid., p. ix
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. *Bingo*, stage directions, Part 1, scene 1, p.1
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., p.3
24. Ibid., Part I, scene, 2.p.11
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Introduction to *Bingo*, p. ix
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid. p. vii
31. Ibid.
32. Gary Connor, *Review of Bingo, Plays and Players*, Vol. 21, September, 1974, p.84
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Introduction to *Bingo*, p. vii
36. *Bingo, scene 3, p.25*
37. Ibid. pp.27-28
38. Ibid. Scene 1
39. Bond, Ms. Notes for the plays April 1973, quoted in Philip Roberts, *Making the Two Worlds One, Critical Quarterly. Vol.21 No.4, 1979. P.81*
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Bond, quoted in *Companion p.53*

43. A moral decision in never private. It is always taken on behalf of others. Our moral lives are always public.
44. John Worthen *Endings and Beginnings*
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid.
48. John Worthens, Endings and Beginnings: Edward Bond and the Shock of Recognition, Educational Theatre Journal, 27, 4 Dec., 1975, p.477
49. Ibid.
50. With few expectations, critics have largely focused on the portrayal Shakespeare as the historically authentic person, and on Bond's distortion of historical and biographical facts, rather than discussing him as a dramatic character.
51. *Bingo*, scene 3, p.27
52. Ibid. scene 2, p.11
53. Ibid. scene 3, p.27
54. Ibid. scene 1, p.9
55. Ibid. scene 3, p.27
56. 'A half crazed old man and a beggar girl It's impossible for those people, those savage innocents, to survive....', Howard Davies, interview with Peter Hulton, *Theatre Papers*, January 1978, p.15
57. *Bingo*, scene 3, p.27
58. Ibid. scene 5, p.43
59. Ibid., scene 6, pp.48-49
60. Ibid., stage direction, scene 5, p.39
61. Ibid., scene 5, p.42
62. John Worthen, p.477
63. Ibid.
64. Bond, quoted by John Worthen p.477
65. Bond, Introduction *Bingo*, p. vii
66. Ibid.
67. Bond, *Theatre Papers (1978), p.21*
68. Ibid.

69. Johan Worthen p.477
70. As Bond himself observes: 'In a play ideas must be enacted and not simply spoken; *Companion, p.45*
71. Bingo, *scene 4, p.32*
72. Ibid., p.34
73. Ibid., p.31 'I've been in prison four times. Dark smelly places. No. Gardens, Sorry yours in so big.'
74. Ibid.,p.33
75. Ibid.,p.331
76. Ibid.,p.38
77. Ibid., p.32
78. Ibid.,p.38
79. Ibid., p.3-39
80. John Worthe, p.477
81. Quoted in Philip Roberts, *Making the Two Worlds One, pp.75-76*
82. Ibid.,p.76
83. *The Fool,* scene 1, p.6
84. Ibid., p.7
85. Ibid., scene 8, p.66
86. Food has similar connotations in the closing scene of *The Bundle,* although here the social and political situation has changed radically both since the beginning of the play, and since *the Fool.* The image of Wang, Pu-To, and the others having their midday meal together, reflects their solidarity, now based on their developing political consciousness, and constructive use of their newly acquired control over their lives and environment.
87. Ibid., scene 4, p.27 Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., scene 1, p.7
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid., scene 7, p.60
92. *Lear,* act 2, scene 6, p.59
93. *Bingo,* scene 3, p.28

94. *Bingo*, scene 3, p.28
95. *The Fool*, scene p.57
96. Ibid., scene 1, pp.6-7
97. *The fool, Darkie and the Men Hanged at Ely, p.74*
98. *The Fool scene 3, pp.35-26*
99. Ibid., scene 2, p.11
100. Ibid.
101. D.H. Lawrence, *Dark Satanic Mill*, Complete Poems, p.6-628
102. *The Women, Scenes of War and Freedom* (London, 1979).
103. Ibid., p.127
104. Ibid.
105. *The Fool* scene 3, p.24
106. *The Bundle*, scene 5, p.30
107. *The Fool scene 3*, p.18
108. *The Bundle* scene 5, p.25
109. *The Fool*, scene 3, p.17
110. Ibid., pp.23-24
111. This technique is developed further in *We Came to the* (London, 1976) where the choreography is more complex.
112. John Lahr, review of *The Fool, Plays and Players,* January 1976
113. Bond, quoted in *Companion*, p.50
114. *The Fool*, scene 6, p.43
115. Bond, quoted in *Companion*, p.50
116. Ibid.
117. Bond, interview with Philip Roberts, p.10
118. *The Fool*, scene 6, p.57
119. Bond, quoted in *Companion*, p.22
120. Ibid.
121. Ibid.
122. Ibid.
123. Bond, *Preface to Lear* p. xiv
124. Bond, *Plays and Players, 3, p.10*
125. Bond, *T.C.L., 4*, p.419

126. Bond, *Plays and Players*, 3, p.10
127. Malcolm Hay and Philip Roberts, *Edward Bond: Stage in A Life. Observer Magazine,* August 6th, 1978.
128. *The Bundle*, Part-1, scene 5, p.38
129. Ibid.
130. Ibid.,p.32
131. *Lear,* Act 1, scene 1, p.3
132. *The Bundle, A Note on Dramatic Method,* p.xvi
133. Ibid.
134. *The Bundle,* scene 3, .11
135. Ibid.
136. Ibid.,p.15
137. Ibid., p.21
138. Ibid.
139. Ibid.
140. Ibid.,p.12
141. Ibid.,p.11
142. Ibid.,.p.11
143. Ibid.,p.14
144. Ibid., part 2, scene 7, p.51
145. Ibid.,p.53
146. Ibid.
147. Ibid.,p.56
148. Ibid.
149. Ibid., p.58
150. Ibid.
151. Ibid., part-1, scene 5, p.39
152. Ibid., part-2, scene 6, p.48
153. Ibid., p.46
154. Ibid.
155. Bond, Theatre Papers (1978), p.22
156. Ibid.
157. Ibid.
158. The Bundle, scene 10, pp.73-74
159. Ibid., scene 6, p.46
160. Ibid., scene 5, p.38

161. Ibid.
162. Bond, '....I used the sounds, the bell and the curlew, which are almost like feelings
163. Ibid.,p.18
164. Ibid.,p.46
165. Ibid.,p.46
166. Ibid.,p.46
167. Ibid., Part-2, scene 7, p.54
168. Ibid.
169. Ibid., p.44
170. Ibid., Part-I, scene 4, p.28
171. Ibid., pp.28-29
172. Bond, quoted in *Companion*, p.22
173. Bond, interview with P. Roberts, p.10

*****