

**The Grotesque Use Of Power And Its Effects On Characters In Manjula Padmanabhn's
Harvest.**

Haidar Leike Hashim

The General Directorate of Education in Al-Qadisiyah Province, Ministry of Education, Al-Qadisiyah
Province, Iraq

E-mail address: haidarhashim8@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The grotesque, as a phenomenon in literature and art in general, is visual and predominately physical. However, in this research, I try to show how power, from Foucault perspective, is as an affective grotesque element, used to turn most of the characters in Mnajula Padmanabhan's *Harvest* into submissive, humiliated, grotesque subjects whose main existence is to supply the Westerners with life and continuity, how the nation in this play works as a narrative script on which ideologies and principles of power are engraved or expunged. And how the characters are suffering from a loss of identity although they live in their original home . It will be noticed that the aim of grotesque in the play is not to show satire or black comedy or to give signs for hope, reconciliation or reformation, rather it is used to show bitter reality and the true face of modernism .This grotesque use of power makes hope and victory only slight dreams of the individuals that fulfil and present nothing to the nation. The research also argues that whereas the play centers on the ambivalence in power affairs and relations, Manjula's vision is quite unambivalent in its utopian notion of political change and its gendered depiction of women within nationalist discourses. The research shows that the playwright's illustration of the Indian world as being intoxicated by the notion of power which is depicted as complex, monstrous and ambivalent .

Key words: *Harvest* , Mnajula Padmanabhan , grotesque , power , Foucault,Identity

INTRODUCTION :

In postcolonial literature, the presentation of power is regarded to be a key thematic paradigm. Due to the complexities and multiplicities of human beings identities, relations of power are, as mentioned by most writers, complex and heterogeneous. In his lectures, Michel Foucault regards power to be something "that is exercised through networks, and individuals in these networks are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power. Where power exists, notions of dominance cannot be eliminated. In the context of state power, the performance of dominance often takes on grotesque dimensions" . (**Michel Foucault 2003:12**) and for this the grotesque is regarded, by Foucault, to be one of the essential processes of arbitrary sovereignty" (**ibid.**). Meanwhile, Homi K. Bhabha ,in his "*Nation and narration*", speaks of "a particular ambivalence that haunts the idea of the nation, the language of those who write of it and the lives of those who live it" . This kind of ambivalence "emerges from the growing awareness of the transitional social reality" (**Homi K. Bhabha, 1990, 1**). This affirmation suggests that, whether in the fictional or in the real world, ambivalence embodies the application of power as a national scheme. This kind of power, as Foucault declares, is often renegade and random sovereignty

functioning outside the values of law and of reason and is exemplified in a more personalized image, in the power of the "strong man; the dictator". ((**Michel Foucault 2003:12-13**). The representation of power as a grotesque form is very helpful to understand the postcolonial encounter between those who rule and those who are determined to be their subjects, between the ones who wield power and the individuals over whom power is wielded. Their sufferings are created by this harsh system of capitalism and by the grotesque use of power which changes them into machines that follow the orders to make more profits and prosperity for the wealthy ,white man who created the system of "Human Labor" , which is applied where labors are not protected by any laws. They are cheap , "less assertive, less taxed, more feminized and less protected by states and unions"(**Ericka Hoagland, Reema Sarwal, 2010, 9**) . This system of labor is applied in the remote countries where Capitalism introduces "a gospel of salvation; capitalism that, if rightly harnessed, is invested with the capacity, wholly to transform the universe of the marginalized and the disempowered." (**Jean Comaroff and Lohn L. Comaroff, 2001 , 2**)

Manjula Padmanabhan's dystopian play *Harvest* (1997) examines how the third world man is changed into a commodity when his body organs are becoming subjects to sell. Manjula Padmanabhan's play, shows an unemployed man selling the rights of his body parts to a buyer in the United States, this is a kind of consumption . It is "the commoditization of the healthy third-world body.". Therefore, people of the third world have become a storehouse or a bank of spare parts of body organs for ailing bodies of the whites in the first world. This act of taking someone's parts of the body is regarded to be the ultimate brutality that the civilized part of the world is applying to guarantee its continuity, In fact it is a grotesque form of power that the first world apply without conscious . In her *Harvest*, Manjula presented Om as a symbol of man from the third world who lost hope and the fight against despair in this brutal world. A man from India who has no work to support his family and no chance to live like a human ,and the only way to be a human is to join the queue of donors to sell his organs. His actions are motivated by this mixture of hope and despair.

1. *Harvest* and Human organ trade:

The first world economy has created its own power and glory simply through consumption of the third world. It is a kind of exploitation that reaches beyond the limits of race and broads to the trade of body organs. It is not surprising, says Nancy Scheper, the famous anthropologist, to see sick and unhealthy but rich people from the first world are turning to be healthy and active again by buying body organs from the exploited, poor people from the third world. This kind of trade of body organs , which is more awful than slave trade, is best be understood in the framework of "Global Capitalism" ,because the movement of the organs mirrors the tour of capital movements in the age of globalization:" from South to North, from Third to First world, from poor to rich, from black and brown to white." (**Nancy Scheper Haugh ,2002, p.197**)

In her introduction to the *Anthology of the Post-colonial Plays* , Helen Gilbert rightly remarks on the nature of the play. She notes:

"Harvest can be read not only as a cautionary tale about the possible (mis) use of modern medical and reproductive science but also a reflection on economic and social legacies of Western imperialism, particularly as they coverage with new technologies" (**Helen Gilbert, 2001, 216**)

Cleverly, the playwright uses the human organ trade because it is prevented in most of the countries of the world and because the human body has sacredness linked with man's own dignity in life. There is

nothing in the whole world that can recompense one's own body organs .But it is the harsh conditions of the third world labors that make them sell their organs, their dignity in order to live some good days from the perspective of the white man. According to Kants' philosophy, people must be treated as ends in themselves rather than a mere means ;" Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only" , this is the first sort of objectification that is called "instrumentality" by Kant. The other sort is called "fungibility" in which a distinction between price and dignity is made: "In the kingdom of ends everything has either a price or a dignity. Whatever has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent; on the other hand, whatever is above all price, and therefore admits of no equivalent ,has a dignity". (Stephen Wikinson , 2003 , 29)

However, Harvest introduces the kind of domination that the first world wants to apply over the third world. The same kind of submission and control of the colonial period in every maneuvering way. The play shows the grotesque power of the West is used to ransack the lives and future of the others. A simple example of this superiority is when Virgil, the white man from the West who buys body organs from the simple, poor Indian, is persisting that Jaya, Om's wife, should change her name to *Zaya*; the name he prefers and uses. Jaya then realizes that she should resist and persist more to use her actual name which reflects the power of her personality and nationality. It's an empowering depiction of the naming .

Manjula's *Harvest* is in fact a bold initiatives to find answers to certain critical inquiries about how brutal the world is ? and can the inhuman part of civilization be exposed? and why is the middle class living with dual personality? .By the revelation of the darker part of the world, Manjula tries to bring a new artistic and scientific movement that goes side by side to futurism and surrealism theatre which dominate in the first half of the century . It "brilliantly allegorizes the relationship between the first and the third worlds, literalizing the fundamental practice of globalisation and its central situation : the third world provides the raw material that the first world consumes for its own survival and expansion."(**Solomon , 2014 ,15**) " by leaving apart all the technical and scenic obstructions that were used in the very beginning of the century and replacing them with a human touch, Manjula Padmanabhan's *Harvest* " develops an absurd narrative of the structure of presentation and power in the contemporary globalised culture."(**ibid . 16**)

2. Grotesque and the Grotesque use of power:

When we talk about grotesque, number of attributes jump in our minds to occupy our thinking, among them are "peculiar, odd, absurd, bizarre, macabre, depraved, degenerate, perverse" (Edward and Graulund, 2013, 1) and so on. Yet, grotesque, as described by Sir. Hugo, the narrator of the 1989 great novel *The Grotesque* by McGrath, "occupies our imagination when sensory information is absent" .(**McGrath, 1989, 61**). Grotesque can have the meaning of "disharmony or paradox". It may refer to the mixture of "the comic and the terrifying," the "extravagance and exaggeration of reality", and the "ambivalently abnormal," and also "a sense of alienation where something once understood and expected becomes foreign and threatening" (**Balkun,2000, 826**).

Generally, the use of the grotesque in literature is to emphasise "self-contradiction" , which is the main feature of the grotesque that simplifies the "existence of two opposing principles without subordination," (**Dietter Meindl, 1996, 18**). In this way and according to its position in a particular society, the grotesque makes a reevaluation of the mainstream and prompts readers or spectators that everything in the society and in the world is not easily understood or classified (**Philip Thompson , 1972 , 59**).

However, grotesque can't be confined to peculiar and weird thoughts or visions .Nor are they restricted to the unusual creatures of books or the distorted bodies of some Flemish images. For grotesque also demonstrates itself in the physical, material world of the corporeal body. Sir Hugo in *The Grotesque* is a best example that the grotesque is not something we notice and observe ,it is not something linked to our

imagination when we feel despair and out of hope, but it is something that defines our lives and our identities. Because of his illness that caused some sort of a trophy to his organs and turned him into a thing on a wheelchair, Sir Hugo sees himself as a typical model of a real grotesque person: "that to be a grotesque is my destiny. For a man who turns into a vegetable-isn't that a grotesque?" (**Patrick McGrath, 1989, 16**).

Grotesque, as a timeless conception in the literature of the world, is in fact part of the human nature and it is essential to the nature of its existence. What makes a character grotesque is to find elements that can be seen as irregular freak or bizarre in form. A grotesque character may own an exaggerated character mannerism or features for the sake of provoking both the sense of empathy and revulsion in the audience or readers. Grotesque persons are shown to be somehow imperfect for the deficiency of certain important parts of their bodies, as the missing of certain parts that are cut off; like for example, limbs which are substituted by phantom or fake limbs and corporeal mutations that develop to be dominant traits. (**J. Meyer Michael, 1995, xii**). In some cases, grotesque figures combine human and non-human like the grotesque character of Gini in *Harvest*, animals or vegetable traits. In other cases, the corporeal deformity consists of extra body parts; eleven toes, a human tail, a third nipple and so on. These are excessively grotesque.

However, Balkun states that the use of the grotesque in a given era comes to "explore the anxieties of a given period" (**Mary McAleer Balkun, 2000, 825**). As most of scholars agree that the constant use of grotesque can differ from one epoch to another according to certain psychological, political, social or economic situations. It can shed light and give a close investigation about all of the contradictions, problems, illnesses and maladjustments of these situations. Thus, most authors of the recent era like Flannery O'Connor and Faulkner start to utilize a remarkable form of what is called "psychological grotesque", that is developed to suit the modern era in serving the representation of the unresolvable struggles and incongruities obtained by the modern age and the modern experience. The use of the psychological grotesque comes to be a device to seize and observe facets of the contradictory nature obtained by the modern experience. (**Edward and Graulund, 2013,3**)

The reason behind the rise of the grotesque is to know how the world seems unlinked, untied and out of a joint. It also presents a questionnaire for those pieces of the world that look perfect and somehow united. Thus, nevertheless the notion of the grotesque is not knotted to a specific culture, philosophy or time, each distinct grotesque is formed by the cultural conventions and suppositions that the grotesque pursues to test, and defy (**Geoffrey Harpham, 1972, xxvi**). In fact, grotesque is invoked by writers and artists to push us and make us revise the manner we search for to comprehend and shape the world in which we live, calling into question former suppositions that shaped our thinking and the way through which we see the world.

During the modern era, the world had witnessed numerous catastrophes among them were colonization, world wars and their consequences of famines, financial depression and the loss of faith. These terrible events presented an environment that is suitable for the constant development of the description of the grotesque in literature and in art in general. Philip Thomson's definition of the grotesque, as "the unresolved clash of incompatibles in work and response... It is significant that this clash is paralleled by the ambivalent nature of the abnormal as present in the grotesque" (**Thompson, 1972, 27**), gives the concept of the grotesque the ability and the attribute to transcend over time and place where meaning becomes vague and unachievable. The grotesque produces an inspired power for conceptualizing the indefinite that is created by falsehood and distortion, and reflecting on the importance of the vagueness

and uncertainty that is thereby created and produced. **(Edward and Graulund, 2013, 3)** One of the abnormal that becomes creative grotesque in literature is power and authority. Thus, Foucault illustrates how power is incarnated and be found in the "mechanics of power", not only in the persons who wave to use it like police officers , kings, presidents and soldiers or doctors. Certainly, Foucault's deep insights into world organizations and the history of systems are linked to the dissemination of both power and knowledge in discourse; the matrices, he claims, of power-knowledge are originated in the enormous system of conflicting and intervalidating discursive applications that form reality. The world is submitted to the instructions and procedures created by the matrices of knowledge and power which have great effects on the institutional constructions to create qualified persons whose knowledge , positions , aims and productions are previously determined .Thus, the discursive practices of power and of knowledge can define the ones who are supposed to be relegated to the degree of margins or being classified in particular ways like for example the insane, the illegal and criminals or the corrupt . All the subjects who are dominated in this way are going to be part of the whole process of normalization. However, this kind of society formation depending on the processes and the ideology of normalization can also be a main factor that opens the door for resistance and then for change .Since the dominant discourse is being used , the counter-discourse is going to be the result of this kind of discourse , and in the same respect, since people are classified into subjects , the possibility is the fact that the community will revolt against this kind of using power . **(Prado, C . G ,1992 , 143)**

For Foucault, power :

"Must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses force relations; as the support which these force relations fins in one another , thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institution of the law, in the various social hegemonies". **(Foucault, 1980. 92-93)**

So, power is not a thing that can be possessed nor it is acquired, but it is a notion that has a dynamic nature in a given society, or a s Foucault expresses " power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society" **(ibid, 93)**

Weather executive, legislative or judiciary , power is directed by logic. It is just like fluid, an organism like a monster whose boundaries are unlimited and who can overrun and overcome the dominance of not only certain members, but of the whole community . It is the force that can reshape individuals and modify them .For this, power is definitely grotesque and " its grotesquery operates through the faceless mechanics of the state, in the anonymous bureaucracies of the asylums, hospitals and prisons and in a more personalized image; the power of the strong man, the dictator" . Power in this case works outside the morals of reason and of law , because it is the result of "arbitrary sovereignty" . **(Edward and Graulund, 2013,27)** . For Foucault, it is something easy to discern a grotesque form of power since it is "the essential processes of arbitrary sovereignty" , and it is a process inherent to "assiduous bureaucracy" **(Foucault , 2003: 12)** on which the Western bureaucratic systems depend and make orders that subject people not only of the industrial countries, but of the entire world. The production of "the administrative machine" , that are filled by human functionaries is what these bureaucratic systems are after. To empty individuals from any sense of humanity and make them executed of orders only .

In general, the roles of Foucault's grotesque are in fact different from that of Bakhtin's in three senses:

First, Foucault's grotesque enables killing since it represents a point of transition between techniques of normalization and sovereign power. Second, Foucault's grotesque is set to parody truth because it creates "doubles" of truth that are solid to extricate instead of producing falsities. This kind of parody creates diversions instead of confronting the truth.

Third, unlike Bakhtin's grotesque that produces laughter through parody by the creation of a political body over the organic body, Foucault's laughter is regarded the main device makes power, which used to move between contemptible sovereignty and outrageous authority, is disguised through common presentations of ridicule. (Foucault , 2003: 14)

We are so enamored to know that we have the ability to ridicule the most authoritative and powerful that this pleasure appears to recompense for the fact that our struggle sums for just little in challenging the impact of this grotesque form of power.

3 .The Grotesque use of power in Manjula's Padmanabhn's Harvest .

Manjula cleverly succeeds to use the physical and the secular kinds of grotesque in order to transcend messages of oppression and of brutality through the unleashed use of power which , as a grotesque element , has its own effects on characters, who in turn are transmitted to be examples of "the administrative machine" , for they no more have the human senses , voice and the ability to resist .

Manjula wants to show the effects of Capitalism and of power not only on the precolonized people of India, the setting of the play, but on people of the West when she presents the Guards of The Interplanta Services whose job is to blindly follow the orders of their Western masters to watch, serve and then harvest the organs of the poor victims of the Prakash family. In fact, Manjula reminds us of the characters of Franz Kafka's 1925 *The Trial* ; Franz and William , the officers whose job is to carry out bizarre and heartless , inhuman commands in a robotic way . They are regarded by Foucault to be the best examples of "assiduous bureaucracy" since they are intended to depict "an administrative machine" that appears to be powered by human functionaries . Those guards have no names but numbers which means that they have neither personality nor existence . They are described as being a military team who are not allowed to interact with the donors with an exception for guard number one, the leader . Their responsibility is to make sure that the donors, Om's family are eating and sleeping well in order to keep their organs healthy. When they got the orders to invade Om's house, they started to remove all the stuffs in the chicken .Jaya asked them to stop ,but they don't listen; "you beast! Don't you understand what I'm saying? Are you a machine? Answer me!" (Padmanabhan, 221) . And without any hesitation or objection, the guards harvested Jeetu's, Om's brother, organs, in spite of their knowledge that he isn't Om, the donor who has a pact with the western receivers.

The invasion of the house is regarded to be " a crucial feature" of post-colonial discourse and this is principally poignant in *Harvest* . In post-colonial societies , place is regarded by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin to be a complex interaction of language, history and environment. It is characterized first by a sense of displacement in those who have moved to the colonies, or the more widespread sense of displacement from the imported language, of a gap between the 'experienced' environment and descriptions the language provides, and second, by a sense of the immense investment of culture in the construction of place" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1995, p. 345).

In this sense, the members of the Prakash family have lost control over their own modest and simple home, their Indian traditions and culture, and the way of their ordinary life, and are possessed and continually scrutinized through a contact unit or say surveillance cameras that are fixed in their house without their agreement or understanding that the privacy of their lives will be observed and controlled from across the world.

Like the pact of Dr. Faustus who sold his soul to the devil, Om sells the right of his body organs as well as his soul and the identity of the whole family which has been hijacked by the buyers from the west. Their home, customs, kind of food they like and even their neighbors are forbidden for them. They have to literally follow the instructions of The Guard 1 who says:

GUARD 1. All implements of personal fuel preparation will be supplied exclusively by Interplaza service. Henceforward, you and your domestic unit will consume only those fuels which will be made available by Interplaza. We will provide you more than enough for the unit described in your data sheet. But will forbid you from sharing, selling or by any means whatsoever commercially exploiting the facility. (H.228)

It is true that the subject of identity is somehow a complicated matter because it has, as Erik Erikson cited in Vincent Descombes *Puzzling Identity* 2005, states that identity has many connotations "At one time it seemed to refer to a conscious sense of individual uniqueness, at another to an unconscious striving for a continuity of experience, and at a third, as a solidarity with a group's ideals". (Vincent Descombes, 2005,16). yet, the Prakash Indian family have been cut off from the rest of the society and the result is that they lost their identity since identity was approved to "talk about the relationship of the individual to society" (ibid, 15). Because of this grotesque use of power, the family has experienced an extraordinary and a persisting modification in relation to its position in the Indian society. It is obvious that whereas some of the characters are cemented to the new technology of the west like the television with 750-channel, which the mother, Ma spends most of her time overturning through its channels, others examine and interrogate their value when confronted with the "He's sold his rights to his organs! His skin. His eyes. His arse. Sold them!" (H., 223). For Jaya it is very difficult to accept that the organs of her husband's body are going to be sold piece by piece to a stranger from the west who bought them with a very little price and most importantly is that no one will care not even the mother Ma. Through this kind of humiliation and exploitation, the west seems to "imposed and maintained its codes in its colonial domination of so much of the rest of the world" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1995, p. 221). Very quickly, Jaya manages to notice the swift downfall of their traditions, history identity and culture, and confronts Om who tries to defend himself with the help of his mother, Ma :

JAYA: You said it wouldn't affect us—but see what it's done already!

OM: So tell me—what? IN exchange for your Old kitchen you have a new modern one

JAYA: You call this food? This goat-shit? She Indicates the pellets they have been eating.

MA: It's better than what you make

JAYA: And call me your sister—what's That? If I'm your sister, what does that

Make you? Sister, huh! My forehead burns When I say that word "sister"!

MA: Shoo! Are you a street woman? To speak In such a voice?

OM: You think I did it lightly. But at the cost of calling you my sister...we'll be rich!

Very rich! Insanely rich! But you'd rather in this one small room, I suppose!

Think it's such a fine thing—living day in, Day out, like monkeys in a hot-case—lulled To sleep by our neighbors' rhythm Farting! Dancing to the tune

of the melodious traffic! And starving. Yes, you'd prefer this to being called my sister on a stupid slip of paper no-one we know will ever see! (Padmanabhan, 1996, p. 223)

The kind of power that the Prakash family has been exposed to turned most of its members into grotesque characters. The most dangerous thing that the play suggests, is the breakdown of the whole family, which has been submitted to the external power of *Ginne*, who represents the west, wealth and arrogance of the white race. The complete terrors of this sort of body organ trade are proposed not only by the continuing collapse of the giver body, but also by the complete disintegration of the family as a complete social unit. Ma, Om's mother and who is supposed to be the family keeper and protector, is turned to be a mere grotesque character who lives in the world of oblivion. Ma's future is seen to be more palatable than the future of her children. Staring at the Super Deluxe Video Couch which has 750 channels with a remount control between her hands,(L. Jeevitha , G. Subramanian 2018, 1853). Ma lives in isolation from the rest of the family members. She might think of herself as having the world between her hands and the power to control everything. She is turned to a shadow of a mother who finds an escape from the bitter reality of her miserable life.

Manjula tends to make Ma's character so overstated that she becomes a grotesque, a style that can be performed in a work of satire , irony , and black humour as well. It is said that the grotesque " represents the incursion of disorder, typically associated with abnormalities, deformations, and perversions," and it stresses on "the inhuman and the abyss" (Harold Bloom, 2010, 94). One of the major aims Manjula wants to shed light on through the grotesque character of Ma is to satirize the society and to sustenance satire's socially remedial purposes.

However, to create the social correctness through satire is seen to be impossible in this sever world where the grotesque use of power is prevailing. In this world where every character represents some deviation of exploitation and selfishness, "black humor", as Louis Hasley writes, " has gone beyond satire. Its direction is metaphysical, not social. It has no traffic with the correction of evil, nor does it aim for the enlightenment of those who are less sensitive, less perceptive" (Hasley, Louis 1993, 109) . By using this kind of grotesque, the play suggests no such social correction can be made and no enlightenment can be seen since these grotesque features rise above some economic or political limitations which are all mirrored in Manjula's parodic depiction of Ginni, .

The personality of Ma has been highly affected by the direct presence of the grotesque power in her life. She has been changed from the wise, keen mother whose ultimate task is to keep her family protected into a woman lives in a world of oblivion . At the beginning of the play, Ma is trying to explain to Jaya, her sons' wife, that getting a job to her son Om is important to keep this family going in life, and that she is fully aware of the feelings of love and courtship that Jaya feels towards her son Jutu, Om's younger brother

JAYA: I said I'm hoping he *doesn't* get the job –

MA : Oh – I forgot! Missie Madam *doesn't* want her husband to earn a living wage – like she should! Like any reasonable, respectable wife would –

JAYA : You don't understand –

MA : My son's wife doesn't appreciate him,

that's what I understand –

JAYA Like every husband's mother before you.

MA :Think I don't see the way you wet yourself when he walks in the door. Yes! Your brother-in-law – ohhh, the shame of it! You'll suffer in your next life. See if you don't! You'll be made into a cockroach and I'll have to smash you – (*lifts her bare foot and stamps hard*) just like this one. (*Shows JAYA: the underside of the foot.*) See? Do you see your fate? (*H* 218).

And when Om tells her that he gets a job, she extremely feels happy not for herself of course but for the entire family, because she, like all women of India, is aware that the family is a very important social unit

OM : I got it. I got the job.

MA: Oh! Say it again! Say the blessed words again! Never stop saying it! 'I – have – got – the – job!' Ah my soul, my heartbeat! Come, kiss me! Let me hold you, fondle your ears! Why am I surprised? You deserve every success. (*H*. 219)

Ma embarrassed Om when she knows that her son will give his organs to a rich foreigner who comes from the west :

MA : But why must they come to us? ... Don't they have enough of their own people?

OM : (*to MA*) They don't have people to spare.

JAYA : And we do, of course. We grow on trees, in the bushes! (*H*. 223)

However, the personality of Ma is affected by the presence of all the materials brought to her house by the western power. She has been changed to a woman who doesn't care to anything around her even the lives of her sons. On the contrary, she encourages her son, Om to continue his job with the Interplanta as a donor, accusing Jaya, who always protests, as being " jealous! Can't bear to think of you (Om) being inside that foreign angel." (*H*. 232). In fact Ma's grotesque character is close to a mad person or an insane woman who there is no space for logic in her life. So, for her, it is wonderful that her son's kidneys are going to be inside a western, blond woman whom she never meets directly .

MA: After all, who wouldn't want to be inside such a divine being? Why – it would be indecent to object –

OM : Now, now, Ma –

MA : Who knows? Maybe she'll even want you for a husband someday – why not? If my son's kidneys are good enough for her (*H*. 232)

What she cares of is her TV set and how she orders to buy things . Her life and all her presence is connected to the hypothetical world of the screen through which she runs away from the bitter reality of her house and then the sever problems of her life .She doesn't care for the guards who come to take the organs of her son, but she wants "to watch TV? There's something good on in twenty minutes – You should watch more TV. You could learn so much –" (*H. 234*) . And when the Guards come and take her son Jeetu instead of Om in order to harvest his organs, Ma's reaction is surprising when she points to her son telling the Guards " Go on! Take him – before he runs!" and when they took him out she asks "Can I switch on my TV?" which makes Jaya more angry about her ;" Your son goes off to the slaughter house and you're just worried about your TV!" (*H. 237*)

In fact, Ma's reaction is that of power and of authority since Foucauldian power doesn't requisite to be applied from above. It is not to be recognized with high status , control or domination. For Foucault power "comes from below; that is there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power-relations, and serving as a general matrix" (**Foucault, 1980 , 94**). In this sense we understand that power relation between those who have it and those who are subject to it is not a one-way relationship rather it is something which a person , an organization or a group of people has and applies on another . Foucault states that "power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations." (**ibid.**)

Meanwhile, The grotesque character of Ginni represents the ultimate use of power , of control and of exploitation that western countries have over the others. Ginni is the evil side of humanity whose youth, happiness and continuity is taken by all means including human organ trade.

In this futuristic play, Ginni represents a representation for capitalism and external or foreign violation. The obsession of all body organs is tantamount to surrendering one's culture and identity in a perpetual way to Ginni . Certainly, Ginni's orders quickly control the minutiae of the family, of the Indians' lives in general, stating what kind of food they eat and time to eat, the way they should behave their private hygiene and, to some extent, how they can depend to one another. The result of this invasive power, although it might be exercised at a distance , is the collapse of the whole family as a social component. Each one of the family forgets his or her social role in keeping the family knotted . They either bargain their humanity or betray and deceive their kin in their " hollow quests for affluence". (**Gilbert, 2006, p. 123-130**)

Ginni's main purpose is to keep the donor, Om, happy and active:

“(c) oz if Awum’s smiling, it means his body’s smiling, and if his body’s smiling, it means his organs are smiling. And that’s the kind of organs that’ll survive a transplant best” (*H. 229*)

They need him healthy and happy. They gave the family all kinds of prosperity and entertainment in order to harvest healthy organs. This kind of exploitation reminds us with the colonial period , or as Robert Young describes "the neocolonialism" a phenomenon where, “(a)lthough the formerly colonized territories gradually had their political sovereignty returned to them, they nevertheless remained subject to the effective control of the major world powers, which constituted the same group as the former imperial powers”; it is “merely a change in form rather than substance” (**Young , Robert J. C ,2003, 45**).

Worthy to mention that the name of “Ginni” is a recall to the demonic "djinni", or “genies” of Indian myths ; whose image floats above the room, and increasingly demands obedience from the family. Ma

was about to idolize Ginni, but then she truly worships the new television and its remote control between her hands .

Before the end of the play we have learned that Ginni, the pretty blond woman , is actually Virgil, an old, impotent, hated man who achieves and occupies human bodies like that of Jeetu's in a bid to preserve his youth. He told Jaya "I am old and I was sick and I got into this young body," (H.246). As a matter of fact, Ginni or Virgil is the ugly face of the civilized world and the real embodiment of a lost humanity. Ginni or Virgil exemplifies the ultimate end of this horrible globalized ideology that is based on consumption; a hidden desire that needs planning and support to be fulfilled. Clearly, Virgil explains how this system of power is working to obtain the appetite of mastery and of continuity

"**Virgil:** We began to live longer and longer. And healthier each generation. And more demanding – soon, there was competition between one generation and the next – old against young, parent against child...We prevailed. But our victory was bitter...So we designed this program. We support poorer sections of the world, while gaining fresh bodies for ourselves" (H.246).

Halpin states that "After all, what Virgil wanted was a whole, new, young, male body, so that he can use its sperm to get himself children" at very minimal cost and with little inconveniences, but the wealth itself ", (Halpin, 2014, pp. 13-23)

It is the irresponsible use of power that leads people of the previously colonized countries to live in a very humiliated way, poverty and lack of simple rights. The audience might have the same feelings of disgust and shock that Ginni had when she entered Prakash's tenement which lacks even good sanitary. Manjula here is not writing certain historical events, rather she is mentioning the truths about the life of most of the Indian people. Many sociological studies prove that hardly two percent of India's rural inhabitants, and no more than 50 percent of the urban people of India, had entrance to suitable sanitation at the end of 1990. These are the problems of most of the people in the world especially of India and they do have names: "poverty, resource distribution, state violence, human-rights violations, urban sanitation, development—and there is therefore no reason why they should be left outside the explanatory frames of academic discourse or relegated to the realm of the unmentionable". It is the grotesque use of power incarnated in the personality of Ginni/Virgil that causes miseries to most of the people of the world . It is a system that becomes like "a snake feeding on its own tail , a capitalism dying for the lack of food – collapsing through eating up the last meadow of 'otherness' on which it grazed. It proceeds by assimilating the very condition which alone can ensure its own existence " (Priban, Jiri , 2016 , 20) .

It is thought that one of the aims behind the use of the grotesque power that Manjula tends to apply is the affirmation of the absence of hope and change to most of the problems of the society that are seen to be huge and intertwined .The stronger , the western power is presented to be overwhelmed . Virgil dominates everything. He is the controller of the Prakash lives. Virgil reveals that he watches everything and every movement, even if the Control Module is seen to be off. This leads to the fact that much of the dramatic tension of the play's middle part is when the family members are trying to hide their personal life from Ginni/Virgil who appears to listen and see everything. One of the fact that the family is trying to hide is that Om and Jaya are married. They are husband and wife. The reason of this conceal is that the InterPlanta Services harvest body organs from the single men and women. The organization wants to exclude all the diseased organs and takes only the healthy ones. Ginni, who excluded the diseased Jeetu from the system, has been deceived when the InterPlanta guards accidentally run to take Jeetu instead of Om. These efforts that the family made, however, don't make the family members free, but in fact they increase their horror. They live in a complete loss of freedom since Om has signed the pact with the

strange power of the Interplanta. Virgil's exposure declares that the family's desperate machinations were avail. This complete control and Virgil's own full confidence is the result of the use of grotesque power over the week who are supposed to be submissive and acceptance to the decisions of the vicious power.

Moreover, through the grotesque use of power represented by Ginni/Virgil, Padmanabhan tries to convey the fact that all characters of the play including the audience are somehow grotesques when it comes to the achievement of the pedestrian human desires. Important questions are raised by Padmanabhan that if we have the ability, the technology and the power, aren't we able to chase that desires ? Are we going to be more selfish than Ginni/Virgil, who is seeking for youth, health and the capability to reproduce? And to what extent are we able to chase that desires? It can be noticed that Om's action is more selfish than that of Ginni/Virgil, because he is also seeking for the pedestrian human desires. After enjoying all the kinds of entertainment and luxury that the Interplanta presented to the family, Om, who is supposed to be responsible for his actions, is frightening when the guards come to apply the conditions of the pact and harvest his body organs. He accepts another person's welfare to keep his own health when he admits them to harvest Jeetu's organs instead. Off course there is a huge difference between Om's desires and needs and that of Virgil's, but when it comes to one's life, the matter is different. In spite of the science-fictional focus, *Harvest* is by all means not far away from the historical truths of its time, mainly in accordance to the capitalist system that runs the world economy's structure and in the case of the treatment of the subaltern .

One might ask why Padmanabhan creates the grotesque character of Ginni/ Virgil, i.e. why this shift from a blond beautiful young woman to an old helpless man who infiltrates the Prakash's home, converting its members and monitoring their everyday moves and actions . Padmanabhan, through this technique, tries to give the sense that our enemies are transforming. That the enemy we think we confront is in fact not the one we see. That the grounds which we consider solid and stable and therefore can stand on is so strongly alter and change. The result of the use of this technique is the absence of any kind of reformation and any kind of change or revolution is mere absurd .

In this sense, *Harvest* cleverly suggests that our existence is just based on the shriveled, meaningless sense of reality that forces us to follow the indulgence of our needs and wishes to unimaginable goals. It also proves that what we have in our miserable reality is mere sham; that our tiny control over things we think we have, and that most of the situations we ourselves have deep faith to be functioning within might be an illusion. It is a big lie elaborated and planned by the controlling power to serve their needs and desires whose aims and existence we have never thought about or fathomed.

It might be true that Jeetu has been taken by the servants of the Interplanta instead of Om by mistake is completely wrong. Ginni knows everything about the family especially about Jeetu and Jaya since they show very strong personalities and never been submitted to what has been presented to them. Jeetu doesn't care about life and considers it a "big joke":

Jaya : "always making such a joke of everything,"

Jeetu : "That's all life is, one long joke. The only trick is in learning when to laugh" (*H.* 226),

This kind of laughter represents a psychological rebellion and a strong assertion of what Freud calls "ego's invulnerability" , that gives superiority and then authority of the self over the inferior part of the ego. This laughter represents the absurdity of the world controlled by the grotesque use of power. (**Lessard- Jeanne Mathieu , 2020 , 22**) Yet, it doesn't mean that Jeetu is not afraid of this awful experience or he intends to minimize it, rather it makes him face it strongly and directly.

Ginni wants to end and kill this kind of rebellion of Jeetu and turns him to a grotesque personality that obeys the orders only just like the "InterPlanta Services guards". Thus, the guards start to harvest Jeetu's eyes and replace them with a couple of false eyes designed to make Ginni see everything from them and show images into Jeetu's head that affect his mental ability and make him completely submissive. Jeetu's tragedy is not the deprivation of his sight, but the loss of control of the mind, the ability to think or judge and the distance of reason. Through the images that Ginni projects into Jeetu's head, he becomes no longer able to hold subjective and objective responses to his situation in a balance that both distinguishes it and recalls an emotional and rational remove. Jeetu is no longer a rebellion who regards life "a big joke", but a grotesque personality whose aim is to serve Ginni /Virgil:

Jeetu: "just tell me what you want of me Ginni" (H. 241)

Through the images and videos shown in his mind by the contact module , Jeetu became completely submissive who wants to fill the passion of seeing Ginni who shows herself naked through video images. Jeetu was about to worship her . He started to shout when Jaya told him that Ginni is not real because he regards Ginni a goddess. She becomes part of his traditions and doctrine. Seeing Ginni becomes Jeetu's passion. He is turned to a loyal servant who wants to serve his master .

Jeetu: "She exists. That's enough for the she's a goddess and she exists. I would do anything for her anything.(H. 241)

Then he was taken away by the Guards and no one knows what will happen to him. He might be slaughtered and his parts will be sold in the west to replace someone else's body .

Jeetu's rebellion has been ended when he is forced by the representative of the grotesque use of power to loss his sight and then to loss his intellect and the ability to recognize and perceive.

Now, it is Jaya's role to be turned to a complete submissive grotesque character especially when she knows the truth of Virgil/ Ginni. She represents the only character who has the seeds of rebellion and whose revolt is a dramatic extension of her beloved, Jeetu's. Shital Pravinchalra states that except Jaya, Om's wife who stands for the fight " between technological adventures and human relationship in life". Jaya, as Shital sees her,

" appears as the last hope of emotional value in the fire when a legal moral and bio-ethical debates about organ sales and transplants have been overcome, when the trade in human organ is fully institutionalized and smoothly operated by the rapacious forces of global capitalism (**Shital Pravinchalra, 8**) "

Jaya knows the real identity of Virgil and his ultimate objectives of using Jeetu's complete body and invading and colonizing Jaya's womb with his offspring. This, in fact is completely odd and grotesque. Jaya, however, in a complete hopeless, tells Virgil that she doesn't own her life and she is unable to change her fate and the situations which she faces. She appears to be a victim of the "neocolonial/imperialist" and patriarchal powers that have formed those situations, for those powers have exposed themselves to be so immense that they appear impossible, in the end, to fathom their aims and consequences . Jaya, who has nothing to loss, tells Virgil that their relation has to be clear and that his material presence is a must. She insists that he should risk his skin and come to her in his real person otherwise she refuses to comply with him and if he commands the Interplanta guards to force her, she will commit suicide. This kind of insistence makes Jaya a heroin who successfully achieves what " Ayesha Ramachandran" describes as "the final insistence on the unity of body, mind and identity that shapes the play's most triumphantly utopian gesture" (**Ayesha Ramachandran , 2005, 172**). But this kind of victory

Jaya gets changes nothing to the family, to the country. It is an individual ,so limited achievement that reflects her actions which is the result of resolution .

Conclusion :

In her play, *Harvest* , Manjula presents a challenge to the people of the third world societies in general and to the Indian community in particular, that they must decide whether or not their dignity is worth to lose in comparable to certain commodities obtained from such exploitative, capricious cross-cultural relationships of capitalism; a hurricane which ribbons the vibrant culture of India on the expanse of materialism . The play suggests that most of the characters have lost their identities when they accept to be grotesque figures controlled by a man or woman from the West. For Manjula, it is not necessary to be odd in order to be grotesque, yet, grotesque characters have lost the link to their culture, traditions, and history. These are the elements that form the identity of a person which Ginni tends to harvest.

References

1. Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1995). *The Post-colonial studies reader*. London , Routledge , 1995)
2. Balkun, Mary McAleer. “*The American Grotesque.*” *Literature Compass*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2009, pp. 824-841.
3. Bhabha, Homi K. . *Nation and Narration*. (London , Routledge , 1990).
4. Bloom, Harold. *Dark Humor*. (London , Infobas publishing, 2010)
5. Comaroff, Jean . Comaroff, John L. *Millennial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism*. (U.S.A , Duke University Press , 2001)
6. Descombes, Vincent. *Puzzling Identities*. translated by Stephen Adams Schwartz (London , Harvard University Press, 2016)
7. Edwards D. Justin , Grauland Rune . *Grotesque : The New Critical Idioms* . London , Routledge , 2013 .
8. Foucault, Michel . *Abnormal: Lectures at the College de France 1974-1975* Translated by Graham Burchell . (London , Verso , 2003).
9. Gilbert, Helen. *Post Colonial Plays and Anthology* ,(London, Routledge, 2001)
10. Halpin, J. (2014). *Representing science that isn't: Harvest as science fiction theatre*. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 39(3), 213-223.
11. Harpham, Geoffrey. “The Grotesque: First Principles.” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 34, no. 4, Summer 1976, pp. 461-468.
12. Hasley, Louis. “*Black Humor and Gray.*” *Black Humor: Critical Essays*. Ed. Alan Pratt. New York: Garland, 1993. 107-122.
https://college.cengage.com/english/1439083010_worthen/student/gale/07_unit_1723_harvest.html
13. Hoagland, Ericka . Sarwal, Reema, edits. *Science Fiction Imperialism: Essays on Postcolonial literature and film*. (London , McFarland and Company Inc. publishers, 2010).
14. Jeevitha L. , Subramanian G. *Familial Bonding in Manjula Padmanabhan's Harvest* . International Journal of Advanced Research (IJAR) Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/6362 DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/6362> 2018 . pp. (1383-1386).
15. J. Meyer, Michael . *The Literature of the Grotesque* . Amsterdam , Rodopi , 1995 .
16. Lessard- Jeanne Mathieu. *Framing Literary Humour: Cells , Parts and Bodies as 20th- Century Sites of Imprisonment* . New York , Bloomsbury, 2020 .
17. Meindl , Dieter . *American Fiction and The Metaphysics of the Grotesque*. (Columbia , University of Missouri press, 1996).

18. McGrath , Patrick . *The Grotesque : A novel* . Vintage, New York, 1989
19. Padmanabhan, Manjula. "Harvest." In *Postcolonial Plays: An Anthology*, ed. Helen Gilbert.(London: Routledge, 2001). 217-249. Abbreviated as (H)
20. Prado, C . G. *Descartes and Foucault : A contrastive Introduction to Philosophy* Canada ,Ottawa press, 1992 .
21. Pravinchandra, Shital. *The Third-World Body Commodified: Manjula Padmanabhan's Harvest*. eSharp. Issue.8. p.1-17.
22. Priban, Jiri , *Liquid Society and Its Law* .(London , Routledge . 2016)
23. Ramachandran, Ayesha. "New World, No World: Seeking Utopia in Padmanabhan's Harvest." *Theatre Research International* 20.2 (2005): 161-174.
24. Scheper, Hughes. N. *The New Cannibalism : A Report on the*
25. *International Traffic in Human Organs*, New Internationalist 300, 1998
26. Solomon, Yamma Obidah. "Globalization in the Eyes of India's Manjula Padmanabhan through her play Harvest. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. www.ighssi.org vol.3 issue 5 May 2014
27. Thompson, Philip. *The Grotesque*. Methuen and Co., 1972.
28. Wikinson , Stephen . *Bodies for Sale: Ethics and Exploitation in the Human Body Trade*. (New York , Routledge , 2003) .
29. Young , Robert J. C. *Postcolonialism: A very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003)