

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

**The Anti-War Rhetorics of Dharamvir Bharati's *Andha Yug* (1953): Allegorizing the Mahabharata Epic for a Post-Partition India.**

Meeraz Hoque,  
PhD Scholar,  
Department of English Literature ,  
Cooch Behar Panchanan Barma University,  
West Bengal, India.  
[meerazhoque@gmail.com](mailto:meerazhoque@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

*The vicissitudes of human emotions at display in the Indian Epic Mahabharata, are craftily adapted by Bharati in his 1953 tragedy Andha Yug to articulate an advocacy for peacemaking and rising above one's own pretty needs. The play is divided into five acts, each of which display one particular character at its most sinister and damnable self, thereby creating an account of the negative impacts of aggressive selfhood. In many ways, Bharati's Andha Yug is also an allegorical account of the brutal sectarian bloodshed in 1947 Partition of the Indian Subcontinent. Bharati's play tries to understand the fault lines inherent within the Partition by utilizing the epic modalities offered by Mahabharata ; finding resonance in the tussle between the Kauravas and the Pandavas and appropriating that tussle to understand the religious enmity and distrust that hampered civic life in India immediately after the Independence. This paper wishes to explore the continued relevance of Andha Yug while rethinking the way the epic scale and expanse of Mahabharata accorded Bharati to illustrate and allegorize his anti-war rhetorics.*

**Keywords:** Epic , Partition, Allegory, Sectarianism, Selfhood.

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

**Introduction:**

It is generally assumed that the foundations of a pre-Modern and yet progressive society lie on the values of moderation and peaceful cooperation between two opposing parties; paving the way for amicable transfer of power and the rolling out of gradual harmony that eventually replaces any malcontent and animosity between the opponents. The word pre-modern is important here as it signifies not only what is lacking in the world depicted in *Mahabharata*, but also highlights the way it differs from our 21<sup>st</sup> century conceptions regarding polity and democracy. There was no democracy and fraternal camaraderie in the world of *Mahabharata*, it was a hereditary monarchy and extremely exclusionary to the ones who deviated from what was expected from them by the powers that be, namely the *Kauravas*, who were unwilling to budge from their claim to power, thanks to the hereditary and patrilineal structure of power transference. Such is the expanse and relevance of *Mahabharata* that it has produced numerous adaptations; both lithic and oral, Dharamvir Bharati's play *Andha Yug* (1953) being one of the most prominent one, at once combining the epic modalities of *Mahabharata* and spelling out a lesson of temperance and toleration for post-Partition, sectarian violence stricken India.

The central question of the play is not about the transfer of power; rather it is about the vicissitudes of the destruction caused by the Battle of Kurukshetra, leaving a wake of death and devastation in its wake. The play opens with a prologue comprising of a choric dance form that contemplates the banality of war and the centrality of the role played out by Krishna. What follows is a five act rumination about the helplessness and confusion of the war-survivors, an emotion so universal and unfortunate that the readers of the play are bound to shudder at the complete dissolution of the polity and the kinship structure of the kingdom of Hastinapur.

The play works on multiple levels as the acts are succinctly conceptualized and are given a one line nomenclature. In Alok Bhalla's 2010 translation of the play, the first act is named "The Kaurava Kingdom", the second "The Making of a Beast", the third "The Half Truth of

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

Ashwathamma”, the fourth “Gandhari’s Curse”, and the fifth “Victory and a series of Suicides”. The nomenclatures are important as they not only highlight Bharati’s critique of armed conflict and bloodshed but also provide a brilliant chronological register of the gradual disintegration of a close knit society, situating a metaphor for the recently partitioned nation of India, one that had gone through terrible bloodshed and sectarian violence that had cleaved away at the centuries old goodwill and shared cultural attributes that had existed between the Hindus and Muslims of India. *Andha Yug* at once becomes a cautionary tale and a chronicle of the perils of personal ambition and aggressive selfhood, one that does not leave any room for mutual understanding and negotiation, engulfing everything within the dangerous binaries of enemy and accomplice, a structural differentiation that works potently if we try to understand the bloodshed and violence surrounding the Partition years.

This Play is usually considered the best dramatic output of Dharamvir Bharati and for good reasons too. Centering on the last day of the bloody battle between Kauravas and the Pandavas, Bharati’s *Andha Yug* is an astute account of the trajectories of human emotions when confronted with terrible bloodshed and pillage. Questions regarding brotherhood, fraternity and the justification of an all devouring military conflict, that too just for hereditary monarchy, are foregrounded in the play.

At the outset of the play, we see confusion surrounding the military conflict that has just unfolded, wrecking havoc and death. The vast expanses of the battlefield are littered with dead bodies that defy human logic. The spectatorial voice is represented by the discussion between the two guards who rightfully ponder about the necessity of their jobs, since there is nothing left to guard.

The excesses of the self and how it can destroy a perfectly good society are some of the issues discussed in this play, at once focusing on the personal ambitions of the warriors and then making a critical commentary upon the universally futile nature of any sort of military conflict that resulted in human misery, of the great war of Mahabharata is a relevant example of.

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

The title of the play literally means “The Blind Age”, thereby alluding to the Kali Yuga, an era of rampant injustices and despotism, as predicted in the Hindu puranas. Bharati seems to suggest that the futility of the war efforts taken out by both the parties is at once symbolic of the needless violence and destruction that characterize 20<sup>th</sup> century living, which falls under the chronological category of the Kali Yuga.

The play was released in 1953, just a few years after the bifurcation of the Indian Subcontinent and the Independence in 1947. The division of an once unified landmass made up of diverse populations and its resultant bloodshed is one prescient allegory in the play. By criticizing the epic battle of Mahabharata, Bharati suggests that the Partition of India is no lesser tragedy and will have deep malevolent consequences for our nascent postcolonial nation. The playwright advocates for temperance and peacemaking. The character of Krishna and his failure to stop the war in Mahabharata is seen as a metaphor for the failure of the civic and political institutions of the country to ensure the safe transfer of population across the Radcliffe Line.

Bharati’s play is a potent register of the Mahabharata and is a plea for anti-war sensibility. He wishes for calmer heads to prevail. The official translator of the play, Alok Bhalla talks about the misrepresentation of God and praises Bharati for trying to restore that divinity which was missing in the battlefield. Bhalla gives us the concept of God, as propounded by Martin Buber and shows how it unconsciously finds resemblance in Bharati’s literary register.

#### **Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework:**

Research Methodology will include a close reading of the play *Andha Yug*, aimed at getting a qualitative reading of Bharati’s vision. This will be instrumental in finding the many textual references. Theoretical framework will include Immanuel Kant’s *Perpetual Peace* (1795), which argues that peace could be secured through universal democracy and bipartisan cooperation. The pacifist teachings of Bertrand Russell would also have importance, especially because of the temporal proximity between his pacifist ideology (during the Second World War years) and the year of publication of Bharati’s play.

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

**Gandhari's Lament in Act I: A Plea for Temperance and Tolerance:**

In Bharati's play Gandhari's often assumes the role of a conscientious objector, one who has not relinquished her humanity in favour unbridled lust for power, a trait that elevates her from the other characters. She has a sensitive moral core that is greatly perturbed by the banality of war; which is why she breaks into the following lament in front of Vidura-

*"There is a dark abyss  
in each of us  
Where a ferocious beast  
-a blind beast  
Who is the master  
Of all we know and do-  
Resides and r, selflessness,  
And surrender to Krishna  
Are mere disguises  
-masks that cover our blindness  
They are like sightless eyes cut out of rags  
And stitched on the faces of puppets;  
That is why  
Sick of all this hypocrisy  
I chose to live  
With my eyes blindfolded. (Andha Yug, trans. Alok Bhalla, 2010)*

This passage in the first act of the play is emblematic of the seven days' of war and bloodshed that has just unfolded. Through the voice of Gandhari, Bharati suggests the imminent arrival of the Hindu age of *Kali Yug* (The Blind Age). It becomes apparent to the reader that Gandhari had been cognizant of the arrival of an age mired by brutality, darkness, power-lust and bloodshed, which is why she had been wearing a blindfold from the

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

narratorial epoch of *Mahabharata*, choosing not to see the injustices that beset her world. Her choice is not motivated by a desire to remain willfully ignorant, rather it is a defensive mechanism that enables her to preserve her sanity and maintain her neutrality, even though her sons are being slaughtered at the battlefield. In the original Hindu epic, Gandhari wears a blindfold out of solidarity with her blind husband, but in Bharati's play the blindfold serves a dual purpose, it gives Gandhari the refuge she needs to save herself from the brutalities that impinge upon her sensibilities. Another reason for wearing the blindfold is to signal a form of disapproval and protest against all the killings, especially her irreverence toward the supposed authority of Krishna, who was being feted as their guide by the warriors and this comes out superbly in her lament to Vidura. By making Gandhari assume an anti-war stance in the very first act of the play, Bharati makes his pacifist ideology clear and it serves as a brilliant exposition to the rest of the play.

#### **Ashwatthama's Personal Loss as a Metaphor for the Futility of War:**

In the second act of the play we are introduced to the character of Ashwatthama, who has lost his father in the senseless violence emanating from the war. His father Dronacharya has been killed in the crossfires and Ashwatthama is bereaved and grief stricken. So much so that he swears vengeance upon Yudhishtira and the whole Pandavas-

*"I am trapped in present time*

*and condemned to seek vengeance!*

*Yudhishtira's half-truth has murdered my future. And yet I shall live*

*. If my damnation has been already foretold then nothing matters. If the future is indifferent it is my enemy."*

It is this banal and senseless nature of violence that the playwright is cautioning us against, one that makes us oblivious to familial ties and fraternal bonds. The third act becomes even more poignant when Ashwatthama launches a vicious tirade against the old Mendicant who

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

had prophesied a Kaurava win. Ashwatthama admonishes the old Mendicant in the following manner –

*You are a false prophet!*

*You are an old fraud!*

*Today you shall not escape these hungry claws.*

*Stop, stop you old fraud!*

This tirade is further proof of Ashwatthama's gradual disenchantment regarding the whole military conflict situation. A learned military scholar, adept in the arts of warfare fails to see the reason, he swears revenge upon the Pandavas, a far superior enemy and also at a time when the wheels of fortune have turned not just against Ashwatthama but the Kauravas as a whole. Bharati suggests that war beats the humanity out of people, compelling them to do the unthinkable and making them susceptible to their frenzy and other base emotions, as in the case with Ashwatthama.

Later in the same act we find Ashwatthama falling out with Kripacharya and Kritavarma, after it has been discovered that Ashwatthama has killed the Old Mendicant in a raging fury –

*I did not kill him!*

*I was blind with rage.*

*I wanted to annihilate the future*

*which has been prophesied.*

*Believe me*

*I do not know how*

*the old man was killed. (Andha Yug, trans, Alok Bhalla, 2010)*

Even though Kripacharya and Kritavarma are aware of the severity of Ashwatthama's misdeed, they do not rebuke him, almost justifying his killing of the Mendicant by saying that the brutal environment and crisis of the war got the better of Ashwatthama. This is exactly what Bharati is critical of, the belief that everything is allowed and permissible in war, no matter how greater the human cost. At the beginning of this act, Ashwatthama is a bereaved

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

son, mourning his father's death, by the end of the act, he is an animalistic marauder, who has abandoned all senses of right and wrong and has given in to his profane instincts. This unsavory transformation of the Self under the negative impacts of war is Bharati's sole concern, it gives him the opportunity to highlight the anti-war rhetorics of his play; one that has an universal appeal steeped in the values of tolerance, temperance, and respect for both your comrade and your adversary.

**Aggressive Selfhood and the Contingent Nature of Truth in Act III, *Andha Yug*:**

The third act of the play dives headlong into the mayhem that the Kurukshetra war has wrought. Yuyutsu has returned to the palace, a defeated and vanquished son of Gandhari who has failed to follow the traditional path of honour and fortitude; as a result of which, his eldest brother Duryodhana now lies dead, the last hope of the Kauravas, who could have salvaged some of their pride. Ashwatthama is embittered after finding out that Duryodhana's death is against the set norms and laws of the land, a transgression that he terms as *adharma*. This opinion is also seconded by Balarama, Krishna's elder brother who considers Krishna's assistance of the Pandavas a heinous act of betrayal, one that can be categorised as *adharma*. The helplessness that Ashwatthama feels is suggestive of the existential transformation that the human self undergoes while engaged in the cutthroat business of military conquest, and especially when it is against their own extended family, as us the case with the Kauravas and the Pandavas.

We get a glimpse of the contingent nature of truth when Ashwatthama launches into a vicious invective against the Pandavas, whom he accuses of being on the wrong side of history and morality –

*They will also be destroyed*

*by adharma.*

*I have decided.*

*I have decided to kill them.*

*I, Ashwatthama*



---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

*Will kill them*

*because they are vile.*

This aggressive demonstration of his aggrieved Selfhood shows just how contingent and open to subjective interpretation truth is, as it is apparent that the Pandavas will deny all charges of *adharma*, and will defend themselves as taking the right course of action. Kritavarma highlights this point when he admonishes Ashwatthama for taking the moral high ground in the following manner –

*“But Ashwatthama*

*the Pandavas are not old men.*

*They are not unarmed.*

*They are not alone.*

*This unrighteous war is over.*

*But since you are burning with courage*

*go spread your adharma somewhere else.”*

Kritavarma is right point out that this is an unrighteous war, one that should have been avoided, had calmer heads prevailed.

Bharati is warning us against the unholy nexus between pride and devastation, one that the warring parties are victims of. This unsavory transformation of the self is a direct influence of war and militancy.

Later in the same act, Ashwatthama vows revenge by any means possible, even if it involves him attacking the defenseless Pandavas in their sleep. He goes on his monologue in the following manner –

*I have found the truth!*

*Ashwatthama*

*the beast has found the truth!*

*To the Pandava camp.*

*They must be unarmed and asleep.*

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

*The victorious Pandavas!*

Ashwatthama is willing to go to any lengths to fulfill his aim. A perverse impact of the war, as it has robbed him of all reasoning power and moral rectitude. This is where Bharati's anti-war rhetorics shine forth, as he closely examines the negative transformation of the self, and shows them as directly related to bloodshed and armed conflict.

**The Permanent Consequences of War: A Legacy of Evil:**

By the commencement of the fourth act, it has become apparent to the spectators that Ashwatthama has applied the *Bramhastra* to kill Uttara's unborn child. This act of infanticide has enraged the people around him like no other. Ashwatthama has gone blind in rage to such extent that he has lost his moral compass. To settle his score with Abhimanyu, he has killed his unborn child, an act so ghastly that he fails to find supporters even within the ranks of Kauravas.

The arrival of the originating poet Vyasa gives Bharati the space to posit a dialectic confrontation between Vyasa and Ashwatthama. Vyasa accuses Ashwatthama of insensitivity and cruelty in the following manner –

*"I am Vyasa.*

*Oh you vile man*

*do you even know the consequences*

*of using the brahmastra?*

*For centuries to come*

*nothing will grow on earth.*

*Newborn children shall be deformed.*

*Men shall become grotesque.*

*All the wisdom men gathered*

*in the Satya, Treta, and Dvapara Yugs*

*shall be lost forever.*

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

*Serpents shall hiss*

*From every ear of corn*

*and rivers shall flow with molten fire.”*

Such is the severity of Ashwatthama’s crime that Vyasa cannot stop himself from dehumanizing Ashwatthama in the following manner-

*You are a beast! You are a beast! You are a beast!*

Ashwatthama retorts to this accusation and alleges that Yudhishtira had turned him into beast. This scene is important in showing the rapid transition that a man undergoes, how the adversarial feelings towards his own family members emerge, a strain that can also be observed in the sectarian bloodshed in the Partition years, one that had evaporated centuries of goodwill and harmony among the Hindus and Muslims of India.

Later in the same act, in conversation with Gandhari, Vidura philosophizes on the terrible fate that awaits Ashwatthama due to his heinous crimes. The speech is poignant and brings out Vidura’s disgust at having witnessed Ashwatthama’s villainy –

*“Cut and slashed by the Lord’s disc his body shall fester forever.*

*Soiled bandages shall staunch the blood that shall flow from his wounds forever and ever.*

*Lacerated, defiled, filthy, and corrupted he shall wander through thick and deep forests forever and ever.*

*His body shall be covered with boils his skin shall fester with pus and scabs and spittle and phlegm and bile and he shall live forever and ever.*

*Excruciating pain will rip through each limb.*

*Every bone in his body will be corroded by suffering but the Lord shall not let him die.*

*He will become an abomination but he shall live forever and ever.”*

It serves as a fore tale of what awaits anyone who deviates from the set norms. This also serves the purpose of Bharati’s anti-war rhetorics. The tragic figure of Ashwatthama is an anomaly in the sense that he begins with great ambition and ends up reducing himself to the ghastly attributes of his opponents, i.e., the Pandavas. His diminished entity is a brutal

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

reminder of what can happen to humans if they let go themselves in the bloodthirsty lust for power.

**Annihilation of the Self and the Society: Act V of *Andha Yug*:**

The fifth act begins with a choric song chronicling how the city of Hastinapur has now been annexed by the Pandavas. It talks about Yudhishtira's rise to power, his occupation of the royal throne, at the same time the chorus also meditates upon the gloomy and forlorn condition of the city of Hastinapur, how it once was ruled by the Kauravas. The chorus goes on to describe how Nature has regained her lustre again, even though much of her vitality has been drained in the bloodshed; which is why the act is aptly named "Victory and a series of suicides".

We are informed about Yuyutsu's suicide, the sudden nature of his demise cleaves away at the foundation of the Kaurava clan. In a larger context his death is seen as a fatality emanating from the senseless defeat suffered at the hands of the Pandavas. Through this scene, Bharati seems to suggest that the trauma of a post-war society weighs enough on its individuals to drive them to commit previously unthinkable deeds. Vidura philosophizes in the following manner –

*"It is sometimes possible  
for one who slaughters his own people  
or murders his mother or his beloved  
or kills women and children to find his way to salvation.  
But the one who kills himself  
wanders like a haunted spirit  
in realms of darkness  
forever and ever"*.

The speech is meant to jolt the readers out of their slumbers. It helps them situate the play in their own contextual settings, providing a guide for those who were perplexed at the violence

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

of the war, the playwright seems to suggest that war often leaves a very personal impact on the persons involved, thereby expanding his anti-war rhetorics.

Kripacharya extends the philosophical discussion that Vidura had started by saying that Vidura had started, commenting upon the changing political economy of the city of Hastinapur through the prism of Yuyutsu's suicide –

*“And that shall be*

*the fate of Yuyutsu.*

*Today in this magnificent palace of Yudhishtira*

*I can hear the ominous footsteps of a future age.*

*I only agreed to stay here all these years*

*to teach Parikshit the art of war.*

*But Yudhishtira's kingdom is decadent and cowardly.*

*It is bent upon its own destruction”.*

Kripacharya is unwilling to compromise with his own moral rectitude, choosing exile over further complicity in Yudhishtira's *adharma*. He goes on –

*“I must leave*

*Hastinapur at once.*

*That would be the wisest thing to do.*

*Self-destruction*

*is a fatal disease*

*which spreads*

*like an epidemic”.*

Kripacharya's rant and argument with is meant to signify how war is essentially detrimental to human freedom and the concept of liberty, compelling aggrieved individuals to make uncomfortable decisions often at the expense of their shared personal history. This is meant to signify Bharati's anti-war rhetorics and forces the reader to assess the malevolent consequences of war on public life.

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

**Neutrality as Complicity: The Sin of Dhritarashtra:**

In the original Mahabharata, Dhritarashtra is the grand old man of power and prestige, welding his authority over his numerous sons and creating an atmosphere of aura and perceived magnificence. In Bharati's play however, he is a much diminished entity, failing to impact in any way whatsoever in the war, Dhritarashtra contemplates seclusion and penance, deeming it fit that he should leave Hastinapur for the sake of his own sanity –

*Leave me here.*

*I am old and blind.*

*All my life*

*I have wandered in darkness.*

*Now I feel*

*as if the flames*

*have surrounded me*

*in a circle of light*

*and I am free.*

*All my life*

*I refused to see the truth*

*. Let me feel the truth today*

*and wear it*

*on these aged bones like*

*a garland of glowing embers.*

It is conveyed to the reader that neutrality is complicity and in a war of the magnitude of that of the Mahabharata, fence-sitting, as practiced by Dhritarashtra does not work. Dhritarashtra with all his political influence and might, could have prevented the war by mediating between the Kauravas and the Pandavas.

Bharati's purpose in emphasizing upon the fate suffered by Dhritarashtra is to show that it is not possible for individuals to remain unaffected by war, no matter how politically non-

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

aligned they are. Neutrality is detrimental to individual liberty, as is exemplified by the hapless condition of Dhritarashtra.

Yudhishtira also becomes despondent after witnessing the incinerated bodies of Dhritarashtra, Gandhari and Kunti. Their terrible fate pushes him over a melancholic edge and he rues his misfortune –

*“Dhritarashtra, Gandhari  
and Kunti were burnt to ash  
in that terrible fire.*

*Yuyutsu’s wounds reopened  
when he performed the last rites for them.*

*He has finally succeeded  
in committing suicide.*

*I could not save his life.*

*Have I alone  
been condemned*

*to witness Lord Krishna’s death?*

*No, no!*

*Let me go!*

*Let my body slowly decay  
on some Himalayan slope”.*

When Vidura advises Yudhishtira against roaming all alone in the Himalayan peak, saying that it would be the same as the sinful act of committing suicide, Yudhishtira gives an eloquent speech –

*And what is victory then? Is that not also*

*A long and slow act of suicide?*

---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

In the epilogue of the play, Ashwatthama mourns the dreadful change in Krishna's character, which he considers to be the highest act of *adharma* –

*“He slaughtered all his kinsmen who were drunk.*

*I recently saw with my own eyes countless dark and bloodstained bodies of Yadava soldiers scattered on the glittering sands of the ocean shore.*

*They had been killed by Krishna himself.*

*He acted as I did that night.*

*The only difference was that I killed my enemies while he slaughtered his own kinsmen”.*

This the vicissitudes of war are greatly magnified in the incineration of Dhritarashtra and in the agonizing self-scrutiny of Ashwatthama. This is meant to highlight the severity of war, how it erodes a perfectly good society and becomes suffocating for the survivors, who have no other way than to surrender to their misfortune and hopeless existence, meted out to them by a cataclysmic event far beyond their control.

### **Allegory and the Relevance of Partition in the *Andha Yug***

Dharamvir Bharati vividly portrays the horrors of the Partition through the perspective of the Kurukshetra War in his play *Andha Yug*. This paper aims to unravel the allegorical elements presented by Bharati, not only by examining the Mahabharata but also by referencing various texts written on the Partition. Furthermore, the paper will analyze the implementation of theater as a medium and explore its purpose in conveying the message. In addition, it will delve into the allegory by exploring themes such as blindness, moral and physical decay, the role of the narrator, the concept of war, and the existential crisis during both time periods.

The play addresses the blurred boundaries between opposing forces, such as good and evil, dharma and adharma, faith and doubt, free will and predestination, as well as light and darkness. Furthermore, it will delve into the question of identity and the notion of “honour.” Through this comprehensive examination, the paper will determine whether *Andha Yug* can be interpreted as a dystopian allegory.



---

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

In the groundbreaking Hindi play *Andha Yug* (1953) by Dharamvir Bharati, the narrative of the Kurukshetra war resonates with the horrors of Partition, encapsulated in the poignant cry, “What is this peace you have given us, god.” *Andha Yug* attained iconic status, with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru himself witnessing a production directed by Ibrahim Alkazi, set against the backdrop of the ruins of Delhi’s Feroz Shah Kotla in 1963. By blending Western dramatic traditions with an Indian epic, *Andha Yug* serves as an early exemplification of the Theatre of Roots movement. This movement gained momentum in the 1960s and 70s, championed by notable figures such as Ratan Thiyam, Girish Karnad, K.N. Panikar, Habib Tanvir, and others.

Composed in the aftermath of the Partition, *Andha Yug* employed the Mahabharata as a metaphorical representation to contemplate the politics of violence that the newly-independent India had to endure. Similar to the war of Kurukshetra, the attainment of freedom exacted a heavy toll in terms of devastation, anguish, and irreversible wounds—and the play effectively utilizes significant episodes from the Mahabharata to emphasize these aspects. The spectators enthusiastically respond as Gandhari directs her curses towards Krishna, Ashwatthama confronts treachery, and Yuyutsu, one of the Kauravas, grapples with the dilemma of choosing between his brothers and the path of righteousness.

**Conclusion:**

Finally, in the end, we obtained Dharma through the politics of treachery in the Mahabharata and the politics of violence in *Andha Yug*. However, the cost was high as millions of people died. But in the third part, we witnessed the politics of truth. There were still sacrifices to be made, but ultimately we achieved independence through the truthful actions of Gandhi, which continue to improve people’s lives even today. The most important lesson I have learned is that the path of truth (Dharma) always leads to a good life. This statement is justified in Bharati’s play, as in the Mahabharata, people resorted to treachery to uncover the truth, while in *Andha Yug*, truth was achieved through violence and revenge. In both examples, people paid a heavy price—millions of lives were lost, and many were morally affected. However,

**(Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal)**

---

by following the truthful ways of leaders like Gandhi, Mandela, and Martin Luther King Jr., people ultimately attain a good life.

**Bibliography:**

1. About the Playwright and Translator” Manoa, vol. 22, no. 1, 2010, pp. 142–143. [www.jstor.org/stable/20720745](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20720745) .
2. Bharati, Dharamvir. Andha Yug. Trns Alok Bhalla. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1953. Bhalla, Alok.
3. “Defending the Sacred in Age of Atrocities: On Translating Dharamvir Bharati’s ‘Andha Yug.’” Indian Literature, vol. 49, no. 1 (225), 2005, pp. 88–104. [www.jstor.org/stable/23346579](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23346579) . Joshi, Prabodh “Aftermath of Mahabharat: Dharamveer Bharati’s Andha-Yug and Kashinath Singh’s Upanhar”. International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities, Volume IV, Issue III, March 2016. [www.ijellh.com](http://www.ijellh.com) 12