

# The Impact of Violence on Culture in Edward Bond's *Early Morning*

## Edward Bond'un *Early Morning* Adlı Eserinde Şiddetin Kültür Üzerindeki Etkisi

Mehtap DEMİRTÜRK   
(Corresponding Author- Sorumlu Yazar)

Department of Foreign Languages, School of Foreign Languages, Sinop University, Sinop, Türkiye  
Sinop Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Yabancı Diller Bölümü, Sinop, Türkiye  
mehtapd@sinop.edu.tr



### Abstract

Edward Bond's play, *Early Morning*, serves as a powerful exploration of violence in society by transcending temporal and cultural boundaries. Rooted in the Victorian era, Bond employs historical characters and anachronistic elements to create a narrative that critiques corruption and brutality through a reflection on contemporary societal challenges. The mixture of realism and stylistic experimentation in the play reveals a timeless commentary on morality, corruption, and societal decay. Bond's masterful blending of historical context with timeless themes invites readers and audiences to draw parallels between the Victorian world presented and the complexities of modern societies. It underscores the role of literature in exposing the darker facets of humanity and serves as a cautionary tale about the enduring nature of human flaws. The universality of violence depicted in the play prompts critical reflections on the human condition. *Early Morning* investigates the origins of human savagery and gives a striking representation of the aftermath of inappropriate power elements. This article investigates the connection between violence and power as depicted in Bond's play by working inside the system of Michel Foucault's arguments on power and its appearances.

**Keywords:** Violence, Foucault, Edward Bond, *Early Morning*, Societal Decay, Anachronism

### Öz

Edward Bond bu oyununda, kültürel ve zamansal sınırları aşarak toplumdaki şiddeti güçlü bir şekilde keşfetmektedir. Oyununu Viktorya döneminde kurgulayan Bond, tarihi karakterleri ve kronolojik hata unsurlarını kullanarak, çağdaş toplumsal zorlukları yansıtarak yozlaşma ve vahşet eleştirisini içeren bir anlatı oluşturur. Oyunun gerçeklik ve biçimsel deneyiminin birleşimi, ahlak, yozlaşma ve toplumsal çürüme üzerine zamansız bir yorumu ortaya koyar. Bond'un tarihsel bağlamı, zamansız temalarla ustalıkla harmanlaması, okuyucuları ve seyircileri sunulan Viktorya dünyası ile modern toplumların karmaşıklıkları arasında paralellikler çizmeye davet eder. Bu sayede, edebiyatın insanlığın daha karanlık yönlerini ortaya çıkarmada oynadığı rolü vurgular ve insan hatalarının kalıcı doğası hakkında bir ibret hikayesi olarak işlev görür. Oyundaki şiddetin evrenselliği, insanın durumu üzerine eleştirel düşüncüyü tetikler. Bu çalışma, insan vahşetinin kökenlerini araştırırken, uygunsuz güç unsurlarının sonuçlarının çarpıcı bir temsilini vermektedir. Bu çalışma, Bond'un oyununda tasvir edilen şiddet ve iktidar arasındaki bağlantıyı, Michel Foucault'nun iktidar ve iktidarın ortaya çıkış biçimlerini inceleyen argümanları çerçevesinde şiddetin toplum üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Şiddet, Foucault, Edward Bond, Toplumsal Çürüme, Kronolojik Hata

Received/Geliş Tarihi 26.03.2024  
Revision Request / Revizyon Talebi 10.05.2024  
Final Revision/Son Revizyon 06.07.2024  
Accepted/Kabul Tarihi 03.08.2024  
Publication Date/Yayın Tarihi 15.12.2024

### Cite this article:

Demirtürk, M. (2024). The Impact of Violence on Culture in Edward Bond's *Early Morning*. *Journal of Literature and Humanities*, 73, 36-48.

### Atıf:

Demirtürk, M. (2024). Edward Bond'un *Early Morning* Adlı Eserinde Şiddetin Kültür Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Edebiyat ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 73, 36-48.



Content of this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License.

### Introduction

Since it is a fundamental and complex part of human existence, violence has long piqued interest and raised concerns in several academic fields, including literature and cultural studies. It has the power to permanently alter societies by influencing norms in literature and culture. Literature, which is a reflection and translation of human encounters, is habitually a powerful device for looking at and grasping the impacts of violence on people and society. Over the entire course of time, violence has habitually shown up in writing as a subject, permitting writers to focus on the vilest features of human instinct and the sociopolitical settings in which they are set. Playwrights such as Edward Bond utilise the artistic platform of theatre to confront audiences with the uncomfortable realities of violence, challenging prevailing narratives and forcing introspection. In this context, *Early Morning* stands as a prime example of how literature can enlighten the human condition and the outcome of violence through the philosopher Foucault's arguments.

It is essential to start with descriptive information on violence and its complicated consequences for society before exploring the details of Foucault's ideas on violence and power in Edward Bond's *Early Morning*. The utilisation of actual power, or compulsion to hurt, harm, or kill somebody is known as violence which is "motivated by hostility and the willful intent to cause harm" (Jackman, 2002, p. 388). It can take a wide range of forms, from plain demonstrations of viciousness to additional, quelled, and fundamental signs of force inconsistencies, for it has sources "in social, economic, political, and cultural disadvantage and discrimination" (Munck, 2008, p. 5). It is commonly inspired by instilled social, political, or mental issues and can be coordinated against explicit individuals, gatherings, or even the whole local area. Physically or psychologically, most people and societies have experienced violence, because it has a significant "role in every society created by man" (Singh, 1976, p. 58). Some social units try to explain the term, such as in the final report of the California Policy Violence Prevention in 1995, violence is described as "the threatened or actual use of physical force or another person, against oneself, or against a group or community results in, or has a high likelihood of resulting in, injury, death or deprivation" (p. 63). The World Health Organisation (WHO) also presented a report on it in Geneva in 2002 and said, "Violence is a universal scourge that tears at the fabric of communities and threatens the life, health and happiness of us all. Images and accounts of violence pervade the media; it is on our streets, in our homes, schools, workplaces and institutions" (p. 1). The organisation adds the following:

The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation (WHO, 2002, p. 4).

This definition is comprehensive, covering various aspects of violence, including its intentional nature, potential targets, and the diverse range of harmful outcomes it can produce. It recognises that violence goes beyond just physical harm, encompassing psychological, developmental, and societal dimensions through multiple explanations about the issue, including "interpersonal violence as well as suicidal behaviour and armed conflict" (WHO, 2002, p. 4) and both physical and psychological harms through "lies, brainwashing, indoctrination and threats" (Coady, 1986, p. 5).

As a significant order of "social injustices and inequalities", it also underscores the impact of leadership behaviour on shaping the prevalence of violence and highlights the far-reaching consequences of a culture filled with violence on the prospects for development (Coady, 1986, p. 4). In this context, Foucault puts forward,

Of all civilizations, the Christian West has undoubtedly been, at the same time, the most creative, the most conquering, the most arrogant, and doubtless the most bloody. At any rate, it has certainly been one of the civilizations that has deployed the greatest violence (2014, p. 174).

Various principal Foucauldian ideas, like the idea of power, the capability of regulation, and the components of dictator control, can be provided to examine this provocative analysis of the progressions in administration and the circulation of power inside Western social orders, as well as their verifiable and political connections. If we consider the period, these arguments can be explained through the Second World War and Nazism. Within this framework, Foucault alerts against an inversion to a circumstance in which the outer layer of lawfulness is eliminated to uncover an unfiltered, pure power. His bigger investigation of how power elements are changing in contemporary society and his assessment of how conditions of exemption could weaken legitimate protections and majority rule values are following this analysis. He indicates that the law cannot be used as mind oppression if fitting dictator goals are undermined or changed. It transforms into an instrument of violence through power and cruelty to control disagreement and authorise consistency. Foucault believes in "the idea that there is no antinomy between violence and reason, in things concerning the state at least" (2014, p. 345) by emphasising the complicated and commonly helpful association between legal organisation and the use of power. Through legitimate and authoritative orders, the state protects its power by struggling that it is fundamental to maintaining security and request. The state can excuse violence by outlining it as a characteristic outgrowth of its administration and integrating intimidation into the essential design of its lawful structures. It turns out to be clear that state violence is legitimate by contentions of

need and principle while the opposition between violence and reason is broken. As indicated by Foucault, the idea of government is a remarkable method for using the power that laid out legitimate systems and government constructs a complicated structure of strategies, plans, and information that are intended to direct and form the way of behaving of individuals and societies. This strategy, which controls organisations, standards, and conduct, is described by its nuance and inescapability.

The ideas of Foucault have been provided to look at the elements of violence in different settings and his arguments on biopolitics stress how techniques for controlling life are useful to keep up with control over society by making life the essential central point of security efforts. He criticises the state for its characteristics of “unlimited growth,” “omnipotence,” and “bureaucratic development” (Foucault, 2008, p. 186), thus he connects this institution with “fascism” and identifies its “inherent violence,” that underlies the hidden “beneath its social welfare paternalism” (Foucault, 2008, p. 187). Foucault points out that the state has a characteristic tendency for violence underneath the outer layer of social government assistance and care. This proposes that the state might use power to apply command over individuals, even in circumstances where the demonstrations seem, by all accounts, to be harmless. Considering the state and its intrinsic relationship to violence, Foucault offers a basic analysis. The state, which is generally connected to thoughts of paternalism and social government assistance, covers an eviller type of violence behind its unselfish strategies. By illuminating the chance of power and control taking rough structures, this thought goes against traditional originations of the state as a supplier and defender. Foucault argues that “the state possesses in itself and through its dynamism a sort of power of expansion” (2008, p. 187) to spread out its control and effect through violence. He recommends that there is an intrinsic tendency for the state to build its power and direct society. Since this power involves the inconvenience of the state’s position and the intrusion of individual opportunities, it tends to be viewed as a kind of violence. This extension goes past basic regions; it is about controlling individuals’ lives and affecting their lifestyles. This may be viewed as a sort of primary violence, in which the power of the state restricts individuals’ independence. To Foucault, there is an association between various “types of the state” such as “the administrative state, the welfare state, the bureaucratic state, the fascist state, and the totalitarian” (2008, p. 187) that concerned as parts of a tree, these states represent many maintenances of state power. This proposes that the innate violence of one kind of state could change over time and bring about new sorts of state violence. These theories have significant insightful consequences for understanding the association between violence and the state. His proposal welcomes a basic analysis of its strategies. It provokes writers and dramatists to examine how state authority can be brutally utilised, even in circumstances where paternalism and social government assistance are used as a cover. Besides, we are encouraged to rethink the limits of state power by Foucault’s discoveries. He questions traditional ideas of the state as a harmless and impartial power by underlining the state’s ability for violence as well as its ability for extension. It pushes people to question the domination of state power on freedom, individual rights, and social elements. By suggesting an insightful assessment of the connection between the state and violence, his arguments challenge the oppressions of state authority, explore the associations between different sorts of state control, and fundamentally survey the intrinsic violence in state exercises.

Culture embraces the beliefs, values, and practices of societies, and it is both a product of and a contributor to violence. Since the beginning of time, different societies have wrestled with the presence and effect of violence within their social structures. From old civilisations to current societies, violence has had an urgent impact on shaping social standards, values, and customs. It becomes a crucial tool for establishing and maintaining social order, settling disputes, and asserting control. By analysing the issue of violence in various societies, literary figures gain experiences along with the intricacy of human ways of behaving, the elements of power, and how violence is involved in social orders. In Edward Bond’s play, *Early Morning*, violence becomes the dominant central point, and it investigates its significant effect on people and society overall through an influential analysis of the refined relationship between violence and culture. At the point when seen from the perspective of Michel Foucault’s way of thinking, Edward Bond’s depiction of violence in the play features the perplexing elements of power, control, and social manipulation as well as reflecting physical brutality. This study looks to express this approach to uncover the multi-layered nature of violence as cultural designs and power elements enrich it.

### **The Impacts of Violence on Culture: An Analysis of *Early Morning* by Edward Bond**

The financial, social, and political climates before WWII were extraordinarily affected by “the Treaty of Versailles,” which was constrained upon Germany following The First World War. The German society experienced serious economic difficulties and harshness because of the arrangement’s extreme compensations and regional misfortunes, which the Nazi Party exploited to hold onto help and influence (Fülöp, 2011, p. 205). The forceful expansionist strategies of the fascist and nationalist systems in Germany, Italy, and Japan, driven by the conversion of philosophical, economic, and strategic contemplations, were the primary drivers of the Second World War. This war caused “constantly changing business and economic conditions” (Greco, 2020, p. 32) including “changes in the national, regional, or local economic situation” (Greco,

2020, p. 46), and people all over the world had to cop up with the serious hard effects of inflation, loss of population, “high unemployment” (Mathy, 2018, p. 128) besides its violent memories. The war had a severe mental and damaging impact on individuals and societies through profound injuries from wartime occasions, for example, losing friends and family, being evacuated, and being a witness to severe violence, which affected individuals’ psychological well-being and general prosperity. Different generations of people were affected, which changed their social communications, family dynamics, and social traditions. The mental impacts of WWII were much of the time passed down through the ages, influencing the emotional well-being and general prosperity of the later generations who did not experience the war. This injury being gone down through ages socially affected social collaborations and family relationships. Social and cultural principles led to significant movements; the encounters of war, alongside the rise of extremist and patriot thoughts, represented a danger to laid out friendly and social guidelines. New cultural and social principles arose, which additionally rushed the breakdown of the previous social designs like the family and community. Since “[t]he destructive impulses unleashed in the war, the increasing fascism of a depressed Europe, and the disruptive shock of revolutionary political situations, impelled artists to answer social violence with a violence internalized in technique and imagery” (Harben, 1988, p. 215), the art and literature were extraordinarily affected by the war and its consequences. The encounters and sensations of the time were reflected in the various writers, performers and dramatists who took part in the actual war. As one of the best contemporary British playwrights, Edward Bond (1934-2024) shed light on society by examining human values through violence and social corruption before and after the Second World War. He made use of drama to present the corruption in the world with the sufferings of human beings. Bond’s experience of violence came firsthand, especially in his childhood. The playwright believes that violence constructs “the dominant problem of our age” even though individuals “could always be cruel to each other; but now there exists the possibility of a total cruelty. Because of our technical advance, we are confronted with something which really does demand an answer” (Willett, 1967, p. 9). He provides these ideas into his plays including his own experiences such as “violence, pity, aggression, love, greed, fear” (Trussler, 1976, p. 34). They question the ongoing effects of “human violence upon our society, culture and political systems” (Billingham, 2014, p. 172). He is a significant figure in English literature who both “preaches to the audience [and] creates the adequate conditions to bind reason and imagination as a means to understanding reality” (Nicolás, 2016, p. 258), so his plays serve as a medium to explore and question fundamental aspects of the human experience, especially the pervasive theme of violence, and how this violence reflects through society, culture, and political structures. It may be suggested that scholars have searched these themes by providing a deeper analysis of Bond’s work through his “interconnected perceptions of the world from a social approach” (Nicolás, 2016, pp. 258-259).

In contemporary literature, “dominant figures are presented as embodiments of social, economic and political forces, as can be seen from the plays of Bond” (Harben, 1988, p. 13). Since the beginning of literature, the dominant literary characters have been portrayed as complicated individuals with generally private inspirations and actions. The mental qualities, moral problems, and relational associations of every one of them impact their separate storylines. Current depictions, on the other hand, as found in Edward Bond’s plays, frequently portray these characters as people as well as images or symbols of even more remarkable social, political, and financial powers. Characters are currently viewed as corresponding to the establishments and philosophies they address by featuring a more basic and foundational comprehension of power elements. As Harben explains:

His genius is for a poetic theatre where language, staging, dramatic tempo and brilliantly realized visual images are skilfully balanced. Ideas are transformed into potent stage metaphors, a serious political concern into theatrical action which is electrifying on both an emotional and intellectual plane, for an audience is brought up short against a vision of the mind and character of whole societies (1988, p. 213).

Through the portrait of violence on stage, the playwright seeks to discover “humanness and the decay of political and social commitment” (Nicolás, 2016, p. 259). Bond believes that violence is a dispensable tool for “a specific material and ideological site” (Billingham, 2014, p. 3) and it is often supported by the ruling class or the government. If people are “violent by nature”, it seems “wise to have the use of violence monopolized by a rational and impersonal body such as the state” (Munck, 2008, p. 6) and to rule a society and to overcome opposition for the regime, it becomes a necessity for a reflection in “power and control” (Billingham, 2014, p. 4). Thus, Bond’s play affirms Foucault’s hypothesis that power and violence are inseparable and regulated in society. To Foucault, power is filled with the establishments and frameworks that run society and isn’t simply used to commit obvious demonstrations of violence. Bond represents this thought in his plays by presenting influential individuals as images of bigger social powers that push readers to think about the nature of violence. Following Foucault’s hypothesis that power is supported by authority and social norms, this strategy clarifies that violence maintains and legitimises authority. This adjustment of how characters are depicted intensifies Bond’s emotional impact as well as grows our perception of the fundamental power structures that form social reflections and human communications. This is predictable with Foucault’s arguments that power is a continuous and common control system.



Edward Bond wrote about his arguments on violence in the preface of his book *Plays: One*. According to him, the term was a “biological mechanism” that had been inherited by people (1977, p. 9). However, he differentiated it as the base instinct of nature from “the violence exhibited and institutionalised by humans and their societies” (Billingham, 2014, p. 6). Since human nature was created by society, “the problem of human violence [lies] not in our instincts but in our social relationships. Violence is not an instinct we must forever repress because it threatens civilised social relationships; we are violent because we have not yet made those relationships civilised” (1997, p. 12). Thus, violence was not “a function of human nature but of human societies” (1997, p. 17) since it is an inevitable “part of the world around us” (Munck, 2008, p. 7). Bond declares his ideas on violence and culture in an interview as follows:

I’m not saying that before the nineteenth century, society was moral, kind, generous. It wasn’t, because the economic grounds for these things weren’t there. But I am saying that it broke up communities on which culture was founded, pushed these people off into factory ghettos, and therefore destroyed the artistic consciousness of the people. And in that way, I think, it destroyed their self-integrity, which they had to set about the long business of finding again (Harben, 1988, p. 241).

Bond’s viewpoint, as presented in this quotation, suggests that violence is a result of societal conditions and that addressing the root causes in social relationships is crucial for reducing violence, rather than perpetually repressing it.

Bond’s historical play *Early Morning* (1969) was performed at the Royal Court Theatre in 1968 in a period of chaos after World War II and banned by Lord Chamberlain by “its surreal portrayal of history” and the writer’s reflections about Queen Victoria (Yanhua, 2013, p. 30). With a historical background of the Victorian period, most names belong to historical personalities. In the play, Queen Victoria and her husband Albert have Siamese twins: George and Arthur. The country is decaying with cannibalism and Victoria arranges a marriage between George and the nurse Florence Nightingale to pacify people by distracting their hostility towards the government. Albert and Prime Minister Disraeli plan to kill Victoria and put Arthur on the throne, Arthur, though, maintains his objectivity. Albert and Disraeli hire Len, who is a death criminal because of killing and eating a man in a cinema queue, to kill Victoria. They fail and Albert is poisoned and killed by Florence who is raped by Victoria. In this chaos, George is accidentally shot by Victoria and dies. The conjoined twins – one dead, one alive – run away. Arthur is alone, depressed, and fed up with violence all over the country; to him, the solution will come by the death of everyone. Thus, he arranges a tug of war, everybody dies, and he commits suicide. However, all of the characters are reunited in heaven which is again ruled by Victoria and people eat each other. People are immortal, for the eaten parts emerge again. Arthur is sad, he cannot eat others which makes George starve and this threatens the order of heaven. Hence, to protect the union in heaven, his family decides to eat him to his bones, lock his bones in a coffin, and get rid of him forever. Finally, the ghost of Arthur rises from the coffin, and no one notices him. In the context of *Early Morning*, Edward Bond’s thought-provoking play, violence serves as a tool that enlightens the face of a seemingly idealised community. Foucault argues, “in the historical discourse of the nineteenth century, be lessened, broken down into regional threats and transitory episodes, and retranscribed in the form of crises and violence” (2003, p. 216). Through the depiction of violent acts and their consequences, Bond presents a sarcastic critique of the inherent violence that lies beneath the surface of social structures that is irrespective of class or social standing. The play invites its readers and audience to confront the uncomfortable truth that violence is an inescapable piece of human existence that transcends socio-economic divisions. It involves violence to uncover the reality of an ideal higher culture. Notwithstanding class or social standing, Bond offers a humorous incrimination of the fundamental brutality that underlies social frameworks by showing violent actions and their outcomes. This affirms Foucault’s perception that violence is legitimised in contemporary societies through legal and governmental strategies, turning into an essential piece of the arrangement of the state. Bond’s basic assessment that the nineteenth century’s modern and economic improvements harmed social institutions and broke social ties is reflected in his portrayal of a falling Victorian culture.

*Early Morning* is a clear example of satire. In the first scene of the play, the Queen’s husband Albert, and Prime Minister Disraeli plan to assassinate Victoria, and Bond uses realistic historical characters to criticise the corruption in politics. They are cruel and decide to kill people after killing Victoria:

DISRAELI: (...) Tonight I’ll bring the black list up to date. I was going to shoot them – to demonstrate our military support, you understand. But I’ve decided on hanging – that will emphasise our respectability. I’ll keep the numbers down.

ALBERT: How many?

DISRAELI: We don’t know all our enemies till we start. So far, eight hundred and thirteen.

ALBERT: Make it fourteen. People are superstitious (Scene One, 1977, p. 139).

Even though they are in the government, they plan to hang members of the opposite group without questioning whether they are guilty or not. To them, the lives of others are just numbers, it does not matter what their society believes in. Bond stresses political violence through characters since it may generate the “demonstration of force” in which “power is institutionalized and organized meant to rule and govern, and force is the capacity and means exercising power. Power is an

end in itself, force is a means to sustain power and violence is [a] force in" (Singh, 1976, p. 60). Although these characters want to put Arthur on the throne in the play, Arthur has hesitations. He asks questions about what will happen to his mother, and how many people will die, but his father evades with unrealistic answers. Arthur is not involved in this political corruption, for he thinks: "The trouble with the world is it's run by politicians" (Scene Two, 1977, p. 141). The "use of violent methods for achieving legal or illegal ends in politics, and may be defined as the use of force or the threat of its use by a group or groups in order to achieve political objectives like maintaining, influencing or seizing state power" (Singh, 1976, p. 63), it is obvious that Bond uses satire in *Early Morning* to critique political corruption, and violence becomes "a use of force to effect decisions against the desire of others" (Hondereich, 1976, p. 48). The dialogue exemplifies the dehumanising nature of political decisions and highlights a character, Arthur, who serves as a voice critical of the political establishment since his presence introduces him as the one "desocialized away from [his] own culture" (Galtung, 1990, p. 293).

The playwright criticises not only the corruption in the political system but also the corruption in the judicial system since violence causes "social and political inequality and injustice" (Billingham, 2014, p. 118) and it creates corruption "comes from the conflict between the imperative to justice and the practical necessity of living in an unjust society" (Bond, 2006, p. 218). This statement outlines the scope of Bond's critique which emphasises that his criticism extends beyond political corruption to encompass the flaws in the judicial system through a connection between violence and social injustice. In the fourth scene, Victoria judges a couple named Len and Joyce who are accused of killing and eating a man in a cinema queue. She says: "I shall sum up: guilty" (Scene Four, 1977, p. 152) and they will be sentenced until they are dead. The only person who wants to learn the reason for cannibalism is Arthur. He asks why Len kills and eats the man, he says that the man pushed in the queue, and he was hungry at that moment. Bond presents his audience with a cannibalistic society in which people are nothing except meals, for they do not have any value. He criticises society for being numb to others, and he expresses in *Eleven Vests* and *Tuesday*, "violence always returns to unleash its wrath on the ignorance that creates it. And we are an ignorant society" (Bond, 1997, p. 35). Furthermore, violence in public points to an extensive importance in the play, these kinds of individual crimes become inconsiderable contrasting to "the 'strategic' bombing of German towns it is a negligible atrocity, compared to the cultural and emotional deprivation of most of our children its consequences are insignificant" (Bond, 1977, pp. 310-11). An individual crime and its consequences are adopted as an ordinary incident by society considering the devastating agony of mass violence. Bond is a multifaceted critic who encompasses both political and judicial corruption, and his exploration of the dehumanising effects of violence on society. The specific example of Len and Joyce's trial serves as a microcosm for the broader issues Bond seeks to address. How Bond portrays violence can be better perceived by considering Foucault's comprehension of power elements. While Foucault explains the relationship between power and violence in the political system, he declares his ideas about the ruling class:

Prince receives his principality either through inheritance, or by acquisition, or by conquest; in any case, he is not a part of it, but external to it. It makes no difference whether the link that binds him to his principality is one of violence, or tradition, or one established through the compromise of treaties and the complicity or agreement of other princes, it is, in any case, a purely synthetic link; there is no fundamental, essential, natural, and juridical connection between the Prince and his principality: externality, the Prince's transcendence, is the principle. A corollary of this principle is, of course, that inasmuch as it is an external relationship, it is fragile and constantly under threat. It is threatened from outside, by the Prince's enemies who want to take, or re-conquer, his principality, and it is also threatened internally, for there is no a priori or immediate reason for the Prince's subjects to accept his rule. Third, an imperative is deduced from this principle and its corollary, which is that the objective of the exercise of power is, of course, to maintain, strengthen, and protect the principality (2014, p. 130).

As Foucault argues, the prince's external relationship with his people — which is set apart by violence, customs, or arrangements — features, the weak and never-ending unsafe nature of power. This externality — the prince's absence of natural connections to his domain — reflects the violent and unusual world of politics that *Early Morning* depicts. Violence is an essential strategy to protect authority and control of the culture in which Bond's main characters work. Foucault discusses that the activity of power habitually relies upon keeping up with the ruling class through strong strategies reflecting the fundamental message despite the odd and humorous depiction. Even with Bond's satirical scenes, the play's basic subject is predictable with Foucault's hypothesis: power is regularly important to keep up with control since political power is naturally unsteady. Bond's depiction of a social structure of violent and degenerate rulers upholds Foucault's arguments that power connections are unreliable and continually in danger. This depiction enhances our familiarity with violence that underlies social dynamics and intensifies the sensational effect of Bond's play. Bond's *Early Morning* requests that readers or audiences consider the manners by which power structures are kept up with by violence, as well as what they mean for social norms and human relationships.

In the fifth scene, the setting is Windsor Great Park and Florence says that Victoria raped her, and she is changed, "I've started evil thoughts" (1977, p. 155). This sets the stage for a dramatic revelation, indicating a traumatic event and its

psychological impact on Florence. While Albert and Disraeli plan to kill the Queen by hiring Len, Victoria persuades Florence to poison Albert. This complex plot involves a conspiracy to kill the Queen and Victoria's manipulation of Florence to achieve her goals. It highlights the theme of betrayal within the ruling family. In the chaotic atmosphere, Victoria wounds George accidentally. The court doctor offers to cut George free, but Arthur opposes. While they run away from the battle, they encounter their father's grave and his ghost who insists on cutting George off and makes Arthur the King: *"You were first in the womb. Your mother screamed and struggled, and your brother thrashed his way out in front"* (Scene Seven, 1977, p. 168). However, the audience witnesses George's coming back from death in scene ten. The resurrection of George also adds a surreal and unexpected twist to the plot, further complicating the narrative. Victoria has the power to bring him back to life: *"Arise, my son! George, this is mother, I want you back"* (1977, p. 178); and thus, he is alive *"Where am I?"* (1977, p. 179). It is critical that although George is Victoria's favourite heir, she does not get any kind of happiness and she just says about it: *"Be quiet. Let him thank me"* (1977, p. 179) and utters, *"Government must continue. Arthur must be shot"* (1977, p. 180) and accuses him to kill his father even though she convinced Florence to do it. Victoria's emotionlessness and prioritisation of political interests over familial relationships reveal the extent of cruelty and corruption in the ruling family. This scene is rich in dramatic elements, unveiling a web of familial betrayals, power struggles, and supernatural interventions, contributing to the inclusive theme of cruelty and corruption within the ruling family. As Foucault presents, *"there [is] a violent form of power which tried to attain a continuous mode of operation through the virtue of examples"* (2015, p. 155). Victoria's violent actions and manipulations are clear instances of this continuous violent power, as Foucault declares. The authority figure that Foucault criticises is exemplified by her use of violence and cruelty to provide control and authority. According to Foucault's arguments that power aims to imitate itself through steady, regularly violent structures, the ruler family's demonstrations act as a violent wake-up call of how power is kept up through fear, disloyalty, and the pressure of individual decisions.

While the playwright fictionalises the characters, he presents the dilemma in society. The conjoined twins Arthur and George complete and create a character. When Victoria decides to kill Arthur after the resurrection of George, Florence opposes it:

VICTORIA: (...) Listen, Florence. I'll tell them not to hit George.

FLORENCE: If Arthur dies he dies!

VICTORIA: Will he? The doctors say he will – that means he probably won't. And if he does I'll bring him back to life.

FLORENCE: But he's got no heart! (Scene Ten, 1977, p. 180).

This dialogue indicates a crucial moment in the play where characters confront the ethical implications of their actions. The conjoined twins become a metaphor for the interconnectedness of individuals in a society, and Victoria's actions highlight the corruption that can arise when power is unchecked, and morality is compromised. In the play, Bond provides:

(...) this dilemma of inner division, of being separated from one's natural self, a step further, projecting it in startling visual terms in the form of George and Arthur as Siamese twins, and the other characters as one-dimensional, cartoonlike, strangely dehumanized creatures. By distorting, even demonizing the human figure - using the spontaneity and irresponsibility of a dream as dramatic licence - Bond shows how people can cease to be human under certain conditions (Harben, 1988, p. 238).

It is obvious that Arthur represents both literally and emotionally heart, senses, and morality, but George is a part of the Queen's system and a suitable candidate for the throne. Even though George kills himself again, Arthur runs away with his dead brother rather than becoming the King. Being emotional and thinking with heart is not enough to participate a society; he is depressed and lonely. He carries his skeleton attached to him and acts as if he is alive:

ARTHUR: (...) He can't hear. I pretend he hears because I'm lonely. – You noticed? Sh, I gave it to a dog. I woke up and this brute was slinking off its tail down and its ears back and his foot in its mouth. I threw a stone and it dropped it... Then I thought no. so I called it back and gave it to him. I'm a limited person (Scene Eleven, 1977, p. 185).

To put up with this cruel world, Arthur needs George; however, in one sense he wants to get rid of him by giving his bones to dogs. Even though he is presented as a much better character in the play, he has also an instinct for violence as a member of *"exploitative social organisations"* (Billingham, 2014, p. 6). It explores the emotional and moral dimensions of the characters Arthur and George by searching the complexities of their relationship, Arthur's internal struggles, and the broader societal critique in the play.

Scene Eleven is also crucial to present Arthur's perception of violence. After he explains his loneliness to Len, who is dying, he begins to tell his dream about a mill that grinds people. He confesses that he has better dreams, *"each man slaughters his family and cattle and then kills himself"* (1977, p. 185). Arthur recounts a dream about a mill that grinds people, expressing a dark view of human existence. He believes that violence is inherent in society, stating that before taking his own life, every man butchers his loved ones and animals. It reveals a profound cynicism about the inherent violent tendencies of humanity. He is positive that all of the people in society are violent:

ARTHUR: Doctor, you're a medical man. Why do men hate life? Is it the light? Is it more comfortable to be mud and ashes? Why do the good men work for the bad men? Doctor? Not many people rise to the heights of Hitler. Most of them only nurse little hates. They kill under licence. Doctor, Hitler had vision. He knew we hated ourselves, and each other, so out of charity he let us kill and be killed (1977, p. 186).

He adds that even science, which should be useful to human beings, works for violence:

ARTHUR: (...) Hitler gets a bad name, and Einstein's good. But it doesn't matter, the good still kill. And the civilized kill more than the savage. That's what science is for, even when it's doing good. Civilization is just bigger heaps of dead. Count them (1977, p. 186).

Arthur compares Hitler and Einstein, and he puts forward that both the good and the bad kill. He argues that even science, meant to benefit humanity, serves violence. His reflection on Hitler's understanding of human self-hatred and the notion that civilisation results in bigger amounts of death suggests a deep scepticism about the positive contributions of civilisation. He believes that people prefer to live for the sake of killing others, and he decides to arrange a tug of war and kill everyone including himself: "For the first time in my life I can be useful. (...) What we need now is the great traitor: who kills both sides, his and theirs" (1977, p. 187). Arthur contends that people prefer to live for the sake of killing others, and he proposes arranging a tug-of-war to kill everyone, including himself. This extreme proposal reflects Arthur's belief which puts forward that violent actions become an intrinsic part of the nature of humanity. Conversely, Queen Victoria strongly devotes herself to this 'game' war, and all of the public even disabled people with wheelchairs are involved in it. According to Bond's note on violence, "there must be a strong authority that will use violence to control violence. This authority is the ruling class. It maintains its existence by using violence and being able to organise it politically" (1977, p. 11). This cruelty of society is defined by Arthur as: "The mob's sadistic, violent, vicious, cruel, anarchic, dangerous, murderous, treacherous, cunning, crude, disloyal, dirty, destructive, sadistic—" (Scene Twelve, 1977, p. 189). Arthur concludes that people tend toward violence by birth, suggesting a deterministic and pessimistic view of human nature. This adjusts with his earlier expression that even the good kill by emphasising permanent and inescapable violence in society. Arthur's fatalistic and despairing perspective on violence, human nature, and society and his beliefs reflect a rooted cynicism about the capacity of individuals and civilisation to rise above inherent violent tendencies. The proposed tug of war becomes a metaphor for the destructive nature of societal dynamics in Arthur's eyes and "Bond satirizes the tragic ignorance of an age of aggression and absurd selfcertainty" (Harben, 1988, p. 237). Foucault's arguments that "the nature of this power which has surged into view in all its violence, aggression and absurdity in the course of the last forty years, contemporaneously, that is, with the collapse of Fascism and the decline of Stalinism" (2015, p. 87) have a close relationship with this play's themes. The universal and continuous violence that Foucault depicts is represented through Arthur's perspectives and actions. The social and political elements present the "absurdity" and "aggression" that Foucault portrays in contemporary power structures. Bond's image of an organised and standardised society is reliable with Foucault's investigation of power. Bond brings up the repeating and self-sustaining nature of violence that Foucault argues is featured by the decision of the ruling class's use of violence to hold control. Within this framework, Arthur's miserable actions and his realisation lead to a bigger explanation of the idea of violence and power in culture. The tug of war is not only a game; it's an illustration of the undeniable pattern of violence that saturates contemporary power elements. Bond criticises society's acknowledgement of violence as an essential and sensible method for maintaining request by caricaturising this unfortunate irrelevance, which is much the same as the thing Foucault suggested about the state's legitimisation of violence.

Despite all of the encouragement of Victoria, her team releases the rope and falls down to the cliff, everyone dies except Arthur. The ghost of George attaches him again, and Arthur shoots himself; however, the peace he hopes to find in death does not appear. Scene Sixteen begins with the setting of heaven which is like hell: everything is the same, Victoria rules people, all of them eat each other without feeling any pain, and the eaten parts re-emerge. It is an ever-lasting hell. Thus, Arthur's plan to kill everyone does not work and the game frees neither him nor others from violence, as Bond points out in his work *Plays: Two*, "[v]iolence shapes and obsesses our society and if we do not stop being violent we have no future" (1978, p. 3). With the help of this image of heaven, Bond wishes to emphasise that there is no way to escape from society and its violence, because people "haven't yet found a way of change by using our minds" (qtd in Roberts, 1985, p. 49). In heaven, Arthur cannot eat others, for he vomits. This behaviour makes George starve. Arthur only eats his arm when he feels pain and he is not involved in the violence around him. He says, "Bodies are supposed to die and souls go on living. That's not true. Souls die first and bodies live. They wander round like ghosts, they bump into each other, tread on each other, haunt each other." (Scene Nineteen, 1977, p. 209). This quotation reflects the world, which is full of violence and corruption, people first lose their souls before death. However, the ruler Victoria announces him as a traitor who does not obey the rules of heaven and creates chaos among people who follow him as a leader. Eventually, Victoria and her supporters decide to eat him to his bones and lock his bones in a coffin to prevent his re-emerging. The past in the world was dominated by her and



her supporters' violent deeds, so the present in heaven "must be controlled into some semblance of purpose and coherence through violence, fear and intimidation" (Billingham, 2014, p. 116). This cannibalistic heaven presents the idea that people "don't eat anybody physically but [they] eat [others'] mental suffering, [they] eat their despair, [they] eat the waste of their lives (...) Our economic relationship to the earth is through eating and destroying each other" (Hayman, 1973, p. 11). According to Foucault, the activity and support of power in society are fundamentally achieved through violence. In *Early Morning*, the never-ending cannibalism in Heaven addresses the unavoidable and organised violence that Foucault expounds on. The play shows how those in, important, influential places control and overwhelm violence in social structures. Bond introduces a savage, horrible heaven that underlines the thought of Foucault that power isn't just practised through clear demonstrations of violence but also through the continuous maintenance of hierarchy in culture. This association with Foucault's arguments expands the individuals' perceptions of how violence is acknowledged and legitimised in the public by raising questions about the possibility of full independence from these severe frameworks simultaneously.

After Arthur's family has eaten him, they realise that his head is missing since Florence hides it under her skirt. They are stark raving mad, and they are, especially George, searching for it. To calm him down, Victoria utters, "George, try saying the National Anthem backwards. It calms the nerves" (Scene Twenty, 1977, p. 217). This scene also presents elements of satire. The ruler family is eager to eat and annihilate one of its members and they enjoy it. They do not hesitate to use the National Anthem to calm their nerves even though it should be honourable and sacred. Through funny dialogues, the playwright criticises the corruption and the tendency of violence in the ruler's family. Finally, George finds Arthur's head and eats hungrily it and so Arthur's opinions about society, which destroy the order, are suppressed, and from now on, the order in heaven will be protected as it should be. To pacify the people, Victoria announces that Arthur killed himself and she hides the murder:

VICTORIA: You can't kill people in heaven. They can only kill themselves. (...) He told you not to eat each other. (...) But he knew he was asking something unnatural and impossible. Something quite, quite impossible. And because he loved you – and he only attacked you out of love – he wouldn't ask you to eat yourself, as he did. So he died, to let you eat each other in peace. His last words were 'Feed them'. (Scene Twenty-one, 1977, p. 221).

This scene employs satire and irony to critique the ruling family's corruption and violent tendencies. The manipulation of symbols like the National Anthem and the fabrication of a narrative around Arthur's death reveal the lengths to which those in power will go to maintain control and suppress protest. In the play, the ruler side puts his bones in a coffin and only Florence cries for him. Arthur rises above his coffin like a ghost, and nobody sees him. He looks old but happy. All of his pain has gone, and he does not have to live in this everlasting 'hell' with his cannibalistic family and society anymore. Arthur, depicted as old but happy, represents a sense of liberation from the pains and struggles of life. His decision to escape this everlasting hell is portrayed as a choice for peace and contentment and in the context of the play's world, death is portrayed as a release from suffering. Foucault's statement helps us understand this scene: "the salvation of each is the salvation of all, and the salvation of all is the salvation of each" (2014, p. 345). One method for reading Arthur's death and his following leaving from the endless violence of heaven in *Early Morning* is a personal salvation that eventually challenges the bigger social structure. As indicated by Foucault's arguments on power and salvation, accomplishing real salvation relies upon delivering the whole society and can't be achieved independently. Real salvation is frustrated by organised corruption, reflected in the ruler's family's forceful efforts to seize power. The way that Arthur decided not to use violence and how he passed on subsequently address a rejection of the corrupted power system. A culture that feeds on injustice and violence may be viewed as being evaluated by his peaceful leave, underlining the need to change for real freedom. Bond's satire and Foucault's ideas may be connected to feature the reliance on individual and social liberation because they uncover the systematic violence existing inside society and should be addressed to reach real salvation. Foucault puts forward "this theatrical and tragic harshness of the state that in the name of its always threatened and never certain salvation, requires us to accept acts of violence as the purest form of reason" (2014, p. 348). Thus, violence is standardised as fundamental for the continuation of the state, as shown by the ruler's family's extreme activities to maintain request, like eating Arthur and misrepresenting his real version of death. This supports Foucault's declaration that the state legitimises violence as a sensible need while masking its tricky presence. Because "[i]nequality is everywhere, violence creates inequalities everywhere, and wars are everywhere" (Foucault, 2003, p. 156). As Bond underlines the recurrent idea of violence that maintains the structures it looks to protect, the cruelty and systematisation of violence in the play reflect Foucault's evaluation of state power. The basic investigation of power relations and the need to assess the use of power legitimised in the assistance of social requests and state security are featured in this play.

In this sense, *Early Morning* is recognised as "almost irresponsibly optimistic" (Hay and Roberts, 1980, p. 65) which suggests a tension between optimism and a sense of irresponsibility, perhaps questioning whether escape through death as a valid or responsible resolution to the problems is presented in the play. An interviewer referred to the idea of hope

presented in the endings of Bond's plays which some people regard as cruel and asked, "the connection between hope and action in [his] plays" (Nicolás, 2016, p. 261). The playwright refused the use of hope as a traditional tool, and he mentioned that his plays demand a closer look to "see something else is conveyed". So, through this critical mind, he uttered,

truth becomes a trigger. It has consequences, it triggers something. (...) I dislike the way people use the word hope. It is what you were saying, you just abdicate responsibility. I never write plays that simply say, well, the future is hopelessly, irredeemably, black. What I am saying is: the trigger of truth is in your hands. (Nicolás, 2016, p. 262)

The protagonist in *Early Morning* has deeply suffered and finally prefers dying out rather than living in the violent and corrupted world. With this bitter optimism, it may be considered that there is always a chance for people to escape from this wild world even though it costs their lives. Hence, through these reflections on the character Arthur's liberation through death and the cost of escaping a world marked by violence and corruption, the play's conclusion is described as optimistic but tinged with bitterness through emphasizing the thematic complexities surrounding life, death, and the nature of the depicted world since violence is an evitable part of our lives.

Interestingly, the play starts with the sentence "the events of this play are true" (1977, p. 136) after readers or the audience have learned the plot of the play: Victoria is a lesbian and rapes Florence, her sons Arthur and George are conjoined twins, cannibalism is common both on earth and in heaven. The play's opening statement immediately captures attention and is likely intended to set a tone of seriousness or realism, highlighting that the events to follow hold some profound, perhaps symbolic, truth rather than mere fiction. Bond rewrites the Victorian period with shocking and savage scenes to point to cruelty and consumption in the world. To Waqar, "as a postmodernist writer, Bond amalgamates the realism of the Victorian age with the stylistic experimentation found in the modernist literature of the early twentieth century" (2015, p. 146) and his play is set in the twenty-first-century society. In this case, Bond is said to compound Victorian realism with the stylistic experimentation of early twentieth-century modernist literature. To construct this, he makes use of 'anachronism', which is defined as "something in a book, play, or film that is wrong because it did not exist at the time the book, play, or film is set" (Collins Cobuild English Dictionary, 1995, p. 55). Anachronism, the intentional utilisation of components not by and large or socially proper to the time portrayed, is noted as a critical complex instrument. Bond provides this "technique of making an audience sit up through the force of startling anachronisms which bring past and present together, driving home the contemporary relevance of what is being portrayed" (Harben, 1988, p. 38) and the play is set in the twenty-first hundred years, yet it changes the Victorian time frame. This choice challenges conventional notions of historical accuracy by contributing to a sense of stylistic experimentation and perhaps highlighting the timelessness of certain themes. In Scene Four, Disraeli and Albert are talking about the plan to assassinate the Queen. While they are discussing whether Prince Arthur will join them or not, Albert utters:

ALBERT: He's peculiar about his mother. It must look as if some stray fanatic kills her. We just step in to keep the peace. We close the ports and airfields, take over the power stations, broadcast light classics and declare martial law. (1977, p. 147)

Bond's use of anachronism in *Early Morning* serves various purposes including challenging traditional narrative structures, offering social commentary, and engaging the audience with a unique blend of styles and themes this utterance shows that Bond combines the Victorian period with the early Twentieth Century by giving examples of airfields and power stations. He takes advantage of this technique in another dialogue between Doctor and Arthur in Scene Twelve:

ARTHUR: Who won?

DOCTOR: We're regrouping.

ARTHUR: Was Napoleon there?

DOCTOR: I didn't see him.

ARTHUR: Hitler? Einstein? (1977, p. 186)

The excerpt illustrates Bond's use of anachronism by placing references to airfields and power stations in a Victorian setting. This technique disrupts traditional historical accuracy and creates a unique narrative blend. Even though the play is set in the Victorian period, Arthur is talking about important figures of the twentieth century. As mentioned before, he thinks that good men are as blamed as bad men. Arthur's belief that both good and bad men are equally blamed aligns with his broader critique of society. This suggests a moral relativism that challenges conventional notions of morality. It is also astonishing that Queen Victoria confesses about the society as follows:

VICTORIA: (...) Our kingdom is degenerating. Our people cannot walk on our highways in peace. They cannot count their money in safety, even though our head is on it. We cannot understand most of what is called our English. Our prisons are full. Instead of fighting our enemies our armies are putting down strikers and guarding our judges. Our peace is broken. (Scene Three, 1977, p. 144)

It sounds as though Queen Victoria experienced all of the issues and degenerations of the twentieth century. She delivers a monologue in which she laments the decline of the monarchy and notes how social unrest, economic inequality, and

problems with law enforcement are all reflections of the 20th century's issues. In this way, Bond gives a realistic depiction of our reality while also using historical figures to critique the modern world. Bond's intentional mixing of historical periods, characters, and issues in *Early Morning* serves to challenge traditional storytelling, offers a moral critique, and stresses the persistent nature of societal problems across different eras. This unconventional approach engages the audience and prompts reflection on the enduring issues faced by humanity.

### Conclusion

As among the post-war period writers, Edward Bond expounded on the impacts of violence in culture and society through the analysis of present-day world hardship by utilising Victorian characters, setting and period in his play *Early Morning*. To dissect this defilement in the two individuals and society, he spun around the principal character Prince Arthur who is frantic to encounter social treachery and viciousness both in his imperial family and in English society. The Ruler faces a dreary activity - human flesh consumption both on the planet and in paradise and this brings up him to doubt and lastly deny his reality. Toward the end of the play, he understands that he cannot change this debased framework. The Prince's choice is not the main significant issue of violence in the play, Bond likewise gave time misplacement by mixing reality and fiction in the past to address ethical quality and socio-political equity throughout everyday life, in this way violence turned into an ironical component.

In *Early Morning*, violence is introduced as an unavoidable impact that surpasses each friendly limit, and it fills in as a device controlled by individuals and networks to hold power, question the current framework, or show irritation and shortcomings. In this play, Bond set forward that violence is an essential and acquired part of human instinct in all societies free of any financial class by crossing social limits in each culture and making an enduring impact on social orders and their demeanours of workmanship. Through the difficulty of individuals' sanctified thoughts regarding honour, power and class, this play offers a motivating illustration of how violence might uncover the real essence of a quiet local area. Clearly, writing has a pivotal impact in looking at, addressing, and creating settings on the impacts of the issue on culture and society. Through writing, the secret pieces of human existence become clear, and it gives desire to change for a superior future.

By surpassing social lines, *Early Morning* presents a strong remark on the presence of violence in the public eye. Since Bond utilises chronologically misguided devices, the setting and the characters in the Victorian Period reflect general issues, such as violence and debasement, which have existed from the beginning of human history. As a post-war period writer, Bond skilfully joined the genuine characters from the nineteenth century with his inventive portrayal which is amazing and provocative. Through this specific situation, the play offers a powerful delineation of the social worries of the contemporary world as well as offering analysis of the prior hundred years thus Bond looks at the Victorian culture he reproduces and the intricacy of the modern world while he attempts to uncover the idea of violence. The dramatist, utilising an erroneous history, has raised questions about social and moral issues and whether they have been addressed or rethought in this advanced world.

Bond envisioned the corruption, violence, and moral erosion of a fictitious higher society and this makes the readers and theatregoers of the play question their social battles in which they live. Thus, the subject of violence turns into a tool that helps to change both scholarly works and social settings since writing features and digs the malicious parts of individuals and their disagreeable activities. The way that violence is generally depicted as a power that exists and is not just a verifiable item leads individuals to contemplate what it could mean for current writing and social stories. Examining the association between *Early Morning* and the setting of culture and writing assists individuals with outperforming time and criticising culture and society by introducing a justifiable impression of mankind. Bond's play presents a valuable source that censures the overall conviction of the higher class's significance by offering similar difficulties in the modern world's lives.

This terrific climate profoundly interfaces with Foucault's study of violence and authority. He points out that violence is habitually legitimate in contemporary society by offering legalistic and governmental strategies, depicting it as a fundamental piece of the rule of law. This is displayed in *Early Morning*, as the fundamental violent and powerful elements of Victorian culture are uncovered through a strange point of view on history. The play reflects Foucault's arguments that violence and reason are joined in the use of state power by performing the problem of people in a general public that is not generally determined by human beliefs. The play's controlled moral rebellion portrays a world wherein predominance and power fights outweigh everything else above moral contemplations. Bond's lines are reliable with Foucault's arguments that power invades and dominates all features of presence through the frameworks of perception and control. Bond shares his image of the continuous effects of Victorian power structures on the present through a clearly mocking critique of a widespread, crazy consumer society. The shocking symbolism in the play reflects the brutal power elements in present-day culture, as proposed by Foucault.

Thus, the issue of violence in *Early Morning* is both an examination of the nineteenth century's understanding and a call

to scrutinise the worldwide issues of profound quality, defilement and social degeneration which have shaped the entire world from the start of history. Here, writing turns into a critical element in looking for the subtleties of our reality in day-to-day existence settings by empowering individuals to contemplate a quiet future through the test of malicious and awkward revelations. Bond's play can influence change by its power which arrives past the stage or the pages of the play. With the assistance of this capacity, its readers or audiences get an opportunity to confront hard real factors and envision an additional empathetic and amicable future if it is yet conceivable.

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

**Financial Disclosure:** The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

**Hakem Değerlendirmesi:** Dış bağımsız.

**Çıkar Çatışması:** Yazar, çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan etmiştir.

**Finansal Destek:** Yazar, bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

## References

- "Anachronism" (1995). *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary*. London: Harper Collins.
- Billingham P. (2014). *Edward Bond: A Critical Study*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Bond, E. (1977). *Plays: One: Saved; Early Morning; the Pope's Wedding*. London: Methuen.
- . (1978). *Plays: Two (Lear, The Sea, Narrow Road to the Deep North, Black Mass, Passion)*. London: Methuen.
- . (1994). *Letters, Volume I. Edited by Ian Stuart*. Philadelphia: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- . (1997) *Eleven Vests and Tuesday*. London: Methuen.
- . (2006). *Plays: Eight (Born, People, Chair, Existence, The Under Room.)* London: Methuen Drama.
- California Policy Council on Violence Prevention. (1995). *Violence Prevention, A Vision of Hope: Final Report*. Sacramento: Crime & Violence Prevention Ctr., Calif. Attorney General's Office, August.
- Coady, C. (1986). The Idea of Violence. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 3(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5930.1986.tb00045.x>
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. (M. Bertani & A. Fontana, Eds.; David Macey, Trans.). Picador.
- . (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*. (M. Senellart, Ed) Palgrave Macmillan.
- . (2014). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. (M. Senellart, Ed.; G. Burchell, Trans.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- . (2015). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, Ed.). Vintage Books.
- Fülöp, M. (2011). *The Unfinished Peace: The Council of Foreign Ministers and The Hungarian Peace Treaty of 1947*. Social Science Monographs; Center for Hungarian Studies and Publications.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291-305.
- Greco, A. N. (2020). *Marketing of World War II in the US, 1939-1946*. Springer International Publishing.
- Harben, N. (1988). *Twentieth-century English History Plays: from Shaw to Bond*. Barnes & Noble Books.
- Hay, M. & Roberts, P. (1980). *Bond: A Study of His Plays*. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Hayman, R. (1973). *Bond is out to Make them Laugh*. The Times. 22 May.
- Hondereich, T. (1976). *Three Essays on Political Violence*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Jackman, M. R. (2002). Violence in Social Life. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 387-415.
- Mathy G.P. (2018). Hysteresis and persistent long-term unemployment: the American Beveridge Curve of the Great Depression and World War II. *Cliometrica*, 12(1), 127–152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11698-016-0158-1>
- Munck, R. (2008). Introduction: Deconstructing Violence: Power, Force, and Social Transformation. *Latin American Perspectives*, 35(5), 3-19.
- Nicolás, S. (2016). The Trigger of Truth is in your Hands': Conversations with Edward Bond. *Contemporary Theatre Review*. 26 (2), 258-266, DOI:10.1080/10486801.2016.1144184
- Roberts, P. (ed.) (1985). *Bond on File*. London: Methuen.
- Singh, G. (1976). Politics and Violence. *Social Scientist*, 4(11), 58-66.
- Trussler, S. (1976). *Edward Bond*. Harlow: Longman.
- Waqar, B. (2015). From Realism to Expressionism: The Pope's Wedding, Saved and Early Morningby Edward Bond. *ELF Annual Research Journal* 17: 145-161.
- Willett, J. (1967). Thoughts on Contemporary Theatre. *New Theatre Magazine*. 7 Spring: 6-12.



*World Report on Violence and Health: Summary.* (2002). Geneva: World Health Organization.

Yanhua, X. (2013). Faithful or Rebellious: Bond's Historical View in Early Morning. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 7(3), 29-33.