ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE DOCTORAL PROGRAMME

A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER AND SPACE IN HAROLD PINTER'S DRAMATIC OUTPUT: *THE BIRTHDAY PARTY, THE DUMB WAITER, THE HOTHOUSE, THE CARETAKER AND ONE FOR THE ROAD, THE MOUNTAIN LANGUAGE, ASHES TO ASHES*

Dissertation

Gülten SİLİNDİR KERETLİ

Ankara-2023

GCPS

ATILIM UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE DOCTORAL PROGRAMME

A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER AND SPACE IN HAROLD PINTER'S DRAMATIC OUTPUT: *THE BIRTHDAY PARTY, THE DUMB WAITER, THE HOTHOUSE, THE CARETAKER AND ONE FOR THE ROAD, THE MOUNTAIN LANGUAGE, ASHES TO ASHES*

Dissertation

Gülten SİLİNDİR KERETLİ

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN

Ankara-2023

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis titled "A Foucauldian Reading of Power and Space in Harold Pinter's Dramatic Output: *The Birthday Party, The Dumb Waiter, The Hothouse, The Caretaker and One for the Road, The Mountain Language, Ashes to Ashes*" and prepared by Gülten SİLİNDİR KERETLİ meets with the commitee's approval unanimously as Dissertation in the field of English Culture and Literature following the successful defense conducted on 07/12/2022

Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem TARAKÇIOĞLU (Chair)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN (Advisor)

Prof. Dr. Gülsen CANLI (Jury Member)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen ARAS (Jury Member)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Korkut Uluç İŞİSAĞ (Jury Member)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şule TUZLUKAYA

Director

ETHICAL STATEMENT

I accept and acknowledge that I have prepared this thesis study, prepared in line with the Thesis Writing Guidelines of Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences;

- Within the framework of academic and ethical rules;
- Presented the information, documents, evaluations, and results in a way that meets the rules of scientific ethics and morality,
- I have referenced each work from which I have benefited while preparing my thesis, and that
- I hereby present a unique study.

I hereby also understand that I shall accept any loss of rights against my behalf in cases otherwise.

07/12/2022

Gülten SİLİNDİR KERETLİ

GCPS

ÖZ

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ, Gülten. Harold Pinter'ın Tiyatro Eserlerinin Foucault'nun İktidar ve Mekân Bağlamlarında İncelenmesi*: Doğum Günü Partisi, Git Gel Dolap, Kapıcı, Sera* ve *Bir Tek Daha, Dağ Dili, Küller Küllere*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2022.

Bu tez, Harold Pinter'ın tiyatro eserlerinde, Michel Foucault'nun iktidar ve mekân teorileri bağlamında 'disipliner iktidar'dan 'otoriter iktidar'a geçişini incelemektedir. Foucault'nun panoptizm ve heterotopik mekânı bu amaca ulaşmakta kullanılacak yöntemler olacaktır. Pinter'ın ilk ve son dönem oyunları, iktidar siyasetinin yerel mekândan uluslararası mekâna geçişinin izini sürmek amacıyla seçilmiştir. Bu çalışma, Foucault'nun disipliner iktidarını ve "öteki mekânları" Pinter'ın politik oyunları üzerinden bağlamsallaştırmaktadır. Siyasi içerik *hapsetme, iktidar siyaseti ve gözetim* gibi kilit kavramları bağlamsallaştırmak için bilinçli olarak seçilmiştir. Keith Peacock, Pinter üzerine kaleme aldığı kitabında, Pinter'ın oyunlarında siyasi bir ideolojiye sahip olmadığını, bunu Pinter'ın kendisinin dile getirdiğini söyler. Oyun yazarı bu tiyatro oyunlarının birer politik analiz olmadığını "gizlenmemiş ahlâkî tiksintisini" dile getirdiğini vurgular. Peacock, ilk dönem oyunlarının 1950'lerin "kurumsal" oyunları olduğunu ve son dönem oyunlarının 1980'lerin "devlet" oyunları olduğunu öne sürer. Son dönem oyunları daha çok azınlık haklarının güçsüzleştirilmesi, Nazi katliamı, Amerika'nın diğer ülkeler üzerindeki hakimiyeti gibi uluslararası meseleler üzerinedir. Bu oyunlar *Doğum Günü Partisi, Git Gel Dolap, Kapıcı, Sera* ve *Bir Tek Daha, Dağ Dili, Küller Küllere* mekansal analize uygun oldukları için seçilmiştir. Mekân kuramcılarından Henri Lefebvre, "mekân politik olduğu için bir mekân siyaseti vardır" der. Bu alıntı, esasen ortaya konmak istenen ana fikri özetlemektedir. Bu tez "sapma heterotopyası" bağlamında hem panoptik bir ceza sistemini hem de heterotopya yani "öteki bir mekân" olarak akıl hastanelerini, psikiyatri hastanelerini, hapishaneleri konuşlandırmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, bu tez yukarıda bahsi geçen Foucault kavramlarını Pinter'ın politik ve açık-politik oyunlarında örneklendirir ve yeni bir çerçeveye yerleştirmeyi amaçlar.

Anahtar Sözcükler: panoptikon, heterotopya, Harold Pinter, politik drama, iktidar siyaseti.

ABSTRACT

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ, Gülten. A Foucauldian Reading of Power and Space in Harold Pinter's Dramatic Output: *The Birthday Party, The Dumb Waiter, The Hothouse, The Caretaker and One for the Road, The Mountain Language, Ashes to Ashes*, Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara, 2022.

This dissertation aims to study the transition from 'disciplinary power' to 'authoritarian power' in the theoretical context of Michel Foucault's power and space in Harold Pinter's selected early and late plays. Foucault's concepts of panopticism and heterotopic space are the methods to attain the goal in Harold Pinter's dramatic output. Pinter's early and later plays are selected with the objective of tracing the power politics from local to international space. This study contextualises Foucauldian disciplinary power and "other spaces" through the political plays of Pinter. The political content is opted deliberately for contextualising the key concepts*: the incarceration, power politics and surveillance*. As Keith Peacock propounds that there is no political ideology in Pinter's plays and the dramatist shares his "undisguised moral revulsion". Peacock suggests his early plays are the "institutional" plays of the 1950s and his later plays are the "state" plays of the 1980s. His later plays are more on the topic of international issues concerning disempowerment of minority rights, Holocaust, American dominance over other countries. These plays *The Birthday Party, The Dumb Waiter, The Hothouse, The Caretaker and One for the Road, The Mountain Language, Ashes to Ashes* are selected because they comply with the spatial anaysis. As one of the space theorists, Henri Lefebvre says "there is a politics of space because space is political" (L'espace et Politique 39). This quote sums up what is essentially intended to be put forth. This dissertation deploys asylums, psychiatric hospitals, prisons both as a panoptic penal structure and an "other space" within the context of "heterotopia of deviation". To conclude, it unfolds and reframes Foucauldian concepts elaborated above in the political and overtly political plays of Pinter.

Key Words: panopticon, heterotopia, Harold Pinter, political drama, power politics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my dearest supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin for her careful reading, invaluable advice, and her precious time both in the process of writing my PhD dissertation and throughout my PhD studies. Without her constant support and instilling confidence in me, this study would not have been completed. I will always be indebted to her for her patience and kindness. I also owe a huge debt of gratitude to Prof. Dr. Gülsen Canlı for guiding me draft after draft to submission and for her recommendations and her redaction whenever I find myself in a bind. I should also like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Neslihan Ekmekçioğlu for her proof-reading during the monitoring committees. I shall also thank all my committee members Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem Tarakçıoğlu, Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen Aras and Asst. Prof. Dr. Korkut Uluç İşisağ for putting their expertise at my disposal throughout my PhD. I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to my mother Ayten Silindir, my father Ökkeş Silindir, my sisters and my husband Mehmet Ali Keretli for all their support throughout my PhD studies. There are many people whom I owe my sincere thanks for their moral support throughout my doctoral thesis writing process. I would like to extend my thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nilay Erdem Ayyıldız, Asst. Prof. Dr. Ülkü Polat, Asst. Prof. Dr. Cemanur Aydınalp, Asst. Prof. Dr. Seher Maşkaraoğlu for their constant support and encouragement. Last but not least, I would like to thank my dearest friends for backing me up at all times: Hakan Kılınç, Pınar Şanlı, Burcu Atav, Murat Arslan, Pelin Doğan Özger, Uğur Arnavut, Sinem Pirinçci, Nesrin Koç, Mustafa Çokyavaş, Dilek Menteşe Kıryaman and all the others whom I could not mention their names respectively.

Finally, I am under particular obligation to the librarians for collecting materials that I have sought to utilise: Bilkent University Library, Cambridge University Library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZ ..... **i**

ABSTRACT ..... **ii**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **iii**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **iv**

INDEX OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... **v**

INTRODUCTION **1**

CHAPTER 1: FOUCAULT'S POWER DYNAMICS AND SPATIAL POLITICS **8**

1.1 Foucault's *Panopticon* and A Foucauldian Reading of Power and Space **9**

1.2 Foucault's "Of Other Spaces" **17**

CHAPTER 2: THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE 1950s AND THE 1980s IN BRITAIN **26**

CHAPTER 3: A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER AND SPACE IN HAROLD PINTER'S EARLY PLAYS **37**

3.1 *The Birthday Party* (1957), *The Dumb Waiter*, *The Hothouse* (1958), *The Caretaker* (1960) **37**

3.1.1 *The Birthday Party* 37

3.1.2 *The Dumb Waiter* 50

3.1.3 *The Hothouse* 59

3.1.4 *The Caretaker* 81

CHAPTER 4: A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER AND SPACE IN HAROLD PINTER'S LATE PLAYS **90**

4.1 *One for the Road (*1984), *The Mountain Language* (1988), *Ashes to Ashes* (1996) **90**

4.1.1 *One for the Road* 92

4.1.2 *Mountain Language* 96

4.1.3 *Ashes to Ashes* 101

CONCLUSION **109**

REFERENCES **113**

TURNITIN REPORT **120**

RESUME **125**

INDEX OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CCTV **:** Close Circuit TeleVision

USA **:** United States of America

GCPS

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this dissertation is to investigate the transition from 'disciplinary power' to 'authoritarian power' in Harold Pinter's selected early and late plays in the theoretical context of Michel Foucault's power and space. The dissertation will explore the various ways in which power defines space and vice versa. It is observed that while the scope of the interaction between power and politics remains limited to local incidents and spaces in Pinter's early plays, it acquires an international dimension in his late plays. The theoretical framework of the dissertation mainly includes Michel Foucault's concepts of the panopticon and heterotopias. This dissertation claims that Pinter represents the panopticon as a disciplinary method in his plays, and in a sense, his plays stand out as dystopic heterotopias offering the audience spectacles that are both unreal and virtual serving mirror images of oppression. To this end, the selection of Pinter's early plays includes: *The Birthday Party, The Dumb Waiter, The Hothouse, The Caretaker,* which are categorised as the playwright's early plays, and *One for The Road, The Mountain Language, Ashes to Ashes* belonging to Pinter's late period.

This dissertation consists of an introduction, a theory chapter, two analytical chapters dedicated to Pinter's early and late plays, and a conclusion. The theory chapter discusses Foucault's concepts of heterotopias and the panopticon while also covering the after-effects of World War II, the Holocaust, and the subsequent Cold War on Pinter's life and works. Although Pinter himself on occassion claims that the Second World War had no substantial impact and that his plays are essentially apolitical, his statements in certain interviews conducted by Lawrence M. Bensky at *Theatre at Work* suggest otherwise.

The socio-economic and political changes that took place in Britain in the 1980s considerably widened the scope of Pinter's drama. In this respect, the dissertation will trace particularly Pinter's increasing concerns in presenting spatial politics in the plays selected from earlier and late stages of the playwright's dramatic output. Pinter's plays have undergone a transition process from local space to international space in the given society. These four plays, which belong to the early phase, exemplify rather narrow, local, and hence limited representation of the playwright's perception of power-politics operating in enclosed settings. His early-

period plays convey a specific locality and temporality. This locality vanishes in terms of power and space in his late plays because the plays written after the 1980s intersect with the politics of that period. The second set of three plays titled *One for the Road, The Mountain Language, Ashes to Ashes,* however, discloses the broadened scope of power-politics moving from the local towards the international and, this shift in the playwright's perception of power-politics inevitably affects the construction of space in the above-mentioned three plays that typify Pinter's later phase. In fact, his late and early plays mentioned above have quite much in common. Although he refuses to be given any label, he employs political themes in his plays. It is acknowledged that his early phase plays deal with slightly political arguments; however, his later phase plays include much more overtly political questions. This direction is evident in his recent plays, notably in *One for the Road* and *Mountain Language.* He reflected his political activism on his dramatic writing particularly after the 1980s. His style of playwriting is divided into three phases. His early phase is between the dates 1957-1967. His second phase is between 1967-1982 and his later phase is 1982 onwards. While Pinter's pre1980 plays have a slight almost hidden political tone, his post-1980 plays exhibit the playwright's political activism explicitly. The objective of this dissertation is to analyse Pinter's selected plays mentioned above from the viewpoint of Foucault's modalities of power and the transition will be observed from the early phase to later phase plays and hence there will be a flow of power in/between these locales. Soon afterwards, the political space will be analysed within the plays. The genealogy of power relations provides Pinter's drama with spatial expansion. Hence the dissertation will attempt to display no matter how the political space produced by the state has changed over the years, disciplinary power exists in all circumstances.

This dissertation highlights the panoptic society as a disciplinary power and heterotopia in Pinter's first and third phase plays. The theoretical framework of this dissertation is constructed on French literary critic and social theorist Michel Foucault's ideas based on *Discipline and Punish*. The other constituent that contributes to the theoretical chapter of this dissertation focuses on Michel Foucault's space as a political instrument in *Of Other Spaces*. Spatial configuration will be dealt with from the Foucauldian point of view and the idea of room as the experienced space which holds fear and threat will be studied simultaneously in the

theoretical framework of the dissertation. The reason why memory plays are beyond the scope of this analysis is that memory is unreliable and determined by the present time needs. Since the present is shaped by the memories which may not be true, the dissertation is going to focus on the political content of the early and late period plays. Moreover, the dissertation will explore the impact of power and space on the process of transition from private to public space in the dramatic structure of Pinter's plays.

As Foucault propounds power varies; these are disciplinary power, authoritative power, bio-power and so on, and so forth. When Pinter's early period plays are compared to late period plays, it could be ascertained that disciplinary power prevails in all the state-run institutions in Pinter's plays explored in this dissertation. The political conditions of the late twentieth century led Pinter to write his overtly political plays because when his plays written in the 1980s are taken into consideration, it is possible to see the remarkable change in his literary style as well as the way he exposed his own political opinions. Most probably, after Margaret Thatcher was elected as prime minister, it could be said that his plays create an atmosphere that criticised the British politics in the second half of the twentieth century. Moving from very limited, restricted space into international circles, Pinter demonstrates that the disciplinary forces wield power on individuals either in domestic or international circles. This disciplinary power is implemented on people via state institutions. One of French sociologists who specialises in 'production of space', Henri Lefebvre asserts that space is political, and undoubtedly in political space, the authority is much more perceived. (*Espace et politique* 59). For this reason, these disciplinary forces and the political space in Pinter's selected plays will be elaborated.

Whether it is sovereign power, or mafia power, or administrative power or "power that be[1]", the power under any circumstances exists, as Foucault propounds. Power is constant, unchanging. Discipline that affects the behaviours of subjects is a power mechanism which processes the ideas. Unlike the dominating power, the absolute rulers, and lords, disciplinary power operates in closed spaces, institutions or organisations like prisons, asylums, schools. As Foucault suggests, modern society

[1]A phrase used to refer to those individuals or groups who collectively hold authority over a particular domain.

we are in is the one in which disciplinary power exists. Organising space that keeps people under surveillance are institutions such as prisons, hospitals, schools, military, the churches etc. In such buildings the task of disciplinary forces is to keep the target group which may include convicts, patients or students under constant surveillance. Despite being concrete spaces, their symbolic meanings are projected on the social consciousness. Indeed, despite keeping under surveillance, these institutions gather people together, thus social life is invigorated. Due to this reason, Lefebvre, contrary to Foucault, regards these institutions quite positively.

As Foucault suggests, the primary power system bases upon the punitive mechanism, which is a typical disciplinary power system, therefore the one who commits crimes is to be punished and to be restrained. This is the oldest and the most common power mechanism. However, in modern societies, this explicit power implementation made a shift to panoptic power implementation. Panopticon[2] is a type of architecture of a penitentiary that Jeremy Bentham developed; it presents a typical modern social order though it was designed by Bentham in 1785. Panopticon is a semi-round tower in which there are nine cells on each floor and the convicts inside the cells are constantly aware of being observed by the tower. The convicts cannot know when they are being watched means that they are propelled to act as if they are being always watched, for this reason the convicts are compelled to correct their behaviour. By internalising this motive and the fear of surveillance, they may refrain from unwelcome behaviour, thus when the convicts are liberated from prison, they accept to work for a nominal fee. Moreover, the settled life is ensured, and this order persists on account of these inmates who are kept under control. While it is designed to make the interior of the building invisible by light tricks, in panoptic system that Bentham developed, this function is maintained by means of cameras in the modern society. For this reason, although the inside of the building is empty, inmates sense that they are being watched and they have to pay attention to their own behaviour. After the prisoners are released from the prison, this internalised fear they experienced continue its influence on their daily lives. Consequently, this system creates individuals who conform to the social norms and sovereign power. Likewise,

[2] In Bentham's description, it is recommended as a disciplinary architectural management model. It consists of many disciplinary institutions like prisons, schools, shelters. (Judith 59-60). Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon was designed at the end of the 18th century. He obtains the architectural structure needed by the governments by working with Samuel Bentham. This building, designed in 1785, is called the Panopticon.

the modern society surrounds the individual with various mechanisms like CCTV cameras, courts, state police power and it keeps every single move of the individual under control. In Foucault's view, religious beliefs hinder individuals from acting freely because of the religious deeds they practise for afterlife. The structure of church resembles the Panopticon. An invisible omnipresent God is perceived as a surveillance model because the worshipper cannot see that he is not seen, thus religious institutions are also architectural structures of a panopticon designed.

As to Foucault's standpoint, one of the prominent concepts, power, is not the relation between a slave and the master, but rather between the monitored and the surveillant because power is everywhere. In the Panoptic surveillance, a group of people are observed and controlled through closed spaces that dominate the individual by claiming the responsibility for functional power. Panoptic power mechanism is non-violent, inexpensive, abstract, but with a strong hegemony over the individual.

In the theoretical chapter there will be a brief overview of spatio-political issues of the notion of power and space. This part especially will refer to the social theories of Foucault on power as included in the works of *Discipline and Punish, the Birth of Prison and Power/Knowledge and History of Sexuality* in order to comprehend the power politics and correlate the power mechanism with Pinter's power dynamics.

This chapter aims at drawing an analogy between Pinter's "pathology of power" in the wider realm of world politics and Foucault's power-politics. This argument will be particularly supported by Foucault's concept of power and "Panopticism" and accordance with the French philosopher's "Of Other Spaces". Obviously, Harold Pinter's rooms, prisons, prison-looking rooms, convalescent home (sanatorium) echo Foucault's asylums, panopticon, heterotopias that belong to carceral culture. It is wise to expand Foucault's treatment of knowledge of space and production of space in detail because "space is political" (Lefebvre 59). In *Production of Space,* Lefebvre indicates Michel Foucault may argue that "knowledge [savoir] is also the space in which the subject can speak about the objects in which he takes a position and which he deals with in his discourse" (3-4). Foucault never explains what the field he means and how he bridges the gap between the theoretical field and the practical field. (3-4). However, Lefebvre's work "provides the spatiality

of politics and history, rather than merely explaining politics and the history of space" (Elden 102). For this reason, it is of great importance to apply Panopticism and space in the political contexts of Pinter's time.

The second chapter associates Harold Pinter's life with the period he lived in. The political and historical background of the late twentieth century will be elucidated in this very chapter. In addition to this, Cold War is also another crucial case in my dissertation. This will be analysed in space theory throughout the later plays of Pinter in the analysis chapter. Since Pinter is affected by the consequences of Cold War, in his political plays influences of the war can be observed for that reason, spatiality of his plays will be examined from a Foucauldian perspective. In addition, other internal as well as international political incidents and issues like minority problems, the USA's abuse of power and Thatcher's politics will be handled.

The third chapter will analyse the plays The *Birthday Party* (1957), The *Dumb Waiter* (1957), *The Hothouse* (1958), *The Caretaker* (1960) from the viewpoint of local and narrow spaces and local powerholders that surveil confined people. The analyses of these plays will be based on the selected critics mentioned in the first chapter. The space-power will be dealt with in these aforecited plays by providing Foucault's power-space structures.

Likewise, the plays of his later period: *One for the Road* (1984), *The Mountain Language* (1988), *Ashes to Ashes* (1996) will be explored in terms of international, enlarged spaces and international power systems in the fourth chapter. These chapters will indicate how powerholders have changed through time and space, and how they led to the historical, cultural and political upheavals that occurred in Britain, and these chapters will shed light on panoptic gaze and spatial analysis drawn from afore-mentioned plays.

Therefore, the conclusion of the study will reveal that disciplinary power dominates throughout Pinter's early plays, but it is observed that there is a transition to authoritarian power in his late plays. It is also underlined that those local, narrow and limited spaces turn into enlarged, international spaces in Pinter's late plays. In addition to this, powerholders in selected plays have evolved internationally in Pinter's later period plays. In this sense, the concepts of space and power will be handled with due diligence in order to reveal that Pinter's slightly political plays of

the 1950s embrace local power and space configurations. On the other hand, overtly political plays after the 1980s cover international power and spatial attributes. Power and space will be observed with reference to social, political, religious and economic factors prevailed in the British society between the 1950s and the 1980s, and the political stance of the author will be discussed. These factors mentioned above determine the literature that society produces.

CHAPTER 1: FOUCAULT'S POWER DYNAMICS AND SPATIAL POLITICS

> "We are neither in the amphitheatre, nor on the stage, but in the panoptic machine, invested by its effects of power, which we bring to ourselves since we are part of its mechanism." Michel Foucault- *Discipline and Punish*

The theoretical chapter of this dissertation analyses the disciplinary power, Foucault's *Panopticon* and his *Of Other Spaces*. First of all, the philosopher's power theory, his ideas on space, power and knowledge are explored. This chapter engages in war politics, state politics and political space in line with Foucault's concept of *Panopticon*. A detailed analysis of power politics with reference to local and international space will be given in this chapter. In the light of this theoretical backdrop, Harold Pinter's early and late period plays will be studied in the following chapters.

In order to combine Foucault's concept of power with space, the discussion on Foucault's *Of Other Spaces* will be elaborated as a space theory; thus Pinter's plays are going to be analysed from different viewpoints regarding space. The chapter will encompass Jeremy Bentham's *Panopticon* and Foucault's notions on power and spatial politics. It is certain that Foucault's analysis of Bentham's *Panopticon* will contribute to the theoretical framework of the dissertation. The other mentioned thinkers' works on space will also be employed to support the argument of the dissertation. Disciplinary power and the sovereign power will be elucidated. The configurations of these powers will be applied to the works of Pinter in the analysis chapters. The next step will be to apply these powers with the spatial politics.

Foucault's power offers a perspective on the urban fabric as an integral factor at the configuration of society. Power relations and their effects are brought to life and stability by integrating them into formal structures. Foucault's concept of "power" is complex, intricate, and ubiquitous. For Foucault, power is equal extent, scope and duration with society; regulates and is extremely common and permeant. Foucault says "Power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday life." (*Power/Knowledge* 39)

Power cannot be seized in a dual structure: dominated and dominating. It can be oppressive in society, but it is also creative. It is a control mechanism that creates our cultural and social conditions. Foucault shows how power is substantiated in cultural and material institutions, including architectural demonstrations as he examines it in his analysis of the panopticon. In his study of the Panopticon, Foucault shows that architecture can become a device for manifacturing and maintaining power relations independent of the people who control it. (*Discipline and Punish* 201)

Foucault reveals how power is constructive and the result of a certain period and makes an in-depth examination of power relations, history and genealogy. In fact, power is historicized. Its special character and effects and nature belong to a certain period of history, cultural and social relations. That is, Foucault describes a fundamental shift in power relations from the top-down powers of the monarch to disciplinary modern and contemporary power relations where the power of the elite is not visible and difficult to grasp. This paradigm shift is essential because it highlights the emergence of the modern and contemporary era and how we are shaped within the social structure. In traditional power formations, as in the sovereign, power itself is made visible, revealed, and constantly exposed. The crowd is kept on the edge, only appearing on the fringes of the bright glow of power. Disciplinary power reverses these relationships. In fact, it is power itself that seeks invisibility. The things they affect on objects are made most visible. It is this phenomenon of surveillance, constant visibility that is key to discipline technology. On the contrary, in monarchical regimes it was the sovereign who had the greatest visibility, in modern times it is those who are to be observed, acknowledged and disciplined and they are the most visible under the institutions. (*Discipline and Punish* 201)

1.1 Foucault's *Panopticon* and A Foucauldian Reading of Power and Space

Power is a notion observed between individuals and communities. Power is defined as the authority or ability of an individual, a social group, a society to dominate, pressure and control other individuals, groups, or societies, interfere with their freedoms and force them to behave in certain ways. From primitive times to the present, power continues to exist as a fundamental power. It usually represents political power and is located at the highest level in the social hierarchy. Even though

it changes and transforms as an institutionalized power with the power to govern the society, it always maintains its existence. From past to present, feudalism and monarchy as traditional forms of power maintain their dominance for a long time. From the 18th century to the 20th century, with the constitutional administration, the power goes through a new process of change and continues its existence with a different mechanism. Post-structuralist thinkers, who emerged in the last quarter of the 20th century, oppose the structuralists and try to analyse modern power with their own theories.

Foucault states what he pursues in his "Power and Knowledge" interview is primarily knowledge and analysis of information; however, he later realizes that the real problem is the current problem of power. Working on this problem since 1955, he shows Fascism and Stalinism as the dark legacy of the 20th century. It deals with major problems such as the problem of misery, economic exploitation, and the creation of wealth. Marxists, historians and economists seek solutions to the problems of the 20th century. Foucault, in industrially developed countries, where there is excess of power, there is no problem of misery, in the 19th century, the state apparatuses, bureaucracy stresses the existence of capitalist regimes in which the excess of the power of individuals over one another is absolutely revolting (*Great Confinement* 167). Foucault's main question is to analyse the history of power traces and the way these mechanisms operate. The inspiration for this question is based on Nietzsche's relationship between knowledge and power. He sees power not as an institution, a structure, a state power, but as power relations between all power and knowledge. In the context of these power relations, it can be determined that the knowledge and power relations overlap in the approaches of Foucault and Althusser. While Foucault refers to the power of knowledge through institutions and the effect of power on individuals, Althusser also emphasizes that ideology is imposed by state apparatuses in the same way (Althusser 33). The main emphasis of both thinkers is that the state imposes a secret pressure on individuals through certain mechanisms and that the means of oppression represent a network formed in the lower layer of the state. Foucault does not develop his understanding of work in this direction through a theory; because he does not believe that there is only one truth. It carries out its studies on an interdisciplinary level. The most important point that he in concrete terms emphasizes is his opposition to theories that centre the subject. According to Foucault, the subject is not free by nature, he is surrounded by social norms from all

sides. Power relations build the subject's self. Based on this idea, it tries to get to the root of the problem; that is power relations. In this context, one of the basic concepts is “discourse-power-control”. With this understanding, Foucault reveals the forms of absolute power, disciplinary power and bio-power. Our study will be shaped through the disciplinary power included in Foucault's power analysis.

The Panopticon focuses on basic concepts such as 'Power', 'Power/Knowledge and discipline'. For the first time when we consider this concept, the Panopticon or Panopticon machine shows the real effect and discipline of surveillance or the emergence of surveillance in controlling behavior and the pedagogical effort of discipline on the body. The purpose of the Panopticon is to individualize the body by allowing it to be isolated and openly displayed by being submissive to permissible norms of behavior. Foucault believes that surveillance belongs to institutions, not just the prison. The Panopticon is a comprehensive example that clearly illustrates the concept of surveillance working in and with regimes of power and information. In the Panopticon, knowledge is the arrangement, standardization, theoretical and ideological motivation of the building, and power is the reason for the existence of the building and institutions. Power produces knowledge and knowledge produces power. It is the power of gaze that connects the functioning of Power-Knowledge as a disciplinary and normalizing force because it makes control necessary, and there is no control mechanism without surveillance.

Foucault considers schools, hospitals and mental institutions as the basic institutions in which all individuals are educated; they are places and centers of power-knowledge. Institutions do not exist in physical isolation; they exist and function within the wider social structure. Institutions develop within the larger structure of the state, the city, the urban, and the domestic. According to Foucault, the city and urban space connect, reproduce, expand and constitute the power-knowledge produced in the spaces of institutions where surveillance is still a disciplinary control mechanism.

> If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but say no, do you think one could be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things; it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative whose function is repression (*Power/knowledge* 119).

The similarity between an institution and its spatial style can be seen in Foucault's analysis of the Panopticon prison model in *Discipline and Punish*. As hospitals, the Panopticon is also based on the principle of spatial isolation of the body, but it goes even further. The panopticon is a special kind of prison:

> …at the periphery, an annular building; at the center, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other on the outside, allows the light to cross from the one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in the central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy... He is seen but he does not see; He is the object of information, never a subject in communication" (*Discipline and Punish* 200).

The prisoner, who is in a custody room where it can be seen easily, knows that he is constantly watched, without knowing whether he is being watched or not. The panopticon aims to achieve the internalization of implied norms. The Panopticon prisoner is subject to rules and under orders. If he does not follow the rules, he will be punished and will be dominated by an unknown power. Therefore, the prisoner has to control himself constantly. As a result of the dominance of external power and self-control, prisoners internalize certain norms. The prisoner does this by his own effort Foucault's analysis of the Panopticon prison model is intended to support a social practice of architectural arrangement. According to Foucault, the Panopticon is a social practice of holding prison, and this prison model shows how it is organized to achieve more than it can do on its own. The Panopticon prison model represents an active architectural organizing role that can function almost independently of social presence and reality.

The production of space in clinics, prisons or factories, or even the city in general, is not a neutral social praxis, says Foucault. He says that the exercise of power is a praxis dedicated to certain ends; spacecraft is essentially a power/knowledge. Therefore, we may not see space as a "normal" and neutral category, independent of social and political definitions. In this respect, space is not entirely composed of its sole material reality. The space contains its socio-functional characteristics and goals and has cultural-symbolic and representational layers. These aspects of spatial configurations, the relational characteristics and cultural

determinants of spaces can be read from Foucault's description and analysis of heterotopias. (Grbin 309).

In his concept of power/knowledge according to Foucault, space is shown as the instrument of the practice of power, a power whose power lies in the applied knowledge of spacecraft. It is the practice of power/knowledge in, within and alongside space. Foucault is clear that space is a crucial category of analysis, as it reveals areas where power or any other social category becomes visible. (West-Pavlov 160).

Social space, as reading Foucault can reveal, represents more than physical, material and thus empirical reality. We cannot produce knowledge about social space through the mere positivist scientific observation and measuring because it includes socio-cultural, symbolic layers that are open to different readings. Heterotopias show that the spatial configurations represent and have immanent cultural, functional, political, and symbolic meanings. Without scientific observation, we see space commonly, both social and natural, through these meanings – we see nice, we see shiny, we see dirty, see modern, kitschy or pastoral. Unless it is a heterotopia, we see normal. At the end, in social space we see reflection of our culture, values and society (Grbin 311).

Stuart Elden and Jeremy Crampton claim in *Space Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography* that matters of space permeate much of Foucault's works. It is interesting to note that in addition to prisons, the targets of the GIP (*Grouped'Information sur les Prisons)* included: "courts, cops, hospitals, asylums, school, military service, the press, television, the State", all of which deal with issues of space and geography. For Foucault, to protest these institutions was not a theoretical exercise but arose out of a personal desire to contest specific power relations. Throughout most of his life, and certainly in the 1970s, Foucault participated in political movements, and linked his intellectual work with a materialism that sought to expose everyday power struggles and their intolerable effects.

Elden and Crampton deal with questions focused on the questions of whether power as strategy implies war, whether geographers constitute their knowledge as a science, and how they conceive power. Many of their answers seem to be aligned

with Foucault's and the two thinkers' addition of space to knowledge and power is useful. For example, the editors of *Hérodote* assert in their response to Foucault's questions that while there is no fluid whole to power, strategy involves the topography of the "knowing-how-to think-space" (Crampton and Elden 24). Moreover, Brabant argues in response to Foucault's question about power that "what characterises power is the way that its internal complexity goes hand in hand with a multiform intervention on the place of space" (25). Racine and Raffestin state in response to Foucault's question about science that "Geographers no longer begin with science, but with 'popular knowledge'", in order to "produce a counter-discourse of possible alternatives" (32). The purpose of doing so, they contend, is to allow for more "democratic control" over the "production of their space", which, in their view, is the sole criteria of the truth.

In a 1967 lecture, Michel Foucault states, "the present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed" (*Of Other Spaces* 22). Foucault's foresight attained greater prominence towards the end of the 20th century, and in today's ever-globalizing world, space has a distinctive role in critical thought, and spatiality has become a hermeneutic tool as significant as temporality in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Foucault became extremely influential in so many domains of thought. His profound interest in the architecture, the spatial organization, the bodily practices and the material configurations of human interaction and social organization was not only illuminating itself, but also inspired scholars in a wide range of disciplines to turn their gaze to the spatial dimension of human activities. Foucault is but one among many thinkers, such as Henri Lefebvre (1991), Gaston Bachelard (1964), Michel de Certeau (1984), David Harvey (2001), Saskia Sassen (1991), Edward Soja (1996), and Iris Young (1990) to name a few who have discovered space and used it as a critical and analytical tool during the second half of the twentieth century.

While Surveillance Studies has developed a strong attachment to *the panopticon* as a guiding theoretical inspiration, the concept's genesis as both an architectural drawing and a set of letters, *as interpreted by Foucault*, is largely unexplored (see Wood 2007 for some exception to this oversight). Studies of Foucauldian panopticism often treat Bentham as an introductory footnote and fail to

question how *the panopticon* has emerged from a decidedly selective translation and interpretation. Oscar Gandy (1993), for instance, in the seminal book *The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information*, says only that "It is from Foucault that I derive the underlying concept of panopticism... The *Panopticon* is the *name* given by Jeremy Bentham to the design for a prison…" (9).

To speak of the panopticon, in other words, is a reference only of Foucault's words, not the distinct interpretation of Bentham's *panopticon* plans and letters. The panopticon was not just a name or title for a building coined by Bentham, it was a sustained political project, and a schematic drawing of a reformist liberalism. It was in other words an expression of a much broader political philosophy, replete with an architectural drawing to explicate its intended effects. The core theoretical and political contributions of Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* cannot be grasped without noting the diversions, interpretations, strategic omissions, and out-right rejection of passages from Bentham's series of letters on the *Panopticon* from 1787 (see Bentham 1995).

Bentham's panoptic writings were developed and subsequently published as a series of letters and an architectural drawing of a prison that invoke strong visual imagery of sightlines and architectural viewpoints. They connote a plan in the making, a proposal whose components were expressed and shared in specific details, moving the reader through exact measurements for an entire building. The first set of letters (numbers I-VI) are designed to capture the imagination of the addressee, the last two (letters V and VI) subsequently provide an overarching summary of the panopticon's architectural advantages. In conjunction with the drawings or plans of the panopticon these introductory letters form the fundamental architectural or diagrammatic components of Foucauldian panopticism – they invoke a plan that embodies a theory of power.

Focusing on these first six letters we can clearly see where Foucault in many respects inverts the governmental aspirations of Bentham's panopticon, an interpretation that places the panoptic subject at the centre of the panopticon. The distinction moves the focus away from the building as such, to the prisoners, from the act of directly watching to the probability of being watched. The role of the panopticon's tower and 'inspector 'to use Bentham's term, serves as a fundamental difference between the two authors' work. The second of the panopticon letters

introduces the importance of the centre of the building, for Bentham much more than a tower or viewing position – the tower also doubles as a residence: "The apartment of the inspector occupies the centre; you may call it if you please the '*inspector's lodge*' (Bentham 35). Bentham further explains that as a familial, domestic space the lodge plays a key role in the efficient monitoring of the inmates:

A very material point is, that room be allotted to the lodge, sufficient to adapt it to the purpose of a complete and constant habitation for the principal inspector or head keeper, and his family. The more numerous also the family, the better; since, by this means, there will in fact be as many inspectors, as the family consists of persons, though only one will be paid for it (44).

Bentham, in short, instilled a patriarchal regime of surveillance at the center of his panopticon, one that emphasized the intransigent, immobility of the inspector and family, as much if not more that the prisoners themselves. In Bentham's panopticon the inspector and family are themselves effectively isolated, segregated or ironically jailed, a set of characteristics more commonly associated with Foucault's prisoners. For the family in the tower there is seemingly little else to do but watch. Watching for Bentham is automated. Foucault too agrees that the panopticon produces an automatic effect, yet with no reference to the residence and its workings at the heart of Bentham's panopticon. Foucault's panopticon emphasizes an enactment of surveillance, a subjectivation of power, as instilled in prisoners who architecturally speaking must assume ubiquitous surveillance that they may be under inspection at any time, night or day. What distinguishes Foucault and Bentham's definition of *the panopticon* is *perspective*, meaning the view outward from the residence, the tower – in Bentham's terms a site and mode of "seeing without being seen" (43). Conversely, for Foucault *the panopticon* could not be reduced or framed by a unidirectional gaze from the centre, tower or singular managerial gaze. Conceptually, for Foucault, the prisoners, not the tower, are at the centre of the panopticon. For Foucault *the panopticon* served as a metaphor, contrary to Bentham it was not to be coupled with – or reliant upon – the very act of watching; it was to be viewed as a logic and process. Foucault dubbed the panopticon a 'laboratory of power', not only to highlight its experimental nature, but also to indicate its continuous search for improvement, its 'gains in efficiency' (Foucault 204). But, most importantly for Foucault:

> …the *Panopticon* must not be understood as a dream building: it is the diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form; its functioning, abstracted from any obstacle, resistance, or friction, must be represented as a pure architectural and optical system: it is in fact a figure of political technology that may and *must be detached from any specific use* (205).

Unlike Bentham then, Foucault's panopticon insisted upon its figural qualities, its iterability a term Agamben (2010) uses to note the productive potential of systems that constantly repeat functions. Foucault also employed a definition of surveillance that extended right to the 'top' of Bentham's hierarchy with the inspector also under surveillance. In Foucault's own words:

> The *Panopticon* may even provide an apparatus for supervising its own mechanisms. In this central tower, the director may spy on all the employees that he has under his orders: nurses, doctors, foremen, teachers, warders; he will be able to judge them continuously, alter their behaviour, impose upon them the methods he thinks best; and it will even be possible to observe the director himself…enclosed as he is in the middle of this architectural mechanism, is not the director's own fate entirely bound up with it? (Foucault 204)

Foucault defines surveillance as the disciplinary power that is a tool for ordering, organizing and normalizing individuals. As in the Foucauldian panopticon, the observer in the tower knows what the prisoners are doing in their cells; but the inmates have no knowledge of whether he is there or not.

1.2 Foucault's "Of Other Spaces"

Michel Foucault states that the 19th century is the age of history, and the 20th century is that of space. He attached special importance to space in analyzing societies utilizing the concept of "heterotopia", a term he introduced expending thus the discourse on space in the field of social sciences. Heterotopia can differ from one to other cultural areas and can accommodate different periods and places within a single space. The term 'heterotopia' was used by Foucault in one of his lectures given to a group of architectural students in 1967. This lecture was published in 1986 in an essay entitled 'Of Other Spaces'. Although this is a theory to be explored for exploring spatial relations in the field of architecture, its implications could be extended to various other fields. Foucault, in this lecture proposes ideas and new ways of thinking about 'space' or 'spaces' in a globalized world where heterotopias are like "counter-sites". A concept which has been considered ambiguous and incomplete in its attempts of definition by some has also remained a topic of much discussion and debate for many. It serves as a base for understanding complex urban

spaces in a globalised society. These spaces form a part of our modern urbanized identities and cultures as well and according to Foucault, the concept of heterotopias is like a disruptive force, a way to think about things differently. Foucault's lecture historicizes the concept of spatial existence and probes into the problem of juxtaposing heterotopias with real spaces of our existence. He talks about tensions and contradictions in these sites of contradiction which exist since the conception of civilization. Foucault, while theorizing with the post -modern condition of existential reality in the modern European world, has also pointed out several real spaces that serve as examples for heterotopias. Foucault's theory about the formation of the ideal subject in 'different spaces' or 'other spaces' are dealt with in his later work Discipline and Punish. His own published lecture is however insufficient in this respect and there are a handful of scholars who have been working on elaborating and extending his theories in their research works.

Foucault claims that a proper and definitive definition of space might never be possible as our life is perhaps still governed by a certain number of oppositions that remains almost unbreakable ("Of Other Spaces" 16). Certain oppositional institutions and practices are still considered as givens like the difference between public space and private space, between family space and social space, between cultural space and useful space, leisure and work etc. (16). Foucault considers that the chief anxiety of our era lies in the consideration of space as more important than that of time as part of our existence (15). Foucault claims that the space in which we live or the space in which our daily experiences occur is not at all a homogeneous one but a heterogeneous one (16). Our daily experiences take their shape amidst a network of relations originating in separate yet interlinked spaces both in domestic and public sphere. These spaces are closed or semi- closed sites like the house, the bedroom, the bed, the pub, the garden etc. Foucault proposes his interest to be in those sites that have the 'curious property of being in relation with all other sites in such a way that those sites can mirror or reflect and contradict at the same time' (17).

Coming back to the concept of heterotopia/s, it can be said that the idea of the other space or the different space can also however not be limited to Foucault himself. There have been scholars to extend on this subject and its implication. Edward Soja and Henri Lefebvre are some of the well-established scholars working on the theory of space from various disciplines. Foucault claims that there has been a

history of space and it is also not possible to separate the concept of time and space. He mentions Galileo and his role in changing the concept of space in its totality (15). Human idea of existence was challenged when the reality, that, the earth is moving around the sun was discovered. The idea of the possibility of the existence of an open and unending space beyond our comprehension was propagated. Post urbanization, the concept of space/s started receiving a different kind of attention in geographical and architectural fields. It was not the empty open space of the outer cosmic world but one that keeps on forming and reforming as the experiences of our lived space is inside that of a set of relations which determine all other experiences of living. In a globalized world, the space in which we live is thus given to us 'in the form of relations between emplacements' (15). Distinctions are drawn between Family Space and Social space, between Cultural space and useful space, between the space of leisure and that of work etc. All these concepts of space/s are a result of a certain amount of unspoken 'sacralisation' or segregation of those particular spaces. Foucault has used the word 'emplacement' in several places. The word 'emplacement' implies that the relationship between locations in space is also the constitutive principle behind the perception of that space as well. He talks about the emplacement sites like passages, the streets, trains etc. and also sites of temporary halts like cafes, cinemas, beaches etc. which can be defined through that network of relations that interrelates them (16). There is also the closed or semi closed emplacements of rest that goes behind the making of the house, the bedroom, the bed etc.

The concept of space is broadly divided by Foucault into two: utopias and heterotopias. Utopias do not exist in reality but have their origin lying in a vision of perfection (17). He also adds that heterotopias are those places, which have evolved in the process of creating utopias. These spaces are like 'counter sites', kind of places that are outside all places and are also localizable. The mirror is shown as a very good example of a proper heterotopia. Foucault continues with the six principles of a space termed as heterotopias/s, namely: the 'heterotopias of crisis' and 'heterotopias of deviation', the pre-existing heterotopias made to function in a very different manner, heterotopias juxtaposing several spaces in a single real space, heterotopias of time called as 'heterochronisms', isolated heterotopias with distinct system of opening and closing and spaces having relation to all other spaces and performing a

function according to that (17) He has provided examples for the above mentioned various kinds of heterotopias and sketched a detailed analysis of his thoughts about space. Foucault however talks of the mirror before beginning with his analysis on heterotopias and refers of it being a utopia as it is one kind of a 'placeless place' (17) according to him. The mirror embodies a space which is unreal and virtual at the same time. The reflection of the subject in the mirror is also a projection of one's self in a place where he or she is actually not present. It is like a shadow that shows the presence of the body in a place where it is not. The mirror is said to function as a 'heterotopia' in this respect as its existence is different from that of all other spaces (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 17). The six principles through which Foucault has chosen to describe the phenomenon of heterotopias is termed as 'heterotopology' by him.

The first principle takes into account that all cultures in the world do have heterotopias. Their existence however might be embodied in various forms not visible in common eyes so easily. These heterotopias can obviously take various forms and there can be no universal form of heterotopia existing as such. Foucault begins by citing the reference of the 'crisis heterotopias' in primitive societies ("Of Other Spaces" 18). The word 'crisis' over here implies those places which are kind of privileged or sacred or forbidden and reserved for those individuals who are in relation to society always in a state of crisis and thus are seen occupying different space in themselves. Such spaces are one of those inhabited by people who are passing through any particular phase in their lives and their existence is not in particular terms with the existing dominant mode of life in the society. Although such a demarcation was better found to be existing in the primitive society, a few remnants can still be found in the modern world as well. The crisis heterotopias of the primitive world are said to be consisting of temporary phases in life like that of the growing up boy or the period known as adolescence, the elderly, the pregnant women etc (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 18). The heterotopias of the modern world are different from that of the primitive world. The modern world heterotopias in our society are for example, the boarding schools in its nineteenth century form or military service for young men playing different roles and all other spaces such as the nowhere, the heterotopias without any proper geographical markers. Foucault however remarks that the heterotopias of crisis are rapidly disappearing in the

modern age and these are getting replaced by spaces what can be termed as heterotopias of deviation. These places are like those 'other' spaces in which the behaviour of the inhabitants is 'deviant' (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 18) or different in relation to the required or established mode of behaviour. Examples provided in the essay are rest homes and psychiatric hospitals, the prisons, the old age homes, the asylums etc.

These are classified as the heterotopias holding deviant modes of behaviour in respect to that of the expected mode. The inhabitants existing in the above mentioned spaces are said to be existing somewhere in the borderline between the heterotopias of crisis and the heterotopias of deviation as these inhabitants are seen to be facing a period of crisis in their and their behaviour is also not considered to be normal and thus deviant in one sense. Thus they can be said to be belonging somewhere in between that of the heterotopias of crisis and heterotopias of deviation or inhabiting both the above mentioned spaces (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 18).

The second principle for the description of heterotopias as given by Foucault assumes that one existing heterotopia can be made to function in various other ways ("Other spaces" 18). Although each heterotopia does have a specific function of its own within the society, it can also have a different function as well. He cites the example of the cemetery in this case. A cemetery in the European culture holds a very special space in the lives of all Europeans. Most of them have a connection with it due to their deceased relatives. So it is connected with all sites of the city, state, country, village and society. The architectural positioning of the cemeteries has however changed since the eighteenth century. Prior to the eighteenth century the cemeteries usually occupied a sacred position in the central part of the cities, churches, houses or communities. It was however from the beginning of the nineteenth century that the new cemeteries started to be located at the outside border of cities. A gradual change in human perception of the death happened from the course of the eighteenth century to the nineteenth. The pious believes of people regarding the dead was somewhat centred upon the idea of resurrection and the immortality of the soul and lesser attention was given to the physical body of the dead. A gradual doubt and uncertainty regarding the presence of souls and the concept of resurrection after death shifted the attention towards the physical bodies of the dead. Scientific developments in the beginning of the nineteenth century

acquainted Europeans about the contagious aspect of various kinds of illness that could spread due to the dead being buried in and around the populated areas of the community in both cities and villages. This consciousness was perhaps, as Foucault explains the major reason for shifting the cemeteries from the 'sacred and immortal' heart of the city to that of the suburban separate space in the margins ("Of Other Spaces" 19). Thus the existing heterotypic space of the cemetery gets transformed from the central position to that of the margins across centuries.

Foucault cites the example of another and the third principle of classifying heterotopias. These heterotopias can project several incompatible juxtaposing spaces in one single real space ("Of Other Spaces" 19). He cites the example of a theatre, a cinema, or a medieval garden in order to describe this principle, in case of a theatre, the spectators experience a whole set of places that are kind of alien to each other on the single stage. In case of a cinema, the audience are made to imagine or enjoy the projection of a three-dimensional space on a two-dimensional screen. The most interesting heterotopia falling under this principle is the garden in Orient culture. Foucault writes, "... the garden... had very deep and superimposed meanings" ("Of Other Spaces" 20). The traditional garden of the Persians was a sacred space structured into a rectangle representing four parts of the world. This sacred space or the garden consisted of a central piece of architecture like the fountain or the water basin in the middle of the rectangle. The entire mass of vegetation would grow around this central space and come together in this imaginary centre of perfection. The garden is thus like a microcosmic spatial representation of the entire world, and at the same time is a very small part occupying a different space in the geography of the entire world (Foucault, Of Other Spaces 19-20).

Foucault talks of the fourth principle in determining heterotopias. He terms them as 'heterochronies' or heterotopias of time ("Of Other Spaces" 20*)*. These spaces function when the inhabitants can reach at a sort of absolute break with the traditional time in those spaces. The cemetery can be used as an example in this respect as with the loss of life is associated the idea of eternity which is actually a kind of break in the traditional mode of time. The other instances of such heterotopias are the Museums and libraries as in these spaces time keeps on building up since ages. Libraries and Museums are places of "all times, all epochs'', and "all tastes" ("Of Other Spaces" 20). Museums and Libraries are heterotopias where

accumulation of time takes place across history qualifying them in the category of heterotopias. The other kind of heterotopias of time is those that are linked to time in its transitory aspect and these spaces are absolutely temporal. Temporary fairgrounds, festival grounds, vacation villages etc. are live examples of such heterotopias (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 20). The fifth principle talks about the opening and closing of any heterotypic site which is not freely accessible to all. The entry in such a space is possible only after going through certain rules and permissions. These rituals associated with opening and closing rites not only isolates them but also makes them penetrable at the same time. Examples for such spaces would be places of particular kind which are although rare not completely absent from the world. People choosing to enter these heterotypic sites are under the illusion that they are entering one particular place where the fact of their entry is actually excluded. Here Foucault talks about the famous bedrooms existing on the great farms of Brazil and several other places in South America. People entering these rooms did not have any access to the family quarters as these people were uninvited guests in need of these spaces. Foucault uses the American motel rooms as examples for this principle ("Of Other Spaces" 21).

Foucault writes, "The last trait of heterotopias is that they have a function in relation to the rest of space a function...Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes all real space... Or else, on the contrary, creating another space... ("Of Other Spaces" 21)". So the sixth and last principle of heterotopias talks about spaces which are either an illusion exposing the reality of all other spaces and the 'other' kind of space, which tries to project itself as one that is perfect and mostly well arranged in comparison to other real spaces. The first kind is the 'heterotopias of illusion' and the second one is termed as the 'heterotopias of compensation' (Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" 21). The writer establishes the example of a brothel for the 'heterotopias of illusion' as the activities in a brothel actually exposes the hidden reality of societies in all cultures. He brings up the example of the establishment of colonies as an act creating the 'heterotopias of compensation'. The colonies established in the beginning of the seventeenth century by Puritan Societies in America were like perfect other spaces or heterotopias of compensation. The colonies were structured according to a perfect plan. There would be the village houses with the families living over there, practising religion on particular days,

following a regular daily schedule, having its own cemetery, own church etc. Christianity was behind the making of the geographical space of the American colonies in the European world. These colonies had the regular life of their inhabitants regulated from morning till night as expected by the established period of time. Thus brothels and colonies are like two extreme types of heterotopias in the sixth or last principle (*Foucault,* "Of Other Spaces" 22*).* Foucault ends his lecture by giving the example of the boat or ship as a floating piece of space connecting all other places. This floating piece of architecture is one among the temporal heterotopias without any permanent geographical location, representing several spaces in a single real space and perhaps the 'perfect other' space of illusion, real and imaginary at the same time. He uses the phrase 'heterotopia par excellence', ("Of Other Spaces" 22) for describing the ship, which has remained one of the greatest modes of economic development in our civilization for centuries.

Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* talks about the idea of space from the spatial geographer's point of view. It is thought that Lefebvre's project concerning the idea of social space had Foucault's idea of space and the concept of the formation of subject at its centre. The concept of space was linked with the formation of human body as a subject existing in such heterotopias and the kind of relationship that was formed between these subjects and their living spaces through a network of power. In his *Discipline and Punish,* Foucault theorized a regime of modern power that he says has been working upon the creation of disciplined bodies or what he calls 'docile bodies' (135). These docile bodies are made to follow a particular disciplining routine for their daily existence in places like the prison, the correction homes etc. The prison may be imagined as an example of heterotopias which can be classified under the principle of 'heterotopias of deviation'. It is about how bodies confined in a particular space are actually captured in the web or network of power. Although the concept of heterotopias remains unresolved as to what should actually be included and excluded from this concept, Foucault was perhaps able to make the concept of 'space' or 'spaces' function in the epistemology of the postmodern discourse. Various scholars from various fields have opened a wide variety of studies on the topic of heterotopias which has come to be known as Heterotopian studies. Critical responses have also grown on this topic. The school of heterotopian studies has people like Edward Soja, Gennochio, Saunders, pointing out

the various implications in this field. Genocchio has questioned whether Foucault's over elaborative examples of different or other spaces is at all plausible. He doubts whether all the associated sites are at all true heterotopias in the proper sense of the term ("Interpretations of Heterotopia" 1) Soja's claim is that Foucault's accounts of heterotopias are 'incomplete and inconsistent' and they are only rough and sketchy works to some (Johnson 1). The problem of heterotopias and making it work in the practical field is that, there are no definite ways of locating these spaces. The concept of heterotopias is in itself considered to be of an imaginary nature in itself by some. Locating heterotopias in real world is not free from contradictions as particular criteria of locating a heterotopia are controversial as well. Genocchio, Soja and other similar critics have also speculated about the possibility of the heterotopian spaces to be serving as 'sites of resistance' as well (Allweil and Kallus 192).

The theory on heterotopias has been provoking multiple responses in the architectural field as the concept is considered to have become a dominant theme of discussion for architectures belonging to the 'postmodern urban space'. It would be important to draw a brief reference to Lefebvre's idea of space over here. As implied in his work on this topic, Lefebvre draws upon the theory of space from three different but interrelated structures of space and concludes that the production of space also produces different patterns of communication for each. Whether heterotopias have any existence outside the structures of social power or not is also a matter of interest for her. The essay in itself has also seen to acquire a different space in the entire school of criticism. Foucault's heterotopias are problematic, yet it challenges, advances, enriches and complicates our understanding of the evolution and history of space and its various other implications.

CHAPTER 2: THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE 1950s AND THE 1980s IN BRITAIN

Harold Pinter is almost always credited with the theatrical movement "Theatre of the Absurd", which is a kind of post-war playwriting and the term was coined by a theatre critic, Martin Esslin; however, Pinter refused to be given any distinctive label. Nevertheless, many critics and scholars regarded him as an inheritor to the tradition developed by Eugene Ionesco, Samuel Beckett and the others. Later in his political drama, although he stated that he is indifferent to political issues and distant from politics, and though he refuses any given label, his dramatic output (earlier, middle and late stages) is marked in his earlier plays "slightly" political, in his late plays "overtly" political. Till the 1980s, his own statements almost always foregrounded his distaste for politics throughout his playwriting. The tradition of post-war political theatre in Britain that covers socialism for its political vision did not appeal to Harold Pinter because Pinter did not have partisan viewpoints. Political playwrights such as John Arden and Edward Bond have considered Pinter insufficiently clear, rational, and informative in his political theatre (Billington 333-4). This is because Pinter shows little interest in class consciousness and identity politics compared to the other playwrights concerned with post-war British drama. Pinter's transition to political plays occurred at the time of other contemporary playwrights' losing pre-eminence on British stage.

Pinter's overtly political plays coincided with the waning of John Arden, Arnold Wesker, Edward Bond, David Mercer, David Hare, Howard Brenton, Howard Barker, David Edgar, Caryl Churchill (Peacock 33). This tradition of radical theatre came to an end by the time of Pinter's conversion to overtly political plays. The work of writers such as John Arden, Edward Bond and Arnold Wesker had effectively been marginalized or self-marginalized in terms of the established British theatre, while characteristically Pinteresque features such as a concentration on personal anxiety, a disbelief in the existence of political solutions, a distrust of language, and a scepticism about the possibility of historical change, had permeated the playwriting of authors such as David Hare, Howard Brenton, and David Edgar (Grimes 1-3).

Harold Pinter was born in Hackney, London borough in East End in 1930. Pinter's birth coincided with the rise of anti-Semitism movement in Europe which influenced the western part of London. Pinter's birthplace was mainly inhabited by Jewish population and upon the break of World War II, Pinter was evacuated with others. He could return to London only in 1944. Pinter painfully recalls his return to London as the very first thing he saw was a flying bomb and sometimes when he opened the front door, he found the garden in ashes. Living in this environment affected Pinter's conception of the class system that was present in Britain, as well as educated him as to where the Jewish people fit into that system (Mskhaladze 390).

The dissertation will investigate the influence of power which he could not get over in his childhood and youth led him to write his scripts, how he was overwhelmed by the consequences of the Second World War and how Hitler's power influenced his own playwriting, and lastly the correlation between the power that Pinter experienced in his life. In addition, Chapter Two will encompass Pinter's mastery of pauses and silences, the definition of the term "Pinteresque" describing the idiosyncrasies of Harold Pinter's artistic output, and lastly his anti-Thatcher views.

Mel Gussow's interview with Pinter, "A Conversation (Pause) with Pinter" discusses Pinter's youth. Pinter claims that he remembers very little about his childhood, "If you ask me to tell my childhood stories, I would find it almost impossible" (Gussow 29). Pinter's lack of memory of his youth suggests that he tried to repress a past that was too hard to forget. He claims that "I can't remember so much, but it is not actually forgotten. It exists because it has not simply gone. I carry it with me. If you really remember everything you would blow up. You can't carry the burden." (29) Pinter's reflections suggest that his need to forget his childhood led him to withhold the trauma he survived, only to have it manifest itself in his plays.

The themes that recur in his plays distinctly reflect his Jewish background. Pinter recognises that his fascination with "dominance and subservience" has become a common theme in his plays (Gale 18). Steven H. Gale discusses Pinter's themes, suggesting that they are all ultimately related. He refers to Bernard Dukore's analysis of Pinter's work, who describes Pinter's writing as "a picture of contemporary man beaten down by the social forces around him, based on man's failure to communicate with other men" (17). The idea that Pinter's plays reflect a

type of social oppression can be traced back to Pinter's own youth experiences. His childhood fears deeply rooted in his psyche had a great impact on his career as a playwright. He always remained a Jewish child who had experienced World War II and was shattered and scared. His childhood memories are a leitmotif for Pinter's whole career (Mskhaladze 390)

When Pinter began his playwriting career in 1957, one idea was foremost in his mind as a major theme: fear. As a young Jew living through the early days of World War II,he had gone to bed afraid that he might be awakened in the night by a knock at the door and that he and his parents would be taken forcibly from their home by unknown assailants, a vivid image drawn by the tales of Hitler's Germany (Gale 18). Pinter himself stated in interviews that he could hardly bring his childhood memories back and was unable to recall any stories whatsoever. Pinter's bad memory or absence of his childhood memories implies his unconscious will to suppress his past and escape from it. He would rather forget than remember such a malign past.

In Miriam Gross's interview, "Pinter on Pinter," Pinter discusses his suspicion of political structures and governments and the way that the government manipulates people for its own gain. His political point of view comes from his strong feeling about war. He states, "I felt very strongly about the war. And still do, if you see what I mean. After all, I wasn't a child by the time it ended; though I was when it began" (Gross 39). Pinter's reflections on war reveal that perhaps he has buried his childhood memories, only because they were too painful or difficult to live with. This repression is important to consider when analysing Pinter's work, especially since he was victim to anti-Semitism. Pinter's childhood, the most formative years of a person's life, has a strong influence on his playwriting. Pinter's plays are influenced by events and moments from his past, whether or not they are consciously recognisable. For example, his plays are noted for their use of silence and cryptic small talk. Pinter's major plays are usually set in a single room, whose occupants are threatened by forces or people whose precise intentions cannot be defined by neither the characters nor the audience. Often these characters are engaged in a struggle for survival or control. It is arguable that Pinter's plays depict his lifelong awareness of the discrimination of a minority group. Susan Hollis Merritt notes Pinter's Jewishness in her article "Major Critics, Strategies, and Trends in Pinter Criticism." Pinter's "repressed wishes and fears are extrapolated from

characters' dramatizedones; his repressed ambivalence and anguish about his own Jewishness in an alien, hostile world motivate tensions and ambiguities characterising human relationships with others in his plays" (Merritt 314).

His early plays were ones that represent a subconscious characterisation of the Holocaust. More importantly, the plays act as a political commentary on the way that power corrupts people. Although Britain was never occupied by the Nazi Regime during World War II, there was a strong anti-Semitic attitude prevalent in London, an attitude that forced the British Jews to live in fear as well. Pinter's experience of growing up in a political minefield would later manifest itself in his work, both creatively and politically; however, despite his Jewish identity, Pinter does not reflect anti-Nazi thoughts in his political plays. (Halwas 7).

Pinter's Jewish origin, his painful war experiences, and childhood memories played a significant role in his future political life too. Pinter despised Cold War policy which he officially demonstrated by the refusal of military service. He also joined apartheid movement as he shuddered against the deeds of Americans committed in Vietnam. He also supported anti-Thatchergroup who were against policies carried out by Ms. Thatcher. Pinter condemned the foreign policy of America and Britain after World War II. People did not feel safe anymore in the world they dwelt, especially after World War II. People had not forgotten holocaust and definitely their life was not secured from human evil and malice. The main causes for this cruelty were the heads of the states who did not exercise any credibility among citizens and as a result of their wrong policies more and more people were under threat. This feeling of threat was further intensified during Cold War tensions between western and eastern blocs. The world was before the threat of a Nuclear War. As might be expected, under such circumstances, Pinter's characters rush to rooms and spaces to keep away from hostile environment existing outside. Pinter's early plays are discreetly political. Pinter hides those political messages so delicately that on the surface it is difficult to label them as political plays. Thus, during the 1950s-60s Pinter was never considered a political playwright. It is true that Pinter started writing plays in 1957 but the first play which is considered an overtly political was written after three decades in the 1980s. When Pinter started writing political plays, they were met by skepticism from the society. To begin with, public disapproved Pinter's decision to diverge from his traditional plays. They were

doubtful about his political commitment and artistic autonomy. They believed it is not a playwright's obligation to write about politics. The public became disinterested in Pinter's plays; they thought it included shallow political messages. However, what they did not realize was that Pinter's politics here did not imply making political statements praising any party politics but what he intended was to portray those malicious intents of political systems aimed at suppressing and demeaning humans. In this case, Pinter will question and cast doubt on the truth of the accepted norm of society (Mskhaladze 391).

In domestic and international politics, Britain goes through significant changes; for instance, India's declaration of independence in 1947 blemished Britain's national strength and international reputation. Furthermore, as Peacock explains, "Chinese involvement in the Korean War of 1951 and Russia's blockading of Berlin in 1947 and its invasion of Hungary in 1956 inspired fear of Communist expansionism. Finally, most threatening of all was the adoption of the atomic bomb by both East and West. By 1956, Britain was socially and politically very different from what it had been in 1939" (7). Taking all these events into consideration, controlling and surveillance become the central issues of maintaining a stable economy and creating a working welfare state in the political arena. Michel Foucault's discussion of the birth of the prison and Jeremy Bentham's design of the *Panopticon* will be correlated regarding the social conditions in terms of domestic and international affairs during the post-War years Britain.

Pinter's political turn is that both the attacks he was subjected to in the public press at the height of Thatcherite Britain, and the criticism he received from his scholarly admirers were entirely predictable. Pinter was exposed to personal and critical censure from reviewers, critics due to his public image as a politically engaged author.

The Cold War and early post-Cold War era in which Pinter turned to politics is an ironic moment given the current status of politics, of the prospects for historical change, and even of the very notion of history. Power is always a defining element of human relationships. Indifference of others allows power and cruelty to function freely. Conflicts become battles for survival of identity and self, and struggles over protected, protective spaces and rooms are ever present. Victimisation, hierarchy, terror, ostracisation of individuals, and interrogations which are so close to torture

intensely recur in Pinter's dramatic output since its beginnings, and they are prominent in plays not first thought to be political, such as *The Room, The Birthday Party* and *The Dumb Waiter.* (Grimes 6-7)

Pinter's works have travelled through time and space. As his characters are meant to be portrayed as room dwellers who secure themselves against any danger or harm in his earlier plays in the late 1950s, his characters in the 1980s moved from the domestic sphere into the public sphere. This domestic sphere in which post-war stricken and especially Holocaust victims take shelter in order to ensure their safety is the epitome of enclosed spaces depicted by Pinter. Pinter's "rooms" represent escape from the threat, menace or any hazardous attack because the horror outside threatens their life. The menace outside is dreadful and those who hold the power are those who inflict violence. These threatening interveners who create chaotic atmosphere in the earlier plays turn into oppressive governors in his late plays in terms of spatiality of the characterisation. This domestic sphere turns into a universally oppressive space filled with violence, rape, death and surveillance. In his late plays, it is seen that the dramatised space has been widened both literally and figuratively. The image of the "room" is superseded by the global cities and foreign countries as the locus of oppression and the centre of political power. His late plays go beyond the world of the theatre and become a sharply political scene in the 1980s.

The persecution in Poland and extermination of Jews in Odessa which led to the evacuation of Pinter's grandparents, the Blitz which was nighttimebombing against London and other British cities by Nazi Germany during World War II, and the Holocaust horrors caused Pinter to be a conscientious objector at the military service at the age of eighteen. It is seen that Pinter's plays bear the trace of political, historical and cultural circumstances of his present and his past. The fear and the violence European people suffered are mirrored in almost all his plays. The post-war stricken homelanders suffered the psychological turmoil, thereupon implications of threat and long pauses in his plays can be traced back to the silence of the Holocaust victims. As can be deduced from the historical and political circumstances, in Harold Pinter's literary texts, history is built and fictionalized, for this reason it is necessary to conduct a keen analysis of the text in order to decipher the socio-cultural and political conditions surrounding Pinter's works.

Pinter's childhood terrors led him to be an objector of war politics. Furthermore, in the 1980s Pinter's political position became more widely known through his involvement in *PEN* which is a worldwide writers' association defending writers and readers in the UK and all around the world whose human right to freedom of expression is at risk, *Amnesty International* and *the 20 June Group* and a growing concern for censorship and civil liberties.

It is pertinent here to mention political background of the twentieth century between 1930 and 1980. It is a century full of conflicts, wars, and destructions the sufferings of which were reflected in the literary texts written in that century. The First World War, also known as the Great War, caused the death of some ten million people, left many injured and bereaved, and shattered the emotional lives of millions more. It left scars on the minds of these millions that took a long time to heal. Those scars, with their gravity, continue to haunt modern consciousness reminding their unimaginable horrors and casualties. Contrary to the rhetoric of the time, it proved not to be the war to end all wars but rather brought about the Second World War, which was the bloodiest and deadliest of all wars. Despite being separated by only two decades, the First and Second World War were not similar (Keegan 3).

The Second World War despite being a continuation of the First World War, extended boundaries as well as advanced war weapons and technologies. While the former was "five times more destructive of human lives and incalculably more costly in material terms" (3) the latter, on the other hand, aimed at re-ordering the world and gaining control over it, and marked the eradication of inferior or undesirable others from the earth. These two wars consumed more wealth, killed more people and inflicted more pain and suffering than any of the previous wars in human history. Shortly after the Great War, the 1930s witnessed enormous changes in Russia, Stalin rose to power while Germany experienced Nazism under Hitler who, in order "to rebut the imputation of war guilt" (1) of the First World War; and to retrieve Germany's place in the world, went to war. He justified his invasion of Poland at the beginning of the Second World War and the results were catastrophic. Although Hitler's Germany initiated the war with the aim of conquering Europe, the Second World War soon turned into a disastrous war between the Allies (France, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States) and the Nazi Germany.

There was an enormity of events that originated from the upheavals of 1939; however, the Holocaust was one of the most inhumane and darkest episodes of the war. Holocaust after 1945 acquired a new meaning: the systematic murdering of six million Jews and more than five million gypsies, homosexuals, the disabled and all Slavic peoples by Hitler's Nazi Germany during the Second World War. Hitler initiated his ethnic cleansing by sending his mobile killing squads to search out and kill Jews and other undesirables. Murders started in the form of shooting Jews in large numbers and depositing them in pits, such as in one of the largest massacre sites BabiYar in Kiev, Ukraine where around 100,000 Jews were killed until September 1945 (JewishEncyclopedia.com). This relatively slow practice soon evolved into portable gas vans which, in time, turned into death camps or so-called concentration camps suitable for killing thousands of Jews in a day, such as Auschwitz, Treblinka and Sobibor. At the end of the war, the Nazis had killed around 11 million people according to their systematic plan to eradicate Jews and other unwanted groups. Development of nuclear weapons and their use drastically changed the nature of this war when the fateful decision to end the war by dropping two atomic bombs on two Japanese cities was put into action by the USA. Since these brutal and bloody episodes result in great destruction, Mark C. Taylor points out that the century was "eventually forced to confront the flames of Hiroshima and the ashes of Auschwitz" (47). These episodes have remained the open wounds of the recent history haunting the present day with their harrowing legacies.

Marked by Fascism, the announcement of the advent of the Atomic age and the acceleration of the arms race, which also brought about developments in science and technology as well as in the reconstruction of individual and national identities, the twentieth century could not settle an atmosphere of peace and comfort when the war ended. The war took an estimated 40 to 70 million lives and, contrary to expectations, after 1945 the world was still rocked by smaller wars and catastrophes. Some of them were caused by the Cold War (1947-1991) which was a manifestation of the power struggle between the USA and the Soviet Union lasting almost fifty years; the Suez Crisis (1956); the Vietnam War (1955); the Falklands War (1982); the Gulf War (1990); the dissolution of the Soviet Union (1991); and the Bosnian War (1992). As a natural result of these devastations and psychological disorders in the 20th century, Harold Pinter was adversely affected by Cold War politics and

hence became a polemicist campaigning against abuses of human rights and in a powerful condemnation of the war; he made powerful speeches attacking the US politics. He condemned The Labour Party's endorsement of American nuclear presence on British soil. As a citizen, Pinter became a member of an anti-apartheid organisation and horrified at the events he saw taking place in Vietnam and South Africa. Later, Pinter, along with Arthur Miller, visited Turkey and publicly condemned the human rights' abuses; he attended an anti-Thatcher discussion group and wrote numerous public condemnations of American and British foreign policy since the end of The Second World War, the most notable being his Nobel Prize acceptance speech on Art, Truth and Politics. As a citizen, Pinter's active political engagement is well-documented, with a consensus held on his political stance, but as a playwright Pinter's work is less easily categorised.

Pinter's political concerns are manifested in his dramatic works: the human rights' abuses, the strategic blunder of British and American foreign policy; in brief, Pinter actively engages with the world politics.

Harold Pinter's politics are premised on power-structured relationships and in particular how social relations involving authority and power threaten the autonomy and importance of the individual. Pinter's characters like Davies in *The Caretaker's*are established through the creation of individual identities that subvert generic classifications such as name, racial group or nationality. These broad classifications, which compromise individual identity, are undermined throughout Pinter's work through establishing the importance of the voice of the individual. Through their involvement in political power struggles and relationships, Pinter's individuals struggle to retain their sense of self. This preservation of the self is achieved through several means, including establishing their own sense of space, usually a room or a home, fiercely guarding private memories as retainers of individual experience, and preserving a voice, as the foundation of individual expression and resistance. Pinter's power struggles occur at the level of charged dialogue, through to physical power, which are, respectively, weighted against the defence of the individual. His politics are those of a struggle between power and powerlessness, induced by an instinctive moral rage against any injustice which strives to erode the validity of the individual, as an individual

Pinter's exploration of the politics centers on the uses and abuses of language. These explorations in language range from the bombardment of language through interrogation methods, which serve to distort meanings and significances in words, to the complete debasement of language by official systems of rhetoric. Through this societal and global process, Pinter identifies and studies cases of the individual voice, from Aston's broken voice of *The Caretaker*, through the voices of protest of *Mountain Language* and *One for the Road*. As Pinter's scale of focus evolves from the social-scapes of the earlierplays, through global power-structures in political plays, so he moves from an exploratory role as a playwright, to a more assertive and questioning role as a citizen, in the search for truth, amidst art and politics. Especially, Pinter's later plays are informed by his public, non-fiction statements; however, these serve to inform his dramatic and poetic works as critical co-ordinates and not as substitutes for the works themselves. Though there is an evolution in the contexts and approaches that Pinter adopts, from his exploratory outset to his return as citizen, the constant focus of his work remains on the preservation of the dignity of the individual in relation and resistance to these power-structures. Pinter's early works establish an understanding of Pinter's political preoccupations through an exploration of rooms, spaces and unwelcome guests. Enclosed rooms that act as personal spaces of refuge and containers of the self are indicative of the displacement of the individual in a hostile and exclusive society. Martin Esslin's identification of Pinter's basic situation as "a room, a room with a door; outside the door a cold, hostile world," (51) is a useful blueprint for configuring Pinter's space socially and thematically. Pinter's rooms have become a hallmark of his dramatic work; they are secluded and fiercely private spaces where the occupier can feel safe and distinct from the collectivism of the wider society. The habitation and ownership of a room affords a private and secure physical space but is also an important aspect in establishing a separate and contained identity. As such, it is variables of these spaces that are crucial to understanding certain aspect of Pinter's characters, for example, those characters who occupy a room within a house, such as *The Room*'s Rose and Bert, or Mick and Aston of *The Caretaker*, (1959) are working-class characters who struggle to maintain a small space within the confines of a larger house.The responsibility of ownership creates a dichotomy between the enjoyment of a private home and the fear of losing that individual space. This

dichotomy becomes greater as ownership becomes more established, since the greater the one's investment is in the space, the more of the self there is to lose.

The intrusion of another into the private space of a Pinter character, from Goldberg and McCann's forced entry into the seaside boarding house where Stanley is a fixed resident, to Rose's fear of "these creeps come in, smelling up my room," (Pinter 107) is a thematic basis for the destruction of the individual in these early works.

Trespassing on rooms and forced entry into space initiates a breach of the security that becomes crucial to the preservation of identity. It is not simply that an intruder has entered the room, but rather that the intruder has violated the identity of the unwitting host. Though this may be seen as prompting an existential crisis in the individual, this interpretation alone cannot be sustained given the relevance of the contextual reference points that mark the socially realistic aspects of the play. Rose takes pride in the fact that "we keep ourselves to ourselves…we've got our room. We don't bother anyone else," (99) since her fear of unwelcome intrusion is so great that it becomes a barricade between herself and the suspected "foreigners" (87) who also occupy the building. This fear of both physical intrusion and existential invasion is not simply pathological, but rather is the product of a society where the exclusion of the other is promoted. Such a society is one that passed the British Nationality Act in 1948, allowing subjects of the British Empire to take up residence and work in the U.K. and then annexed the aforementioned Act in 1971 in order to ensure a decline in the number of immigrants arriving in the U.K. (Sandbrook 308). Concern and fear about the level of the immigration of citizens from British colonies in the West Indies made immigrants "the objects of suspicion, prejudice and contempt" (307). Accordingly, the entry of a blind Negro into Rose's secluded and guarded room provokes the reaction, "enough's enough. You can take liberty too far, you know."(Pinter 106) Here further indictment of the blind Negro, "what do you want? You force your way up here. You disturb my evening…what do you want?"(107) could pass for the anti-immigration political rhetoric of the Right that is both contextually specific and has been applied elsewhere from the influx of Indian workers in the 1960's to early 21st century Polish immigration.

CHAPTER 3: A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER AND SPACE IN HAROLD PINTER'S EARLY PLAYS

3.1 *The Birthday Party* (1957), *The Dumb Waiter, The Hothouse* (1958), *The Caretaker* (1960)

3.1.1 *The Birthday Party*

Discipline is a power mechanism that regulates the attitudes of individuals in the social system. It is reinforced by surveillance techniques. Foucault uses the concept of disciplinary society when examining the history and institutions of a particular society, such as prisons, hospitals, schools, and the army. Foucault associates "individualisation" with the discourse and prison which has an important place in liberal discourse. Identifying the difference between the individual and the subject, he associates the modern subject's becoming an individual with the model of confinement and disciplined society. Likewise, Pinter handles a state of difficulty in "individualisation" in his plays. As Stanley who is controlled by the pawns of invisible power like Goldberg and McCann, he cannot pursue his life as a free individual in *The Birthday Party*, and fights to be an independent individual.

From past to present, as traditional forms of power feudalism and monarchy maintain their dominance for a long time. From the 18th century to the 20th century, with the constitutional administration, the power goes through a new process of change and continues its existence with a different mechanism. As mentioned above, instead of the brutal punishments for crimes that resulted in physical violence, starvation, or death in times of monarchy, a method in which subjects were secretly punished with disciplinary panoptic gaze was applied.

According to Foucault, the subject is not free by nature, he is surrounded by social norms from all sides. Power relations build the subject's self. Based on this idea, he tries to get to the root of the problem; that is power relations. Under the supervision of Goldberg and McCann, Stanley is subjected to interrogation for hours, and an environment of menace and pressure is created. Stanley is followed by forces that are not clear what kind of institutions or individuals they are. Although there is no prison architecture in the play, the hostel where Stanley stayed has turned into a prison for him. Keeping his identity hidden for months, Stanley turned himself in

even though Meg didn't do it on purpose. Pinter, who did not perform scenes such as violence, harassment, and injury on stage in his early plays, included them in his political plays he wrote after the 1980s, albeit behind the scenes. Although the panoptic gaze is more dominant in the first period plays, the political power is seen more in the last period plays. In the panoptic observation, the prisoners do not know by whom they are being watched, and in this play Goldberg and McCann are observed by the organization to carry out their duties, secretly to get Stanley out of the boarding house. They promise Stanley that they will look after him. They say that they really saved him from a life worse than death to make a man out of him.

As a victim of authority, Stanley is not tortured on stage or in drama script. Psychological suppression and menace, fear, psychological violence, which are Pinter's own style are used. Similar to Bentham who intends to provide a space of safe custody in a penitentiary house, Pinter's rooms in his plays are meant to protect the insiders from the intruders. In *The Birthday Party*, the intruders Goldberg and McCann damage the safety zone and they dominate Stanley and subjugate him by using their authority and power.

Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* questions different kind of ways in which brutal punishments and interrogation has been gradually interchanged by the panoptic surveillance as a means of not only bringing justice to society but also rehabilitating prisoners through a process of incorporating this implementation in which prisoners are compelled to behave according to the rules in the prison, and through spreading it throughout the world. Foucault ascribes this process with discipline in which the guards and overlookers of the prison are presumed to be ubiquitous and observe all the time. Foucault depicts the panoptic system as a means of eliminating the need for torture. Pinter shows that the same effects as training prisoners to follow the rules, the same practice such as Panoptic design creating a sense of constant visibility, can be used to train and discipline a torturer or torture squad just as adequately as their prisoners. Mary Luckhurst addresses Pinter's application of torture in the plays. Her article "Torture in the Plays of Harold Pinter" studies *The Dumb Waiter, The Birthday Party* and then turns to Pinter's later political plays. She pays particular attention to the way those in the role of torturers who are assigned to torture the convicts. However, Luckhurst only examines the torturers who are trained and ordered to carry out the acts they do.

While observing the progression of Pinter's plays, there is a steady pattern in which torture moves from being a source of terror from an outside force into a normalized and politically driven implement of power. While researchers have examined Pinter's early works and his later works, few have examined the progression that connects one play to the next in terms of torture and its perpetrators. By ignoring the potential presence of pain and torture as integral to each period in Pinter's career, the message opposing torturers and human rights abuse is reduced drastically. In *The Dumb Waiter* and *The Birthday Party*, Pinter shows the mindset of the torturers as they interact with themselves and with others as intruders in a domestic environment. However, unlike *The Dumb Waiter* and *The Birthday Party*, a structure is provided for the torturers to perform their job without the need of infiltration or playing to the needs of a bystander for justification. By examining this progression of Harold Pinter's plays as he develops his style and focus, torture and its agents develop from a typical outside source of fear into not only an acceptable factor in social interaction, but a necessity in diplomatic power plays.

The Birthday Party, written in 1957 and first performed in 1958, not so long after the end of World War II, is one of Pinter's early plays which has been reinterpreted while taking the so called 'Pinter's political turn' into account. Grimes, for example, probes the play's political message by examining 'how history—notably the Holocaust—shapes the play's political vision'. (Grimes 36). In 1994, Pinter, himself, admits that Nazism and the Holocaust were in the background of *The Birthday Party*.

> I think *The Birthday Party* is certainly shaped by persecution […] I remember feeling when I was asked once or twice what the hell does *The Birthday Party* mean? […] It always surprised me then, the fact that people seemed to have forgotten the Gestapo had been knocking on people's doors not too long ago. And people have been knocking on people's doors for centuries in fact. *The Birthday Party* doesn't express anything unusual, it expresses something that is actually common. (Pinter, quoted in Fintan O'Toole).

As Foucault reveals, social space represents more than physical, material and empirical reality. It is not possible to produce knowledge about social space through mere scientific observation because it includes socio-cultural, symbolic layers that are open to different readings. Heterotopias show that the spatial configurations represent and have immanent cultural, political and symbolic meanings. It can be deduced from the above quotation that Pinter is less interested in dramatizing the

historical particularities of Nazi 'persecution' than in how this persecution becomes a recurrent historical pattern, given Pinter's claim that *The Birthday Party* shows something quite 'common'. In view of Pinter's statement, he explores the pattern of domination dramatized in the play by tracing its evocation of Nazism and the Holocaust.

What Pinter mentions in his quote is the secret state police 'Gestapo' which means the political police of Nazi Germany can be perceived as a Panoptic gaze and The Lebensraum 'living space' that is "a territory believed especially by Nazis to be necessary for national existence or economic self-sufficiency" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary) can be inferred that this social space is a heterotopia. Heterotopias are counter-sites and kind of places that are outside all places and localisable. Heterotopias differ in six principles according to Foucault. Here, Holocaust can be regarded as heterotopias of compensation'. It is a kind of space tries to project itself as one that is perfect mostly well arranged in comparison to other real spaces. He gives as an example of American colonies in European world. In this context, Pinter's evocation of Holocaust brings up the example for heterotopia of compensation. "Lebensraum comprises of practices of colonialism that became a geopolitical goal of Nazi Germany. It is a territorial expansion and one of the leading motivations of Nazi Germany" (Smith 84). The Nazi government aimed at repopulating these lands with Germanic colonists in the name of *Lebensraum* during and following World War II. (encyclopedia.ushmm.org). This heterotopia is structured according to a perfect plan as Nazi Germany does in Lebensraum.

The historical context of the play's publication, the choice of Jewish surnames for central characters, such as Webber and Goldberg, and the explicit and coded references to Nazi-related terms and notions such as, 'sterilizing' and 'special treatment' all plausibly call for a heterotopic space and panoptic reading of *The Birthday Party*. (*The Birthday Party* 47, 79) That is not to say, of course, that the play simply allegorizes Holocaust. Rather, the play seems to employ Jewish and Nazi signifiers to address a universal kind of problematic, one that is *figured* by the two antithetical, yet co- dependent, categories of Jew and anti-Semite. In short, the play is less interested in the specific cultural identities of Nazi or Jew than in the *positions* of identity they occupy namely those of same and other, respectively.

The figure of anti-Semite is particularly evoked in the play by Goldberg and McCann, who are mainly characterized by their collective identification with the 'organization'. Note how McCann uses the plural pronoun 'us' to refer to the authoritarian self of the 'organization' that he and Goldberg represent: 'Why did you leave the organization?' he asks Stanley, '[…] Why did you betray *us*?' (*The Birthday Party* 42). The 'organization' here serves as a surrogate for the identity of its followers. And it is particularly through this *positive* identification with something as solid and homogenous as the 'organization' that I see in Goldberg and McCann potential Nazis or anti-Semites. Key here, I suggest, is Jean-Paul Sartre's description of the anti-Semite as he who 'choos[es] for his own personality the *permanence of rock* [and] for his morality a scale of *petrified* values'. (Sartre 19). In other words, the anti-Semitic self, for Sartre, denies its own existential contingency by cultivating a sense of pure identity or essence. It follows then that Sartre regards identity as 'bad faith', securing the self against a feeling of existential groundlessness. The mechanism of self-deception that Sartre believes to be at work in the anti- Semitic personality is also expressed by Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno in their *Dialectic of Enlightenment*: *Philosophical Fragments* (1944-1947): 'The closed circle of perpetual sameness', they write, 'becomes a surrogate for omnipotence'. (Horkheimer 157).

We can glance in Goldberg's life account a hint at the *illusion* of 'perpetual sameness' necessary to cover over the 'nothingness' of existence:

> All my life I've said the same. Play up, play up, and play the game. […] Follow the line, the line, McCann, and you can't go wrong. What do you think, I'm a self-made man? No! I sat where I was told to sit. […] School? Don't talk to me about school. Top in all subjects. And for why? Because I'm telling you, I'm telling you, follow my line? Follow my mental? Learn by heart. Never write down a thing. And don't go too near the water. And you'll find—that what I say is true.
>
> Because I believe that the world… (*Vacant.*)…. Because I believe that the world… (*Desperate.*)….
>
> BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT THE WORLD … (*Lost.*)…. (*The Birthday Party* 71-72).

Goldberg's failure to complete his last sentence, I think, seems to betray the unfoundedness of his belief system, something he is trying to escape by "following the line". In the eyes of the "organization", it seems that anyone who does not "follow the line" is seen as "the other". And there is a sense in the play that this

"marginalized" form of identity is particularly portrayed by Stanley. I think Stanley's "marginalized" identity is asserted primarily by his abstract relationship to the place, which is widely understood as a guarantor of enduring identity. Of particular importance here is Stanley's "guest" status in Boles' "boarding house" for "about a year"; this associates it with a style of housing that relies heavily on a lack of proper ownership.

When the audience sees Goldberg for the first time, he takes on the role of superior agent between the two of them, taking care to make sure his friend can stay comfortable. Goldberg seems to view their mission as a vacation, knowing in advance that they will succeed and that he must pass on that confidence to his student, in this case McCann:

> GOLDBERG. But why is it that before you do a job you're all over the place, and when you're doing the job you're as cool as a whistle?
> MCCANN. I don't know, Nat. I'm just all right once I know what I'm doing. When I know what I'm doing, I'm all right.
> GOLDBERG. Well, you do it very well. (*The Birthday Party* 39)

For Goldberg, his strength comes from his memories of those who came before him although it is unclear whether his Uncle Barney was also a member of their organization or simply a strong figure that Goldberg takes after. In either case, Goldberg utilizes these memories of his past as a pacifier for those around him while also bolstering his belief in what he is doing. Goldberg's place as the crusader for the cause as well as his position as instructor in the torture pair marks him as a zealot given, he is able to become emotionally involved in his work as well as to become distant from the events at will. Unlike his partner, Goldberg seems to have proven his proficiency as a torturer and has been moved through the ranks although he does not take as much strength from this as much as he does from his memories. Much like Stanley, Goldberg and McCann look to escape some aspect of themselves if only temporarily: "Goldberg and McCann repress the existential terror of self-knowledge by ignoring the dubious nature of the morality whose imperatives they administer" (Gordon 45). Essentially, Goldberg and McCann utilize the very act of torture as a means of mentally escaping their identity as torturers.

This is a common tactic among torturers given the nature of their work and the need to ignore otherwise natural aspects of humanity such as sympathy. Whereas Goldberg has proven himself a zealot with his sentimentalized view of the cause,

McCann proves to be a more down to earth figure, which may explain how the two complement one another as a team. For McCann, their particular mission at hand seems to be somewhat out of his normal comfort zone, indicating that he may be uncomfortable with the concept of having to perform as he does later with Goldberg or he is uncomfortable about who their current target is. From what the audience is given about McCann, his primary focus at all times is the completion of the task at hand, which makes him a perfect companion for the dominating Goldberg who seems to thrive when placed in a position of power. However, McCann's desire for efficiency within the mission does not mean that he is a zealot like his partner. It becomes clear later on that McCann is susceptible to emotional involvement as it is shown in the final act how much the torture has drained McCann on an emotional level to the point where he is willing to ignore the apparent chain of command:

> GOLDBERG. When will he be ready?
> MCCANN (*sullenly*). You can go up yourself next time. GOLDBERG. What's the matter with you?
> MCCANN (*quietly*) I gave him…. GOLDBERG. What?
> MCCANN. I gave him his glasses. (*The Birthday Party* 67).

McCann's orientation towards order and his emotional weakness place him in the camp of professional. As Crelinsten indicates, professionals have a tendency to avoid the more extreme practices of torture, given that they are concentrating on impressing their superiors in hopes of moving up in the ranks in which case working as a torturer is merely a milestone in their overall occupational progression.

By examining the two together there is a distinct set of roles each one accepts before entering the house and rarely breaks away from. For instance, Goldberg is always the center of attention whereas McCann assumes the more passive position and tries to remain out of the way. This allows both figures to play to their strengths given Goldberg's preference for delivering charismatic speeches:

> GOLDBERG. Right. Now Stanley's sat down. (*Taking the stage.*) Well, I want to say first that I've never been so touched to the heart as by the toast we've just heard. How often, in this day and age, do you come across real true warmth? Once in a lifetime. Until a few minutes ago, ladies and gentlemen, I, like all of you, was asking the same question. What's happened to the love, the bonhomie, the unashamed expression of affection of the day before yesterday, that our mums taught us in the nursery? (*The Birthday Party* 66)

It is this lack of speaking skills happens to be McCann's weakness which he is able compensate for by administering physical punishment as well as other actions

in order to isolate Stanley from his source of comfort and confidence. As Crelinsten notes, torturers tend to operate groups of two or more while rarely if ever working alone. This allows the weaknesses of each torturer to be overcome by the strengths of their partner(s). However, this grouping also prevents the torturers from moving away from their orders and promotes obedience to the central authority

More important, however, is the fact that cruelty is facilitated in social groups. This is why torturers usually work in groups: 'the team approach to interrogation removes the individual conscience from the momentary instincts when he was alone,' said one Greek prisoner arrested and tortured by ESA (Greek military police)." (Crelinsten 58)

The audience witnesses a minor example of this breakdown when McCann rejoins Goldberg in Act III and shows how the events of the night before have affected him. Because the two were separated, they are each given a temporary reprieve from their roles and display their humanity apart from their predetermined roles. While this pair does coincide with the Ben and Gus pair, this particular duo is capable of demonstrating exactly how a torture team would be mobilized in order to extract information and prisoners from a location without directly capturing or arresting them.

While their interactions between one another are important to their effectiveness as a mobile torture team, the other key facet to Goldberg and McCann's success is how they are able to utilize their environment to their benefit. Part of what makes Goldberg and McCann's mission a success in making Stanley yielding information under interrogation and returning him to their superiors comes from their ability to hide their motives and utilize their situation to inflict pain into the everyday rituals to deconstruct Stanley's environment into weapons for their use.

Because Goldberg and McCann are able to adapt to their surroundings, every aspect of Stanley's life from the people he knows to the table where he eats his breakfast becomes another tool to cause him pain. According to Elaine Scarry, this deconstruction is an important element for torturers and interrogators in order to begin manipulating the minds of their prisoners in order to eventually become compliant to the ideals of the regime that has imprisoned them:

> To assent to words that through the thick agony of the body can be only dimly heard, or to reach aimlessly for the name of a person or a place that has barely

> enough cohesion to hold its shape as a word and none to bond it to its worldly referent is a way of saying, yes, all is almost gone now, there is almost nothing left now, even this voice, the sounds I am making, no longer form my words but the words of another. (Scarry 35)

For Goldberg and McCann, Stanley's world is something that must not only be torn down, but reconstructed with their particular spin in order to hold influence over their prisoner and thus claim his world as their own. This is only through this method that the torturers are able to make the prisoner's world retract into itself, leaving nothing for the prisoners to call their own, including his or her own body and mind.

Something that sets Goldberg and McCann apart from the descriptions Scarry and Crelinsten provide of torture tactics is how the two are so proficient at turning an otherwise minor inconvenience for Stanley such as Meg's belief that the day of their arrival is Stanley's birthday. While there are accounts of torturers utilizing such rituals as a birthday celebration in order to inflict a specific form of pain as a means of deconstructing the prisoner's understanding of the world, Goldberg and McCann are able to utilize specific people as a means of increasing the discomfort of the situation to the point where Meg and Lulu become ad hoc torturers in the mission to make Stanley Webber yield information under interrogation. Both Goldberg and McCann can connect with the women in such a way as not only to entice them into revealing a desire that the two men could fulfill, but also become willing participants in the games and events that Goldberg and McCann use to publicly humiliate and torture Stanley:

> MEG (*rising*). I want to play a game!
> GOLDBERG. A game?
> LULU What game?
> MEG Any game
> LULU (*jumping up*) Yes, let's play a game. GOLDBERG. What game?
> MCCANN. Hide and seek. LULU. Blind man's buff.
> MEG. Yes! (*The Birthday Party* 71)

While not actively taking on the role of child to Meg's maternal role, Goldberg is able to apply his memories as a young man and his memories of his family to appeal to Meg's desire to complete her fantasy for a complete family unit.

Although the two women are not intentionally cooperating in Stanley's destruction, they do contribute to his demise in one way or another. Meg's involvement is more active, given how she directly associates with Stanley in terms

of a maternal role thus infantilizing Stanley. While Meg does provide a similar role to Stanley as a mother, she does not address him in any way indicating that Stanley is anything other than a colicky child needing to be soothed and played with:

> MEG. I like cigarettes. (He stands at the window, smoking. She crosses behind him and tickles the back of his neck.) Tickle, tickle.
> STANLEY (*pushing her*). Get away from me.
> MEG. Are you going out?
> STANLEY. Not with you.
> MEG. But I'm going shopping in a minute.
> STANLEY. Go.
> MEG. You'll be lonely all by yourself. (*The Birthday Party* 29)

In this way, Stanley's understanding of himself and his world is brought into question long before his designated torturers arrive. Much like how torturers will utilize family members to supplement the prisoner's pain, Goldberg and McCann are able to manipulate Meg's affection for Stanley in such a way that they are able to command full control over the party while still allowing Meg herself to believe she is still the host of the party. However, Meg's delusion does at times jeopardize the progress of the mission such as her desires to dance and play games which the two men are able to adapt and oblige their hostess's wishes while making it suit their agenda:

> STANLEY *stands blindfold.* MCCANN *backs slowly across the stage to the left. He breaks* STANLEY's *glasses, snapping the frames.* MEG *is downstage, left,* LULU *and* GOLDBERG *upstage centre, close together.* STANLEY *begins to move, very slowly, across the stage to the left.* MCCANN *picks up the drum and places it sideways in* STANLEY's *path.* STANLEY, *walks into the drum and falls over with his foot caught in it. (Birthday Party 73)*

Whereas Meg becomes a physical contributor to Stanley's torture, Lulu serves as more of an object of previous desire, thus playing into the tactic of deprivation that many torturers like Goldberg and McCann utilize in their practice. The audience is shown early on that Stanley does show desire for Lulu and the potential for reciprocating feelings. However, Goldberg's linguistic and manipulative skills quickly win her affections, which the two flaunt throughout the rest of the party:

> LULU (*to* GOLDBERG). Shall I tell you something?
> GOLDBERG. What?
> LULU. I trust you.
> GOLDBERG (*lifting his glass*). Gesundheit.
> LULU. Have you got a wife? (*The Birthday Party* 69)

By usurping Stanley's place as Lulu's target of affection, Goldberg and McCann are able to further diminish Stanley's worldview, in which he may identify Lulu as something to pursue. Unlike Meg, however, Lulu's involvement in Goldberg and McCann's plan does not end with Act II but continue on through the morning:

> LULU *(with growing anger).* You used me for a night. A passing fancy.
> GOLDBERG. Who used who?
> LULU. You made use of me by cunning when my defences were down.
> GOLDBERG. Who took them down?
> LULU. That's what you did. You quenched your ugly thirst. You taught me things a girl shouldn't know before she's been married at least three times!
> GOLDBERG. Now you're a jump ahead! What are you complaining about? (*Birthday Party* 90)

Here, Goldberg has combined his own need to fulfill sexual desires with the parameters of the mission; conquering Lulu becomes a two-fold victory. On the one hand, Goldberg has been able to continue assuming control over the small group by physically dominating Lulu through the use of whatever utensils may be within his briefcase. On the other, Goldberg has further humiliated Stanley by defiling the one character he may have taken true comfort in. However, Goldberg's tryst with Lulu can also be seen as a desperate necessity given the nature of his and McCann's work. Since it is assumed that McCann was not sexually involved with Lulu that night, his grave nature in Act III demonstrates Goldberg's need for distraction during the nightly torturing of Stanley.

Straub discusses this need for distraction in some torturers given their inability to fully distance themselves emotionally from their work:

> We tend to engage in just world thinking because it protects us, makes us feel safe…But as a result of just world thinking, when innocent people are harmed, they come to be devalued. Apparently the harmdoers themselves also devalue their victims, and thereby justify their mistreatment of them and believe that their actions are right and justified. (Straub 103)

Sexually dominating Lulu becomes a great necessity for Goldberg as a way of mentally removing himself from the nature of his work, whereas McCann is given no such reprieve and is thus more heavily affected by the events of the night than his partner.

Goldberg, the older of the two men sent to the boarding house, is another typical member of the organization, loathing any questioning from his subordinate

McCann and adamantly focused on the task at hand. Goldberg, unlike Ben from *The Dumb Waiter*, solidifies his dominance over McCann by imbedding his knowledge in his experience, leaving no room for McCann to question him. Goldberg serves as an agent of the organization very much like Ben, although his work is based more in his demeanor than his knowledge. Goldberg, then, is able to command respect and control in a situation with his ability to cater to the unspoken wants of those around him. By priding himself on his experience and his position as the older partner, Goldberg points out his power over McCann as a teacher would a student within the classroom:

> The main issue is a singular issue and quite distinct from your previous work. Certain elements, however, might well approximate in points of procedure to some of your other activities. All is dependent on the attitude of our subject. At all events, McCann, I can assure you that the assignment will be carried out and the mission accomplished with no excessive aggravation to you or myself. Satisfied? (*The Birthday Party* 30)

In this speech, Goldberg is acknowledging one of the key points of a power structure stated by Rouse in that power can be altered and shifted among agents with a difference in the actions taken by the subject or target (109). By showing his method of operation as teaching McCann how to better adapt to the setting he is less acclimated to, Goldberg secures his position in the hierarchy without any resistance from McCann. Goldberg is also able to convince McCann that his accompanying Goldberg on this mission was by Goldberg's choice and no one else's, which creates a sense of affectionate trust between the two: "And you know who I asked for? . . . Say no more" (*The Birthday Party* 29).

Within this dialogue, the reader is also shown how important one's position within the power structure in relationship to those they work with: "That's a great compliment, Nat, coming from a man in your position" (*The Birthday Party* 29). The role of Goldberg and McCann as Stanley's interrogators positions them, within Foucault's view of social structure, as the visible and aggressive agents of normalization within society. This is especially true in Foucault's discussion of visibility and power when Goldberg takes Stanley's glasses during Stanley's interrogation. Goldberg puts him above Stanley by blinding his targets, making both himself and McCann dependent on them the moment he is blind. Although his position is not questioned, he finds himself in moments of weakness. During these times, she uses talking to McCann to restore the strength of her faith. By talking to

McCann, Goldberg reminds him of his place as an educator and is empowered enough to continue his lecture, even when shaken by events offstage.

Goldberg sets himself as his own disciplinarian when he tells Stanley how he will be "integrated" he is also reminding himself of his own integration into the society, incomplete though it may be. Goldberg, unlike Ben from *The Dumb Waiter*, finds his inner discipline by reminding himself of those that came before him, such as teachers and his father. Goldberg's focus on these people shows his dependence on the hegemony that he sets out to perpetuate within McCann. In Foucault's discussion of power structures, those of higher power are more capable of individualizing themselves than those further down in the ranks (Foucault 193). Goldberg individualizes himself by retaining these memories of what he believes to be essential traits within the organization and presenting his place of power by observing both McCann and Stanley throughout the play.

Following Foucault's theory, the power from observation comes with a value in being invisible; therefore, one cannot be observed in return (Rouse 99). Goldberg's focus on the flashlight and who is exposed by it during the blackout can serve as an indirect symbol of the power of invisibility and surveillance. By controlling where the light is, Goldberg and McCann can determine who is seen and who is not. Therefore, those that are seen are being observed without the ability to observe back. Within Foucault's design, Goldberg's responsibility as the superior officer also places him in the role of the tutor for the new student. McCann shows a need for external discipline without the need for punishment.

Although McCann must be instructed as to how to carry out this particular mission, he is not as incompetent within the organization as Gus is in *The Dumb Waiter*. McCann is placed in the position of the junior officer who understands his role as the pupil to the older partner. McCann, unlike Gus, understands the dangers of asking questions outside the parameters of the assigned mission. McCann allows himself to be subjected to Goldberg's orders because he is aware of what is expected of someone within his place in the hierarchy. McCann's importance within *The Birthday Party* is to be the invisible support for Goldberg, taking it upon himself to do menial preparation work while Goldberg pulls the attention to himself as he takes control of the house and those inhabiting it. McCann's unseen support for Goldberg reflects another of Foucault's observations in that McCann grants power to Goldberg

by willingly following his instructions; without this cooperation, Goldberg would be unable to complete the mission. McCann allows himself to enter a role as visible as Goldberg only when the two corner their target and proceed to break him down with the barrage of questions that cannot be answered.

Within *The Birthday Party*, McCann is seen acting as the quintessential attack dog for Goldberg to command as he sees fit, whether it is to purchase alcohol for the party (44) or to sit in a particular place (78). McCann is only in need of external discipline after he returns in the third act after referring to Goldberg by what is assumed to be his real name, Simey: "(*murderously*). Don't call me that! (*He seizes* MCCANN *by the throat.)* NEVER CALL ME THAT" (*The Birthday Party* 76). Although McCann feels he can get away with breaking an order (however effective it was to get a response from Goldberg), Goldberg resorts to open violence to remind McCann of his lower rank. Like Gus, McCann is punished with a physical reenactment of possible training exercises undergone by members of the organization.

Within *The Birthday Party*, Pinter utilizes not only the torturer as a professional figure bent on the destruction of a particular individual with questionable motive.

Through figures like Meg and Lulu, Pinter examines the ways that bystanders become just as dangerous to victims of torture and how such bystanders can prove as damaging to the victim's sense of identity even before the arrival of the torturer. When the bystander becomes part of the torturer's available resources, aspects of the prisoner's world other than the basic physical components such as the tradition of the birthday celebration become more accessible for the torturer's use. Goldberg and McCann's abuse of Meg and Lulu's desire for self-fulfillment and acceptance of authority figures demonstrates Pinter's understanding of the mindset of the torturer even if it is purely at an instinctual level at this point in his development as a playwright.

3.1.2 *The Dumb Waiter*

Foucault deals with modern societies as disciplinary societies in *The Birth of the Prison*; it speaks of the power of the norm. It deals with the development of the subject from the seventeenth century to the eighteenth century. The main argument

of this power, which has replaced the monarchy, is to discipline the subject by keeping it under surveillance. This subject will in no way remain independent and will be formed by the functional mechanisms of power. These mechanisms emerge as institutions of the state. In the eighteenth century, Jeremy Bentham designed *Panopticon.* Foucault's discovery of this work coincided with his examination of the origins of clinical medicine. He studies on the hospitals at the time of the great reform movements in medical institutions. This review also considers how the medical perspective is institutionalized. While watching various architectural projects of hospitals, he realizes that bodies, individuals, things are completely visible under a central gaze. After this work, he monitors all projects on the reorganization of prisons while examining the problems of criminal court procedure. He realizes that they are using the same theme. All projects signed by Bentham have panoptic gaze. (*Great Confinement* 86). As a result of his impressions, Foucault realizes that these structures have towers called Panopticon. He comprehends Bentham's project as the basic form of administration of power in the eighteenth century. This project creates a new understanding of power, unlike monarchy governments. The understanding of power, which is connected to the penal procedure, intimidates others by executing the criminal. However, after a while, there is a revolt where there is punishment. Power begins to seek new ways to maintain its hegemony. With the development of industrial technology, people are observed and controlled through spaces. Spaces dominate the individual by assuming the functional power. Compared to the monarchy system, the form of power in the 18th century is non-violent, inexpensive, abstract, but with a strong hegemony over the individual. In his works after 1955, such as *Discipline and Punish, History of Madness, Birth of the Prison, Birth of the Clinic, Les mots et Les Choses,* Foucault examines the modes of surveillance, discipline, and control of individuals by working deeply on these institutions, which are the places of surveillance of individuals.

Pinter’s *The Dumb Waiter* displays a strong example for the internalization of discipline within prisoners of the Panopticon as discussed in Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish.*

While Ben is not as much the intended prisoner of the Panopticon portrayed in Foucault’s discussion, he does take it upon himself to monitor his actions as well

as those of his partner Gus. In this case, Ben's knowledge of his place within the hierarchy of the organization reminds him that wherever he is, Ben can never assume that they (Ben and Gus) are not being observed. Ben has internalized the concept of the Panoptic theory within Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* in which unseen agents provide rations and information through a pulley system much like the dumb waiter used within Pinter's play.

Ben is placed in charge of Gus as his surveillant. Foucault defines this as 'admonitor' which is the title given to those in the Batencour institution in charge of students who pose a serious threat to the organisation (*Discipline and Punish* 176). Whether it is the structure of a school of students and teachers or an organization of killers and torturers, there is an instinctual need in groups for cohesion among the group. Through practices Foucault mentions, the way Ben and Gus interact with each other, and their absent superior Wilson demonstrates the need for uniformity and therefore shows the extent to which uniformity is enforced while deviation is punished strongly.

Through his insistence on being correct in their discussion of the phrase "light the kettle" (as opposed to "light the gas"), Ben forces a temporary submission from Gus. In this case, the argument was not about the phrase itself, but an affirmation of Ben's position as the superior partner. Ben's fear is not only that his partner is openly questioning his place in the higher rank, but also on the fact that his superiors are watching and evaluating him as a leader. Ben's internalization of his position is also shown in his eagerness to follow the orders received through the dumb waiter. The effect of the Panoptic environment is one in which Ben knows they are being examined.

According to Foucault, this form of examination "is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish it establishes over individuals a visibility though which one differentiates them and judges them" (184). Because he senses that they are being observed in some way, Ben must be sure to follow the rules placed on his position as well as those placed on Gus. The position Ben notices is one in which the lower ranking member is made completely visible; knowledge of this observation causes a shift in the actions of the observed, causing them to either self- correct flaws in their behavior or improve in their productivity as contributors to a system (Rouse 99-100). With Ben being an older

member of this organization, he is a perfect example of the more established members of the Gestapo that Pinter states had been his inspiration for the knock (Gussow 71).

The final scene of *The Dumb Waiter* can also be interpreted as a movement into physical punishment towards Ben in that Foucault examines how "the disciplinary systems favour punishments that are exercise – intensified, multiplied forms of training, several times repeated" (179). In the terms of *The Dumb Waiter*, Ben is forced to undergo an intensified training exercise for his profession by performing a false execution to discipline his partner, Gus. Although Ben has already taken it upon himself to be his own examiner, he must also be punished for ineffectively keeping his subordinate in agreement with the regulations expected of the lower members of the organization. Along with internalization of discipline, there is still a presence of external punishment.

In *The Dumb Waiter*, Gus is constantly in need of external forces to keep him in check within the organization. The threat Gus poses within the organization is his curiosity and questioning: "What's he doing all this for? What's the idea? What's he playing these games for" (*The Dumb Waiter* 162). By questioning the organization openly, Gus is no longer focused on his responsibilities; instead, he spends his time thinking about the positions and responsibilities of others, including his superiors.

Because Gus questions the inner workings of the organization, he is showing doubt in both the effectiveness of the organization and those placed above him. In doing this, Gus is indirectly removing power from Ben and Wilson by not completely complying with their orders or paying attention to the warnings. It is because of this questioning that Gus is presented at the end entering the room to find Ben pointing his gun directly at him upon entering.

This ending to *The Dumb Waiter* can be interpreted as Wilson making an example of Gus by showing him that he could easily be removed at any time and that his life is dependent on his unyielding submission to his superiors within the organization, including Ben and Wilson. The nature of Gus's punishment is "an order defined by natural and observable processes: the duration of an apprenticeship, the time taken to perform an exercise, the level of aptitude refer to a regularity that is also a rule" (Foucault 179). Gus is placed in the position of the apprentice in which he is being evaluated in the efficiency in which he uses his time in between orders; in

this case he is punished for his misuse of this time to prepare for the next assignment. This outward punishment is one of the methods of "normalizing judgment," which Foucault recognizes as a method of facilitating the movement of power throughout a hierarchy as well as the specialization of sections within the power structures. In this way, Gus is shown that his thinking is not in line with that expected of his particular rank; by being reminded of his expendability, he is forced to reevaluate the necessity of questions in regard to his position in the organization. Gus's constant questions are also a sign of his inexperience within the organization in that his lack of knowledge and his demeanor within the room shows he has not been within the organization long enough to know that there is no such thing as an ending to their tests. Tests designed to keep Gus and Ben, as "functionaries, in practice, to increase the store of surveilled information about them, and to remind them of the power system in which they are enmeshed" (Grimes 58). By conducting these tests, Wilson and those above him are able to remind the two men of their power without directly revealing themselves. It is through tests that Wilson maintains his power over Ben and Gus without needing to directly interact with them. With this practice, Wilson becomes an ever-present force for Ben, ever-present and always knowing what is going on among his subordinates. Given Wilson's practice, Ben and Gus are as many victims of torture as they are tools for implementing it. This duality in positions plays to the need for torture groups to be constantly mindful of their superiors and how their performance influences their continued work as torturers, or in other cases how long a torturer is allowed to live.

Throughout the play, Ben attempts to inform Gus of their predicament by telling him that he needs to be ready whenever they get the call to go, using himself as the proper example: "Have you ever seen me idle? I'm never idle. I know how to occupy my time, to its best advantage. Then when a call comes, I'm ready" (*The Dumb Waiter* 90). For Ben to put so much emphasis on being ready at a moment's notice shows further internalization of the power structure to a point that his mind is constantly on his work. Unfortunately for both men, these warnings go unheard, and Gus is forced to experience a potential (or actual) death sentence at the end of the play. However, this failure serves as a mark not only against Gus, but Ben as well. If torturers are expected to operate at their most efficient, it is not enough for one torturer to carry the responsibility of both. For Wilson, if one of the two must be

punished then both men will be punished. In this way, Wilson is demonstrating not only his power to punish those who would directly question the organization, but also those who fail to suppress this questioning for the sake of group cohesion and optimum performance from each member. It is through punishing both Ben and Gus that Wilson establishes himself as the supervising force of discipline:

> And, although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a 'head,' it is the apparatus as a whole that produces 'power' and distributes individuals in this power to be both absolutely indiscreet, since it is everywhere and always alert since by its very principle it leaves no zone of shade and constantly supervises the very individuals who are entrusted with the task of supervising; and absolutely 'discreet,' for it functions permanently and largely in silence. (Rabinow 192)

Through silence, Wilson can instill himself in the minds of the more loyal members of the organization like Ben who have completely internalized the power structure. By having Ben fulfill the role as executioner, Wilson is letting both men know that if Ben is as loyal to his work as he appears, then killing Gus would be seen as just another order. Ben's loyalty and willingness to follow orders through this exercise is meant to show Gus that he is being watched and he is never out of reach from his designated executioner.

In examining Ben, he is the paradigm of the professional torturer from his ability to distance himself from past jobs to his ability to routinize his life in between jobs. Ben's very existence is the paradigm for how torturers are expected to act in that he never questions what orders he receives and does everything in his power to complete his orders to the best of his ability such as fulfilling the impossible orders coming down through the dumbwaiter and his anger at Gus' inability to learn from his partner:

> BEN. I'll remember this. Put everything on the plate.
> *They pile everything on the plate. The box goes up without the plate*
> Wait a minute!
> *They stand.*
> GUS. It's gone up.
> BEN. It's all your stupid fault, playing about!
> GUS. What do we do now?
> BEN. We'll have to wait till it comes down.
> BEN *puts the plate on the bed, puts on his shoulder holster, and starts to put on his tie.*
> You'd better get ready. (*The Dumb Waiter* 150-151)

However, Ben's attempts to prepare his partner while stifling his questions do little to save Gus from his eventual punishment. Although Ben attempts to lead by

example, this proves to be ineffective for his partner. As an instructor, Ben appears incapable of directly teaching his partner what is necessary in order to stay on their superior's good side. In other words, Ben is only able to identify what is good practice and what is bad but he cannot quite explain to Gus why questioning the system is bad or exactly how important it is that he demonstrate his devotion to the organization at all times.

Ben, as a torturer, has based his entire life around performing every aspect of his job which is vital for each member of such an organization if the group is expected to succeed and continue operating without resistance. Ben's role as the professional is also demonstrated in his discussion about his hobbies in order to take his mind off of work when he is not on a job:

> BEN. Look at me. What have I got?
> GUS. I don't know. What?
> BEN. I've got my woodwork. I've got my model boats. Have you ever seen me idle? I'm never idle, I know how to occupy my time, to its best advantage. Then when a call comes, I'm ready. (*The Dumb Waiter* 134).

Ben's statement leaves an ambiguous meaning for the audience. He is always either physically ready to perform a job or he is mentally prepared to do what must be done for the organization. In the latter case Ben becomes just as vulnerable as Gus although experienced enough to have developed a coping method in order to quickly recover from the horrors he is expected to inflict on the new target. Unlike Gus, Ben understands the importance of staying in line with his superiors which guarantees his sense of safety as a torturer.

> As far as knowing the consequences within the closed world of the torturer, the consequences are clear enough. The world of conventional morality and human decency, internalized through the socialization processes of the civilian world, has been largely replaced by a new morality where disobedience means punishment, disgrace, humiliation, expulsion (with its loss of status and privilege) or even death. Only input from another world, the outside world, a world that represents a parallel power to the torturer's world, a world that cares, only input from outside can break the spell for many inhabitants of the torturer's world. (Crelinsten 60-61)

Gus's inability to understand the potential risks reveals his vulnerability as a torturer in that he is almost hypersensitive to the outside world and therefore places him in potentially terrible danger as revealed at the end of the play. It is only through this exercise that Wilson is able not only to tell Gus as Ben has tried throughout the play that questions are dangerous, but to show him outright that his life is only in as much danger as Wilson's patience will allow.

Pinter chooses to end the play here without giving a definite result is intended to leave the audience to decide Gus' fate for themselves. For some Gus is killed then and there at the hands of his senior partner. For others he is spared, allowing the humiliation to serve as punishment enough. Because of this, Pinter leaves Gus in a dual existence: both alive and dead within the same instant. However, it is not part of Pinter's message to give his audience the satisfaction of knowing what the answer is.

Throughout *The Dumb Waiter,* Pinter utilizes the interaction between Ben and Gus to demonstrate the mindset of the torturer at its core without the need for a performance on the torturer's part. Ben's need to distance himself through hobbies and reading the paper exemplifies the torturers' necessity of separation from their work in order to block out any desire to sympathize with their target and thus maintain mental composure as they work. Meanwhile, Gus's curiosity and need to question the organization on every aspect of their work reveals the danger that is constantly looming over the torturers as they work with their superiors. In both cases, Pinter shows the torturers as not only the perpetrator of violent acts of dominance, but also victims of similar acts at the hands of those who oversee their action and thereby judge them on their performance.

The Dumb Waiter still depicts torturers and their world as something both everyday yet separate from the social norm. Unlike works to follow, *The Dumb Waiter* examines torturers as they interact between one another without the available distraction provided by the target, who would allow them to take the focus away from themselves. Because the torturers cannot look anywhere but inwards, Ben and Gus's mysterious and unseen superior Wilson sees the two as in need of discipline to remind them of their place within the organization. According to the conflict for control among torturers and their superiors, a constantly developing practice in which each member of the power structure must remain aware of his individual position and any defiance or risk of defiance must be quickly removed from the individuals or the individuals posing the risk must face harsh consequences. It is this lack of distraction that makes this play a key insight into the mind of the torturers and the world they live in. In this earlier work, Pinter has demonstrated the mindset of not only the torturers as individuals away from their typical role where they must face their work and themselves without anything to help them ignore what they do and what they are.

The Dumb Waiter's characters, Ben and Gus, show the different ways in which torturers must avoid directly thinking about the acts they commit in order to prevent any sense of humanity from hindering their process. Ben demonstrates this need for torturers to temporarily ignore the requirements of their job early in the play by keeping to his process of reading the paper and waiting on the next assignment. By doing this, Ben is separate his personal life from his professional responsibilities. It is this separation that creates an irony to his disgust at the article in the newspaper about the young girl killing a cat, a potential form of torture, and yet allowing Ben to find amusement in the story of the old man being crushed under a bus. Unfortunately, Gus is not so easily pulled into the same mindset which can be an infliction of pain in itself as Francesca Coppa notes: "he doesn't just prompt Ben, he questions the story. How did she do it? Why doesn't the article say? Moreover, Gus actually goes so far as to argue the girl's innocence, suggesting instead that she was framed by her eleven-year-old brother" (Coppa 48). Because Ben and Gus have separated themselves mentally from their work, they are able to feel compassion and disgust for what he read even though the actions they commit are just as horrifying. However, as Ben and Gus show throughout the play, the conflicts of power and control found in the role of a torturer or killer still seep through to the personal world, no matter how hard it is blocked by the torturer.

Throughout the play, Ben and Gus find themselves in constant conflict over every movement during their occupation of the room. The primary example of this battle for dominance, as Robert Gordon points out, is the argument over the proper wording for making the tea:

> As they engage in seemingly nonsensical quarrels over the wording of trite local newspaper stories and the correct language for petty activities like *lighting* as opposed to *putting on* the kettle, the audience observes the terms of their relationship: Ben is the senior partner and more dominant personality, while the more sensitive Gus is the junior partner who defers to Ben's authority as leader. (Gordon 25-26)

This conflict is more oriented to who assumes dominance in the situation regardless of who is correct. The practice of fighting and pushing boundaries is key among equals in the torture squad given that it keeps individuals aware of their strengths and weaknesses and therefore are in a constant state of self-improvement by building up a defense against such attacks and thus hardens the individuals mentally. These conflicts are bound to occur between torturers when there is no other

means of hierarchy other than the other torturer. This need to control is prominent among torturers, given the nature of their work in which control is the final goal in the process. The primary problem faced here is Ben's loyalty coming in direct conflict with Gus's need for understanding which is a greater source of danger than blindly following orders. In this way, Ben's abusing Gus is simply a method of enforcing the group mentality that is vital for keeping organizations comprised of torturers together.

For Gus, the need to question why he and Ben do what they do shows that he is unable to accept orders without the need for explanation. In the world of torturers and killers, this is quite risky given that to question the need for pain is to question the authority of the entire system. The need for answers shows a need for justification that has yet to be fulfilled by either Gus's partner Ben or through the purpose of the organization itself. The lack of justification shows that Gus is either too new to the organization to learn how to properly block his mind from the actions he is expected to perpetrate, or he has worked for the organization long enough to be trained and yet has not been properly removed from the role he currently occupies. According to Herbert Kelman, what Gus appears to ignore is the necessity of perseverance without looking beyond his place within the larger system:

> Perhaps the most important component of the routinization of torture is the normalization of the torturer's work. They see themselves as performing a job, as doing their duty…Above all, it is a job that one can be proud of because it is a special job that represents a significant service to the state, and that often carries with it membership in an elite corp. (Kelman 31)

Unlike Ben, Gus does not see what they do as simply a job, but as something that needs explaining; something to be examined and fully understood. Unfortunately, this places Gus as a danger to the organization. Ben's actions are an attempt to make Gus fall in line without directly telling him of the danger he is in, but to no avail. As a fellow torturer, it is Ben's job to always keep his partner under the organization's influence, including when they are not currently in the middle of a job. However, Gus's innocent appearance can prove effective when working with an otherwise stiff figure like Ben.

3.1.3 *The Hothouse*

In *The History of Madness, The Birth of the Clinic, Discipline and Punish, and The Birth of the Prison,* Foucault conducts historical source of knowledge, and

he questions the domination of the power formed in the lower layers of these institutions over individuals. After discovering the panopticon in his historical studies, Foucault defines it in the seventeenth century. In his book, *The History of Madness*, he describes the formation of the 'Great Confinement'. In 1656, an institution called a general hospital was established in Paris, and six thousand out of three hundred thousand of population in Paris were taken under surveillance in this hospital. Foucault says that this institution is not related to medicine and treatment. This institution is a part of the monarchy and bourgeois order that was being organized in France at that time. At that time, the elderly, the disabled, those who cannot or do not want to work, homosexuals, the mentally ill, prodigal fathers, and benevolent children are taken into custody without any discrimination; they all end up in the same place. According to Foucault, there is an economic and political power behind this confinement. The collapse and crisis of the economy at that time affected the whole Western world. Foucault mentions that this confinement fulfils two functions. He determines that the idle and unemployed group for the current government is taken under surveillance and cheap labour is provided through them. (*Great Confinement* 106). As Foucault states, there is no distinction among the confined ones. In short, confinement is the measure taken by states against rebellions in the modern age. The subject matters such as the surveillance in a hospital, confinement, authoritative control, and panoptic gaze can be observed in this play of Pinter's the *Hothouse.*

In this tragicomedy, *The Hothouse*, Pinter implies that the mentally ill people in the sanatorium are confined because they are excluded from the society, just like in Paris. It is a play that shows how the state mechanism of abused power dominates individuals. State power is operated in the hands of those who present authority. Nothing has changed in the management of the sanatorium, which has been going on for years. After each new administrator takes power, instead of dealing with the problems of the patients, the administrators engaged in a power struggle among themselves. In this sanatorium, patients do not have their own names and identities and are called according to the number system. Considering Foucault's panoptic penal system, patients in the convalescent home are observed as individuals who do not comply with social norms and do not comply with the rules of social life determined by the authorities, but when the Panopticon is considered, although the

surveillants in the observation tower are not visible, it is the opposite in the *Hothouse*. To put it simply, the inmates observed here are not identified and not visible in the play. However, administrators Roote, Gibbs, Mrs Cutts, and Lush have created a visible panoptic structure. In the panoptic structure, the surveillants in the observation tower are not visible, only the inmates are made visible. The inmates dwelling in this convalescent home in the play are ostracised because they are characterised by departure from the accepted beliefs. As one of his interviews Pinter asserts: "this psychiatric hospital appears to be the incarceration of political dissidents. Pinter himself claimed in the Omnibus interview that his dramatization of this situation had in fact preceded the revelation of the similar employment of psychiatric hospitals in the Soviet Union" Keith Peacock emphasizes in *Pinter and Politics* (Peacock 140).

In the *Hothouse,* it is observed that there is a context of a hierarchical organisation's attempt to neutralise a dissenting individual. For this reason, we cannot hear the patients' conversations and defences during the play. They are not given an identity and their voices are silenced. At the end of the play, we learn about the harassment and murder committed by Roote, the executive director of the Sanatorium, but as if Roote knew nothing, Roote wants the murder to be investigated and this is an indication of a corrupt authoritative state. Foucault favours the observation of tower surveillants in the panoptic order. Here, only the surveillance of inmates is a wrong method. Foucault says:

> The Panopticon may even provide an apparatus for supervising its own mechanisms. In this central tower, the director may spy on all the employees that he has under his orders. He will be able to impose upon them the methods he thinks best and it will even be possible to observe the director himself. An inspector arriving unexpectedly at the centre of the Panopticon will be able to judge at a glance, without anything being concealed from him, how the entire establishment is functioning. And, in any case, enclosed as he is in the middle of this architectural mechanism, Is not the director's own fate entirely bound up with it? (Discipline and Punish 204)

Since The Ministry institution cannot direct Roote and other administrators appropriately, patients' problems cannot be managed well, so many crimes like rape and murder are committed in the institution. The senior managers are covering up their crimes, and the hierarchical order harms the institution, the state, and the state administrators. Therefore, individuals in the society are also adversely affected by it. According to the panoptic penal order, if the administrators of the institution were

constantly watched, the people in the institution would put themselves in order and would not be able to commit crimes. because the Panopticon “functions as a kind of laboratory of power. Thanks to its mechanisms of observation, it gains in efficiency and in the ability to penetrate men's behaviour; knowledge follows the advances of power, discovering new objects of knowledge over all the surfaces on which power is exercised.” (Discipline and Punish 204).

This chapter also contextualises Pinter’s sanatorium by contextualising it through Foucault’s “heterotopia of deviation”. Foucault remarks that the heterotopias of deviation are those ‘other’ spaces in which the behaviour of the inhabitants is deviant. In “Of Other Spaces”, the examples of such spaces are rest homes, psychiatric hospitals, the prisons, almshouse, the asylums (17). Foucault claims to be in a society too large and complex to manage social disorder. Imagine a small town where most people know each other. A person may break local rules. The collective response is not to build a prison, but rather to resolve the perceived problem in less formal ways, either to turn a blind eye to that person's quirks, to force that person's behavior, or to banish or destroy that person altogether. Modern society, by contrast, struggles to break the rules. It should produce settlements where deviation can be managed. Thus we observe the design of psychiatric hospitals and prisons, but we also imagine all sorts of other deviant settlements that are not technically 'prisons', but merely prepared to localize 'other' behavior.

With the development of industrial technology, people are observed and controlled through spaces. Spaces dominate the individual by assuming the functional power. Foucault examines the modes of surveillance, discipline, and control of individuals by working deeply on these institutions, which are the places of surveillance of individuals. Likewise, Pinter designs a kind of heterotopia of deviation with his asylum. Pinter's asylum dwellers, patients in *the Hothouse* act in a certain manner to deviate their cognitive and behavioural thoughts. However, at the end of the play, patients cause mayhem that results from the abuse of power and mistreat of senior managers.

Pinter's decision to use his reputation in the theater to bring political injustice to the public's attention began with his 1980 production, *The Hothouse* which he shelved because he thought it was taking an overtly partisan stance. This was the first premiere of his work directed by Pinter himself. Later, he would direct each of his

political plays. *The Hothouse* was about the incarceration of political prisoners in psychiatric hospitals, a study conducted by the Soviet Union that Pinter wrote to the Soviet Ambassador and Times on March 22, 1974. Several short plays with political themes were followed in the 1980s (Peacock 135).

Pinter's concern with the international politics in which he had previously denied any interest, was initially provoked in 1973 by the military coup that Pinter believed with American support, had overthrown the democratically elected Allende government in Chile. Since then, his involvement with national and international protest movements has proven extremely far-reaching and has included along with various transitory causes, The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; International PEN, international writers' organisation formed to develop links between writers of all nations and the Index of Censorship. (135).

Pinter's outspoken expression of his political concerns has led to a reputation in the press for sudden explosive altercations. The thread uniting Pinter's political activity has been a concern with individual freedom, expressed in terms of support for justice, freedom of speech, resistance to state censorship, racial and religious intolerance, authoritarianism, nuclear weapons, unjust imprisonment, torture, and political hypocrisy. (136).

What is meant by locality in the introduction of the dissertation is that the plays were published in conservative theatrical climate in accordance with the Theater Act enacted in 1843, as Keith Peacock said. That is the reason why Terence Rattigan's Aunt Edna was still accepted in the post-war period, namely in the 1950s. Another reason why Pinter's early plays have locality was the impact of Thatcher's policy on the Art Council of England in Thatcherite Britain. For this reason, Thatcherism and the decline in economic activity impeded British theatre's growth. Even David Pattie in his article discloses that "the political atmosphere of 1980s affected the theatre in all terms" (389) Theatre companies had to comply with the new administrations' demands for market solutions. However, Pattie asserts that Harold Pinter objected to the theatre which is interested in progressive politics. (389). For this reason, Pinter's drama was different from the political dramatists of the period. One of the plays that was written in 1958 but published and staged in the 1980s is *The Hothouse*. The space in the play is a sanatorium. The sanatorium in the play can be regarded both as political instrumentalisation of space and it can be

envisaged as the panoptic machine which is designed by English philosopher and social theorist Jeremy Bentham.

Pinter wrote The *Hothouse* in 1958, but "set it aside for further discussion" in 1982, when, as the author himself noted in his note before the text, "decided it was worthy of being staged". The reason Pinter felt it was time to bring the play before the audience in 1982 was because he believed that reality had finally caught up with fantasy. He told playwright Steven Gale in The *Hothouse* 1958 that “would have been taken as a fantasy, as something remote and surrealistic” in 1958, “I felt that was not the case then, and I know it is not the case now. In 1982 it cannot be denied that it fits in with the facts of life today. The real political hypocrisy and brutality are now blatant. We cannot be fooled by them any longer” (Merritt 134). The "facts of life" implied by Pinter in this statement apply to a country like Britain under Margaret Thatcher.

The Hothouse is set in a state-run convalescent home although there are some doubts about what the institution is. The work deals with several important themes that are to find their way into his later and more overtly political plays: the secrecy, corruption and arbitrariness of state power; the systematic physical and mental abuse of prisoners; the disjunction between language and reality; as well as the strong tendency of tyrannical authorities to classify people according to one criterion or another in order to justify their inhumane actions against those they categorize as the “other.” The mission of the facility, as stated by Roote, the man in charge, is to provide aid and support to the patients, who are not criminals but “people specially recommended by the Ministry”: “They’re only people in need of help, which we try to give, in one way or another, to the best of our discretion, to the best of our judgment, to help them regain their confidence, confidence in themselves, confidence in others, confidence in...the world” (*The Hothouse* 9).

In *the Paris Review,* Pinter gives some accounts about *The Hothouse*. The sanatorium is described as “an institution in which patients were kept: all that was presented was the hierarchy, the people who ran the institution; one never knew what happened to the patients or what they were there for or who they were.” (Bensky 361) The play is accordingly about this panoptical place and the corruption that creeps into this institutional authority and the institution is in a state of decay under bureaucracy. It is possible to claim that all the seemingly omnipotent administrators

are in fact pawns employed to fulfil the commands of a higher and visible authority. The institution's director Roote is faced with a crisis in authority from the moment the play opens. *The Hothouse* mostly concerns the conflict in the hierarchy of the institution, and the power play between the staff. There is an opposition between three members of its staff: Roote, Gibbs, and Lush for the position of director and overall authority within the institution. This competitive antagonism occurs as Roote and Gibbs separately have affairs with the same member of the staff, Miss Cutts. Roote's waning authority is increasingly challenged as the play progresses. This crisis appears to be closely connected with the death of one patient, and the rape and pregnancy, designated by the institution as 6459 and 6457 respectively. The play primarily implicates Roote for both crimes, though the complicity of the other staff members is also heavily implied. Roote's crisis of authority is finally resolved as the unseen patients of the institution rise at the end of the play, with an uprising that is still not fully visible to the audience. It is revealed that the patients violently disposed of the staff with the exception of Gibbs, who ends up as the new director of the institution. Both crimes committed against the patients are pinned on a member of the staff, Lamb. Lamb is interrogated and tortured by Gibbs and Cutts earlier on "Do you ever feel you would like to join a group of people in which group common assumptions are shared?" (*The Hothouse* 77) It is Roote who first moves to position him as a scapegoat, yet Gibbs as the new head of the institution is the one who contributes to the downfall and failure of the previous director. Lamb is completely forgotten by the surviving staff after his torture, as the curtain closes in the wake of the patients' rising. Last time the audience sees Lamb, he is left silent and broken in the interrogation room in a catatonic state of trance which surfaces often in Pinter's body of work.

As with Pinter's other comedies, the stage of *The Hothouse* is claustrophobic, and it is encroached on by an approaching external threat. In this case, the threat comes from the patients of the institution, who always remain ominously off-stage as a presence. In *The Hothouse*, even the less distant pasts of patients 6457 and 6459 are tangled with conflicting accounts, where memory and record-keeping prove equally useless. Yet *The Hothouse* is revised and staged in the later, final stages of Pinter's career, when his work takes on a more distinctly political character. The play has shared interests with Pinter's other work from the period of its staging, in its

examination of incompetent and unjust bureaucracies and hierarchies, and a more concentrated investment in power and its nature. *The Hothouse* is the one where the secondary aims of the play's institution most conspicuously and markedly remain ambiguous. In terms of its purpose, the institution of *The Hothouse* is deemed "a convalescent home" and "a rest home" in turns, it is grouped with "nursing homes, . . . sanatoria" run by The Ministry (38). Roote even alludes to a more ominous "crematorium" at one point (90) which evokes a darker possible function for the play's institution, when taken in conjunction with its numbered residents, and Pinter's own Jewish heritage in mind. The most that can be gleaned about the institution of *The Hothouse*, however, is that it is in fact "an institution in which patients are kept" as Pinter puts it (Bensky 361). However, even this definition is somewhat precarious. "After all, they're not criminals" (*The Hothouse* 21) Roote concludes about the residents of his institution. Yet Roote does not consistently think of the residents as patients, either. The distinction between a patient and a criminal, in the eyes of the institution, is flimsy and thin. This can clearly be seen when Roote accuses 6457 of having "an accomplice" for the crime of her pregnancy (48). There is further confusion and spillage between different institutional missions and fields. The institution of *The Hothouse* may be mostly medically aligned; yet Roote is a Colonel who "still possess[es] considerable military bearing." (78)

Another institution exists in the sidelines of *The Hothouse*; this institution "The Ministry" to which Roote's institution is subject, remains equally vague and ambiguous (21), and there is no further elaboration on what field exactly The Ministry administers. In this respect, *The Hothouse* does not sketch out domains of discipline as specialized and limited in their fields of missions. Lush more explicitly alludes to such generalized character of modern institutional discipline at one point in that the "age of the specialist is dead" (87). The institution is instead led by Roote, who is markedly not a specialist. Rather than characterizing its primary institution through its specialized disciplinary aims, *The Hothouse* instead highlights the generalized and dispersed domain of institutional regulation. Discipline in *The Hothouse* works to regulate and maintain order in all aspects of daily life. Even in the carefully edited and polished description of disciplinary operations that Lush gives to the bewildered mother of 6459, the extent of disciplinary dispersion rises to the forefront. Though it is only a public relations-friendly version of its operations, the

institution of *The Hothouse* aspires to regulate not a limited field related to its secondary aims, but instead, the full existence of its subjects:

> "It's not quite so simple as that. In a rest home, you see, you do not merely rest. Nor, in a convalescent home, do you merely convalesce. No, no, in both institutions, you see, you are obliged to work and play and join in daily communal activity to the greatest possible extent" (56-57).

The control the institution exerts, and its power are dispersed over a large field of disciplinary activity. The institutional work includes the regulation of "work and play" and "daily . . . activity" (57), in addition to rest or convalescence which are the purported domains of the specialized institution. This concern of institutions with discipline in all aspects of life, and "over society as a whole" in more precisely Foucauldian terms recurs in Roote's rendition of the ultimate institutional origin story.

In *The Hothouse*, Mike is a legendary figure who is presented as the progenitor of all institutions, "the predecessor of [Roote's] predecessor, the predecessor of us all" (38). Mike is credited with the establishment of many institutions across the country, and he is perhaps even the originator of the concept. Yet ultimately, Roote does not define Mike's work through the specific missions of the institutions he is believed to have set up. In this story of institutional roots, Mike is credited with "[seting] in motion an activity for humanity, of humanity and by humanity" (38), yet for Roote, and for the greater institutional structures of his society, humanity ultimately does not resonate as a keyword. Instead, "the keyword [is] order" (38), which is what ultimately characterizes Mike's project. In this respect, order remains the principal concern and chief aim of *The Hothouse*'s institution, and so, discipline within this institution can be its own aim, method and justification all at once. In comparison, any secondary institutional mission can be nothing but vague, as it is with the institution of *The Hothouse*, and practically irrelevant.

The opening conversation between Roote and Gibbs is taken into consideration: Roote inquires about 6457, one of the inmates at the facility, and Gibbs informs him that this inmate has died two days earlier. Roote argues that that could not be the case as he himself had met with 6457 the day before. The brief and bizarre exchange that follows proves Roote to be not only a clueless boss who has no sense of time, but also an incompetent, corrupt, disoriented and probably insane

individual. To disprove Gibb's statement about the death of 6457, Roote "sits at the desk and consults the diary" and the following conversation ensues:

> Roote: Wait... here we are. Got it. Conversation with 6457 ten o'clock Friday morning. That was yesterday. Well, what do you make of that?
>
> Gibbs: I'm afraid there seems to be a slight discrepancy, sir.
>
> Roote: Discrepancy! I'm danın sure there's discrepancy! You come and tell me that aman has died and I've got it down here that I had a conversation with him yesterday morning. According to you he was in his grave. There does seem to be a slight discrepancy, I agree with you.
>
> Gibbs: I meant about the dates, sir.
>
> Roote: Dates? What dates?
>
> Gibbs: in your diary, sir... .1 must point out that you are in fact referring to Friday, the 17th Yesterday was Friday the 24th Here sir. You had a conversation with 6457 on the 17th He died on the 23rd (5).

Such confusion could have been understandable and maybe even excusable had it been caused by having too much work at hand and having to meet with too many inmates, but as it turns out, Roote had not actually met with any of the inmates for an entire week. in addition, it soon becomes clear that there was not only one "slight discrepancy" but several of them: the person Roote had met with on the 17th and was inquiring about was inmanumber 6459 and not 6457, and while the second had died two days earlier, 6459 has given birth the day before the conversation between Roote and Gibbs occurred.

Surprisingly, the news about the birth of a child in the facility seems to be far more disturbing to Roote than that about a death. As a matter of fact, the only questions Roote asks about the death of 6457 are strictly administrative: "did he get a decent burial?" (13) and "who said the last words over him?" (14). in response to the news about the birth of a baby, on the other hand, Roote declares that he is "dumbstruck. Quite thunderstruck. Absolutely thunderstruck" (23). Roote's disproportionate reactions to both incidents are undoubtedly surprising and disturbing, but what is even more significant is the reason he offers for his fury over the birth incident: "This has never happened before. Never! in all the years I've been here, in all the years my predecessor was here. And I'm quite certain never before him" (23). it seems fair to conclude from this explanation that Roote's surprisingly calm reaction to the death of the inmate is indicative of the fact that death is quite common in this institution, while birth is not.

In addition, Roote's statement shows that the system in the institution is based on unquestioned and arbitrary rules and traditions passed down from one "predecessor" to another, a fact that Roote himself admits makes the "institution so fragile in its conception and execution, so fragile the boundary between the achievement of one's aspirations and their collapse" (23). Every time a comment is made about the need for a change in the institution, the authority of the forefathers is invoked, resulting in an instant abortion of any such attempt. Consider, for example, the time when Roote complains about the confusion caused by the use of numbers instead of names to identify inmates: "Why don't we use their names, for God's sake? They've got names, haven't they?" To these questions Gibbs is quick to remind Roote that "it was your predecessor who instituted the use of numbers," (8) a response that is powerful enough to make Roote immediately drop the issue for the time being. When the topic is brought up later, Gibbs offers to put it on the agenda for further discussion, but Roote decisively answers with "Certainly not. We can't" because "that was one of the rules of procedure laid down in the original constitution. The patients are to be given numbers and called by their numbers. And that's how it's got to remain" (10). The original constitution was established by "Mike," the man whom Roote describes as "the predecessor of my predecessor, the predecessor of us all, the man who laid the foundation stone" and the man whose statue could be seen out of the window "covered in snow," (24) not a very subtle hint at the outdated status of "Mike" and all that "Mike" stands for.

In addition, the absolute and unconditional obedience to those higher on the hierarchal ladder seems to be the most important criterion for promotion. Roote acknowledges that he was promoted because he would only "yes sir, no sir and certainly sir" (9) his predecessor, and therefore when the latter retired, he was "invited to take over his position." Similarly, Gibbs who constantly yeses Roote, even to the extent of annoyance, would ultimately succeed him. Roote has no problem with his male staff members "dipping their wicks on occasion" (28) as long as the rules are followed: "Never ride barebacked and always sendin a report." Roote rationalizes that such a practice "can't be avoided" and brazenly adds that it is not only "in the interest of science" but also in the interest of the female patients themselves that "some degree of copulation" takes place.

The real monster lurking inside the seemingly civilized Roote is exposed when Gibbs inquires about what is to be done with the newbom child and Roote unhesitatingly instructs him to "get rid of it" (29). Billington observes that he heard Pinter read this particular scene at the University of East Anglia in 1993 and recalls "the frisson that ran through the hall at that particular point" *(Life* 104) This is because, as Carey Perloff remarks, "nothing is ever abstract when there is a child or an animal" involved (5). With all his psychological and moral problems, however, Roote is not unique among his staff; they all seem to be equally morally corrupted and socially insecure. Billington describes the staff in *The Hothouse* as an "isolated and immured" group of people who are "victims of the bureaucratic machine they are supposedly operating" *(Life* 103). Roote constantly complains about how "stifling" the place is, "like a crematorium," he says (68). It is a place where staff, patients and even machines age prematurely: "Roote: Rust? What are you talking about? It's a brand-new typewriter... Brand new." (62). Nothing much happens at the facility and nothing ever changes. Lamb, who has recently joined the staff, tells Cutts, a female staff member, "I only wish I had a bit more to do" (18).

The monotonous routine intensifies the tension among the co-workers who constantly engage in competitive sniping and who are mutually suspicious of the motivations and intentions of those around them. Although the patients remain totally invisible--since as in all Pinter's political plays the primary focus is on the torturers and victirnizers--we do learn a good deal about them through the words and actions of the staff members. We know, for example, that they were "recommended by the Ministry," simply because they are vaguely identified as different "They're not any Tom, Dick, or... Harry" (10). Now it is up to Roote and his staff members to help these patients conform again to the structure of society and to "instill that confidence in each and every one of them" (10). To achieve this goal, the patients are locked up in their cells and the staff is given absolute freedom over their lives. They are isolated from each other as well as from the outside world, constantly raped, subjected to electric shocks, and abused; they are stripped of their names and identities and given numbers instead, a process that causes considerable confusion similar to what occurs at the beginning of the play.

Yet despite its gruesome images of corruption and horror, Pinter considers *The Hothouse* the funniest play he had ever written. One source of humor is to be

found in the utter absurdity of the exchanges between staff members, similar to the one that occurs at the opening of the play. Another is the many farcical scenes in the play, such as when Roote repeatedly spills his drink over Lush's head or when Lush and Gibbs simultaneously pull Roote, the boss, in two opposite directions to help him sit. This mixture of humor and horror, remarks Louis Marks, adds to the power and brilliance of the play (21). In addition to being funny, the play also allows for some kind of hope in the power of the victims to rebel against their victimizer. Indeed, the play ends with the slaughter of the staff at the hands of the patients who can no longer tolerate the atrocities committed against them. But it is a guarded hope for the patients are put "back in their rooms" soon after murdering the staff. The only tangible change is the replacement of Roote with the officious Gibbs, who seems to faithfully follow in the footsteps of his murdered boss.

"The Hothouse suggests a cyclical chronology, this time concerning the institution. The Predecessors of Lamb and Roote in particular hint at a repetition of patterns, with the indication that this is perhaps not the first uprising in the institution" (Sönmez 91). Roote appears to have similarly gotten rid of his own predecessor: "When my predecessor … retired … I was invited to take over his position" (20). Lamb's predecessor, whose whereabouts and fate are unknown to the staff as Roote's are at the end of the play, might have been similarly sacrificed. Gibbs mentions that Roote's predecessor used to give [them] a helping hand occasionally, too, you know" (66). In this respect, though the patients' uprising isn't all conclusive at the end of the play, there remains a possibility, however small, that one day the cycle may be broken.

The main concern that this chapter will examine in relation to *The Hothouse* will be the institutional power in terms of how individual and collective bodies interact. The interplay between the parts and the whole of the institution is integral to the examination of power, and the manifestation of individual borders in *The Hothouse,* particularly in terms of how the members of the staff relate to the body of the institution at large. Since *The Hothouse* is mainly concerned with the higher-ranking staff of the institution, how these small cogs in the disciplinary machine individually reconcile with the greater institutional operations that they undertake is particularly on the forefront. The borders between the body of the institution and the bodies of individuals are alternately emphasized and deemphasized over the course

of the play and the intimacy of the interrogation/torture presents a complicated relation to these borders (Sönmez 92).

"In *The Hothouse,* members of the higher-ranking personnel all appear to suffer from a serious lack of connection and contact. *The Hothouse* restricts its scope to the highest-ranking members of the institutional personnel from the beginning; and in a way, the very structure of the play supports the upper staff's isolation" (92). Roote, Gibbs, Lush and Miss Cutts are isolated from the rest of the institution from the understaff and from the patients. Any interaction these characters have with the patients is reported only second hand. There is little positive contact between the upper staff themselves and even in the respective affairs of Gibbs and Roote with Miss Cutts, there remains something artificially formal and distant. Such inability to communicate and insurmountable emotional distance are staples in Pinter's work. In *The Hothouse*, these characters' inability to connect and establish contact with others is linked particularly with their institutional positions of power. Miss Cutts steals patient 6459's nightgown, in seemingly an effort to imitate a measure of intimacy that patient 6459 can manage, but Cutts, with Roote, cannot manage by herself. This impossibility of human intimacy also manifests in the characters' curious treatment of mothers. Roote, Gibbs and Lush have a fight about whether they all had a mother themselves, after Lush mentions talking to the mother of patient 6957:

> ROOTE: How do you know she was his mother? … How do you know?
> LUSH: She looked like a mother.
> ROOTE: How do you know what mothers look like?
> LUSH: I had one myself.
> ROOTE: Do you think I didn't?
> LUSH (pointing at Gibbs): He didn't.
> GIBBS: Oh yes, I did, damn you!
> ROOTE: I was fed, Mister Cleverboots, at my mother's breast.
> GIBBS: So was I.
> LUSH: Me too. Sudden silence. (106-107)

The excessive protests of Roote, Gibbs, and Lush reveal a lack of understanding and a certain vulnerability concerning mothers. Gibbs and Roote talk of the patient 6459's baby, and her motherhood, with similar ambiguity and cluelessness: "Don't you think the mother might miss the baby?" "I won't miss it. ... Then why should the mother miss it?" (46). As such, motherhood is almost an empty signifier to the members of the upper staff, with no corresponding reference. In terms of connection and intimacy, this lack of maternal connection emphasizes the isolation and distance to which the upper staff are confined. The higher-ranking

personnel of the institution struggle with establishing personal connection, and they fail to communicate with other individuals. In this respect, the staff's troubled relationship with the other (such as the patients and the other members of the staff) extends to an incomplete connection with an initial other, in the figure of the mother, which remains abstract and absent. Yet the institution of *The Hothouse* utilizes such familial connections to appeal to its subjects, promising a sense of belonging, and an erasure of rigid personal boundaries. The institutionaly-celebrated Christmas time strongly evokes a sense of family and unity. Even Roote can experience a measure of contact and connection during the celebrations: When gifted a Christmas cake by the understaff, Roote is "most touched. Most touched. More than touched. Deeply moved." In turn, Roote himself appeals to a sense of belonging, unity, and familiarity, in his Christmas address to the understaff: "Remember that you are not alone, that we here, for example, in this our home, are inextricably related, one to another, the staff to the understaff, the understaff to the patients, the patients to the staff. Remember this, as you sit by your fires, with your families, who have come from near and from far, to share this day with you, and you may be content." (145)

Roote's speech emphasizes connection and contact, imagines the institutional subjects as members of one big family. However, this contact is perhaps not experienced altogether positively in the end. After all, Roote's Christmas address is what signals, and perhaps even provokes the patients' uprising; Roote's emphasis on unity serves as a last straw for the patients. Ironically, this emphasis on institutional unity that finally prompts the patients to turn against the institution. The higher-level staff also do not generally experience their institutional connections positively: Gibbs, Roote, and Lush are all frightened of each other, and the limited connection that they feel is one of complicity as Lush says, "we're all buddies, aren't we? We're all in the game together" (52) There is Roote, also, who briefly imagines himself as a reformer, yet is quick to disclaim any actual attempt at change when he remembers his institutional allegiances. The higher-level staff, in this respect, experience contact with the body of the institution negatively, more as helplessness and complicity.

Gillen considers *The Hothouse* "further than any of Pinter's other plays in supporting the radical assessment of Lois G. Gordon that Pinter's work 'condemns the initial contact that man makes with society, the unmanageable, indeed unworkable, negotiation of man and all institutions'" (Gillen 87). Contact along the

borders of institutional and individual bodies is particularly complicated in *The Hothouse*, where pressure can be felt both as discomfort and as joy. Lamb's interrogation and questioning presents one such complication of borders under pressure, and of bodies in contact. Lamb is initially as isolated as the rest of the staff; he is similarly incapable of experiencing contact and connection: "I don't seem to be able to … reach the others. Don't know why" (*The Hothouse* 35). He considers Miss Cutts his "only friend" in the institution (35), yet from one-sided conversation, it is clear that Lamb also is not entirely able to reach Miss Cutts. While Lamb hasn't "really got used to the place" (33), he is eager to become a part of the institution and dreams of a promotion. In this respect, the institution promises a sense of belonging, and a feeling of connection to Lamb, who is otherwise unable to establish such connections. "I mean, you really get the feeling here that something… important is going on, something really valuable, and to be associated with it in any way can't be seen in any other light than as a privilege" (60). The institution offers "a group of people in which common group assumptions are shared" (77), as Gibbs mentions in one of his questions. Lamb's interrogation/torture is about contact and connection with the institutional body, in this respect. Miss Cutts also sees the process centering around contact and connection, which is felt as pressure on borders: The questions in the interrogation are "so intimate," to the point that that "intimacy becomes unbearable" (120). The pressure that Lamb is under is similarly two-faceted. Lamb feels "an extraordinary uplift" when called to the interrogation room he is "rather enjoying" (78), the questioning, "chuckles" intermittently (78). Yet this contact is too much, uncomfortable and painful. In the case of Lamb, this pressure that contact with the institution causes, leads to a breakdown of borders. If Lamb does not fully yield information under the interrogation, which is both institutional contact and painful pressure, the repeal of all contact afterwards finishes the job. Lamb truly breaks once he is left alone, when all contact is withdrawn from Lamb, and he is left completely isolated. The breakdown of Lamb comes with a breakdown of personal borders.

In terms of the play's formal strategies, the first element that this chapter will examine is music, sound and rhythm. *The Hothouse* is wordless, has non-discursive sounds, and marked silences are elemental to the play's execution. Pinter frequently and distinctly marks silences and pauses on the text "pause," "sudden silence" etcetera (107) which can be as impactful as the worded dialogue and takes

comparable space. The silence in Pinter's works has certainly generated much discussion. In Harold Pinter: The Poetics of Silence, James R. Hollis argues that such pauses in Pinter's plays mark "the limits of language" (15).

Dukore proposes that silence can function as a means of resistance in Pinter's plays. There are two instances in *The Hothouse*, however, where the nondiscursive, both non-verbal sound silence, is particularly at the forefront. First, there is the patients' uprising, which is realized on stage in "squeaks," "clanging," and "rattle of chains;" the uprising is represented through the "whispers, chuckles, halfscreams of the patients," all of which are markedly non-verbal (*The Hothouse* 145). The intimation of the uprising happens through similarly non-discursive sounds. The members of the staff are disrupted by the commotion of the patients twice, before the uprising takes place—there is "a long keen," "a long sigh," "a laugh … amplified, dying away" (117). In both instances, the staff stop what they are doing in reaction, but they also do not verbally address the sounds. The nearest attempt at addressing and discussing these sounds, and the disquietude in the institution, is found by Gibbs as: "It is absurd. Something's happening, I feel it, I know it, and I can't define it. It's … it's ridiculous" (121-122) Whereas institutional language works to subdue the patients through scientific jargon, there is something that defies language and definition in the patients' noise. The second instance where the non-discursive is at the forefront of the play relates to Lamb. The interrogation of Lamb utilizes a shocking and deeply disruptive sound, which is heard through his "earphones, emitting high-pitches cries" (68). More importantly, however, there is the curtain line, which is not a line at all. The curtain closes on a still and broken Lamb, in a "sound-proof room" (154). In this respect, the silence of Lamb is the play's final statement.

As another formal aspect of the play, the humor in *The Hothouse* is bound to be complicated, due to the plays' concerns and ominous subject matter. Billington suggests that the comic nature of Pinter's plays is often underplayed in stage adaptations, particularly later in the playwright's career. Yet there is no doubt that *The Hothouse* has darkly comic elements. Billington traces the influences of contemporary town hall sketches in *The Hothouse*, likely referencing commercial formulas of comedy. Within the play itself, humor can be applied strategically in the characters' fight for dominance within the institution. Roote is fearful of ridicule,

apprehensive that someone may be "taking the old wee-wee out of [him]" (27) and is perhaps the most vulnerable to ridicule to his position of greater authority. The members of the staff ridicule and humiliate each other, and especially Lush takes subtle jabs at both Gibbs and Roote. There are moments where humor is more broadly turned against institutional authority, where institutional grandiosity is undercut by the play: The microphone for the Christmas address, standing as a sign of authority, comes out of a cake. The cake is cut with a bayonet. Billington judges *The Hothouse* as constantly going through a fine line, where the play is funny, until it is disturbingly not. As an example, Billington points out to the quickfire, comic exchanges between Roote and Gibbs concerning the description of patients, which is abruptly followed by ruthless planning on how to eliminate 6457's baby (366). Classic comedy is similarly followed by institutional violence in another scene: Gibbs points to a light "You see that light?"- only to tell Lamb to "ignore it" (67). The joke is succeeded by Lamb's interrogation and torture. In this respect, violence and humor in *The Hothouse* are perhaps more interdependent than contrasting. The play is not necessarily above slapstick in its comedy. There are literal slaps and even an exploding cigar in *The Hothouse*. At one point, Roote, Gibbs and Lush engage in a physical tussle. In this respect, the humor of the play can originate in violence. Violence is perhaps not the limit of comedy in *The Hothouse* but a persistent aspect of it.

As for the final part of the play's formal and technical examination, *The Hothouse* remains markedly non-naturalistic in its depiction of institutional practices, in its tone and staging. *The Hothouse* verges on absurdity; as Gillen mentions, the play was initially drawing comparisons with Ionesco from critics. Beyond its absurdist elements, however, *The Hothouse* proves particularly interesting in its form, because of its references in terms of genre. Billington points out that *The Hothouse* references contemporary popular commercial forms of theatre, such as the town hall comedy sketches that were previously mentioned. Furthermore, the very structure of the play's plot echoes and parodies popular murder mysteries, where the detective turns out to be the culprit: Roote is tasked to discover the mysterious father and the murderer in the institution, he turns out to be both (Billington 103). In *The Hothouse*, there is an awareness about the theatricality of the institution. Miss Cutts is presented as "our dramatic instructor" by Lush (*The Hothouse* 56), who also

claims that the mother of the dead patient “left much moved by [his] recital” (57). In addition, it is not only commercial forms that Pinter references, but also himself. Gibbs describes Patient 6459 as “a woman in her thirties,” which “means nothing to [Roote]” (40). Gibbs’ description echoes Pinter’s usual dramatis personae, where he introduces his characters in the same formula, in simple terms, only through their age.

To conclude, *The Hothouse* is about a rest house which is a government establishment. The staff is led by an ex- army officer, Roote and Miss Cutts is the only woman in the cast, who has an affair with the superintendent and his aide as well, Gibbs Lamb, the newest member on the staff, is used by Cutts and Gibbs for experiments. The home is a centre of varied activity. One patient dies, one woman patient gives birth to an illegitimate child, and in the end Gibbs reports to a bureaucrat that the entire staff has been murdered in bloodshed. It is doubtful whether they have been killed by the inmates or Gibbs himself. At the end of the play, Lamb is sitting in the soundproof room, 'earphones and electrodes attached, quite still.' In the 1982 edition this became, "He sits still, starting, as in a catatonic trance."

The Hothouse also formally emphasizes conflict, as both violence and impact, in its staging: Patients’ sounds resonate most deeply in their scratched soul. The play’s humor depends on violent contact and collusion. Thus, the sinister violence of *The Hothouse* often draws attention to the audience’s own contact with the institution. On the one hand, interaction with the institution is always bound to cause conflict, which is often felt violently. In that regard, the audience’s own contact with the ominous hothouse is no exception. Yet conflict is also how resistance to the institution and the pushback against this institutional contact can be felt, and ultimately this is what *The Hothouse* manages.

The in-depth study of Pinter's plays has brought out the power politics of the playwright on the surface. Harold Pinter has produced many plays depicting the modern sensibility. The playwright was awarded the Nobel Prize of literature in the year 2005 for the variety of his theme and the richness of his dramatic art. Along with the absurdist theme like meaninglessness and alienation of man, the impossibility of communication and the unbridgeable gulf between the aspiration and fulfillment, Pinter has also used his political ideas in the composition of his plays.

Pinter's political instincts have always been there in his plays, though matured in the 1970s. During the 1980s it manifested itself in greater activism and resulted in his writing overtly political plays that successfully created such dramatic images and situations that have jolted our moral complacency as well as our bourgeois mentality. The plays that Pinter wrote during this period find enough expression of his political feelings.

The Swedish Academy awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature for 2005 to Harold Pinter hailing him as “the foremost representative of British drama in the second half of the 20th century”. In the same citation, the academy describes Pinter as “a known fighter for human rights, whose stands are often seen as controversial ... (he) uncovers the precipice under every prattle and forces entry into oppression's closed doors” (Nobel Citation 2005). The citation has precisely captured the spirit of the whole Pinterian dramatic and artistic output and deservedly bestowed this rather long overdue honor upon Pinter. Pinter accepted this honor, but not without taking a dig at the Swedish Academy, by saying that “(he) hopes ... the academy has not taken into account his views on the U.S. foreign policy alone while awarding this prize” (*The Guardian*)

Pinter, bristling with a controlled fury, begins his acceptance speech by explaining the unconscious process that he uses to write plays, 'which start with an image, a world, a phrase,” and as he says, 'the character becomes people with will and an individual sensibility of their own, made from component parts which cannot be changed, manipulated or distorted'. He also maintains that 'language in art remains a highly ambiguous transaction, a quicksand, a trampoline, a frozen pool, which might give way under you, the author, at any time.' but while drama represents the search for truth, Pinter says, “politics works against truth, surrounding citizens with a vast tapestry of lies, spun by politicians eager to cling to power.” But it is not for the first time that Pinter has vehemently attacked the U.S. foreign policy. He believes that "since the World War II, the crimes of the Soviet Union had been well documented but those of U.S. had not.” Almost with a furious sarcasm, he says “I put it to you that the U.S. is without doubt the greatest show on the road ... brutal, indifferent, scornful and ruthless it may be, but it is also very clever. As a salesman it is out on its own and its most saleable commodity is self love" (Pinter’s Nobel Speech).

As John Peter says, “Pinter's plays have already been political in the sense Ibsen's plays are political: they expose the private roots of power, the need to dominate and mislead, the terror being excluded or enclosed, the compromising contagion of past actions". the compulsion of re-imagine the past.” (qtd. In Billington 355).

While going through Pinter's dramatic writing right from the beginning to the present day, we can see both his characters and his work have always been imbued with a profound sense of suspicion of authority, as also dominated by the conflict between the individual's conscience and the arbitrariness of the authority. The plays like *The Dumb Waiter*, *The Birthday Party*, *The Hothouse* can very well be seen as Pinter's political plays which were written during the early phase of his dramatic career.

Pinter's political awareness began as a conscientious objector when he was only 18. During the 1970s, Pinter seems to have put on a mantle of moral obligations and rage, which has shaped his political vision. The 1973 military coup in Chile, which succeeded only because of the U.S. support, brought down the democratically elected government. The political injustices accentuated his anger against the injustice and unfairness of the U.S. foreign policy. For this reason, Pinter's political instincts have always been there, though matured in the 1970s. That is why; the earlier plays have the political content in his plays in the hidden form whereas after 1970 dissenting thoughts are quite obvious in his plays.

In the early phase of his dramatic career, Pinter has pointed out the conflict between individual and authority. *The Birthday Party* is a beautiful example of this conflict. It is a skull-beneath-the skin play, exposing the horrors and fears that lurk under the calm, dull surface of our everyday existence, behind the frenzied ceremonial drumming of the humdrum. The play is set in the sea-side boarding house kept by a childless couple, Petey and Meg. Petey has the most mundane of jobs; he is a deckchair attendant. Meg lives in terror of the wheel-barrow in which, one day, she will be trundled away to a waiting van. Meanwhile, she mothers their one boarder, Stanley, out-of-work concert-party pianist. His way of life is shattered by the arrival of two other guests, Goldberg and McCann, a Jewish businessman and his Irish men, who, under the pretext of throwing a birthday party for Stanley, break down his personality and lead hiın to commit a symbolic murder. The constant questioning of

Stanley by the two- Goldberg and McCann shatters the personality of Stanley. In fact, the two strangers are symbolic of the authority which is always ready to impose upon others and disturb the calm and peace of one's life. True to its title *The Birthday Party* contains a birthday party for Stanley who insists it is not his birthday. Birthday not only means the anniversary of one's birth, but it also means the day of one's birth, and in *The Birthday Party* the celebration of the former helps to create the latter. The intruders turn Stanley into what McCann calls a new man. At their hands he is reborn, made into a different kind of person on a birthday that becomes a birthday.

Written the same year as *The Room* and *The Birthday Party*, *The Dumb Waiter* revolves around two people in a room. Whereas *The Birthday Party* chiefly focuses on the victim, The *Dumb Waiter* centres upon victimizers, two hired killers, who wait for instructions as to when their victim will enter. The play is about its title, The *Dumb Waiter,* which is ambiguous for it has three possible referents. One is the machine with its unexplained, perhaps inexplicable, descents and ascents. This referent stresses the arbitrary and irrational universe in which man finds himself. Perhaps the title alludes to Gus, the inquisitive killer who, while waiting, foolishly questions his colleague Ben about why people in the newspaper stories did what they did, why it takes the lavatory tank so long to fill, and more dangerously- matters concerning their job, such as whether Ben ever gets fed up with it and who cleans up after they have killed their victims. Since he questions aspects of the organization for which he works, he may threaten it. That is why, Ben is ordered to kill his partner Gus.

Pinter, in an I.C.A. video interview with Benedict Nightingale, said about The *Dumb Waiter* that it is about the pressures put on an individual to conform to the establishment and not ask any questions, why should anyone do what the government says. In the light of this statement, it is convenient to view Ben as a conformist, Gus as a non- conformist, and the unseen Wilson as the establishment. Ben is sleepwalking. He has been reduced to the status of a cipher and as such has no control over his own self. Because he conforms to the establishment, he has been spared. Juxtaposed to him is the co-assassin, Gus, who has an individualistic streak. An awareness of his self induces him to question the orders of Wilson. He has misgivings about his job and views his involvement in it with uncertainty. He is victimized due to it. The mysterious Wilson is a scathing comment on the

establishment. His inconsiderateness, as shown by his arranging an unpleasant room for Ben and Gus, his thoughtlessness, as shown by his making them wait for his orders, his superciliousness, as evident· by his queer orders for food, all point at the unfeeling and inhuman structures of establishment.

3.1.4 *The Caretaker*

The 'room', it is agreed, is a classic Pinter motif. Indeed, in 1961, Pinter himself says this:

> I went into a room and saw one person standing up and one person sitting down, and a few days later I wrote *The Room*. I went into another room and saw two people sitting down, and a few years later I wrote *The Birthday Party*. I looked through a door into a third room and saw two people standing up and wrote *The Caretaker*. (Pinter, *Writing for myself* ix)

The spatial dimension of Pinter's early plays tends to be analysed either in existential terms, psychoanalytic terms, or domestic terms. With respect to the domestic, Una Chaudhuri argues that there inheres in the very physicality of 'the room' something that triggers feelings of both 'primal pleasure' and 'fear':

> The structure of the room as a boundaried space, capable of keeping out as well as keeping in, allows it to function as a referent for such thematics as danger versus safety, infantile sexuality versus oedipal threat, political passivity versus active resistance. (Chaudhuri 93).

In this chapter, however, I argue that the domestic world of *The Caretaker* (1959), as manifested in the play's setting – 'a room' in 'a house in West London' – functions as a figure for place in general, and its relation to the identity of the political subject. (*The Caretaker* 4). In short, I argue that the notion of 'home' resonates far beyond the play's immediate, West London location, serving, as it does, as a trope for national home or 'homeland'.

The notion of 'home' or 'at-homeness' and its opposite – homelessness – are particularly important in this play, given that it was written just fourteen years after World War Two. In the opening of the preface to the first edition of *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1950), Hannah Arendt identifies homelessness as one major facet of the post-war era: 'Under the most diverse conditions and disparate circumstances', she writes, 'we watch the development of the same phenomena – homelessness on an unprecedented scale, rootlessness to an unprecedented depth'. (Arendt xxix). Pertinent, here, I suggest, is Davies's evocation of post-war displacement whenever he mentions his long-lost identification 'papers' – papers that have, he says, been in

Sidcup since 'the war': 'Oh, must be… it was in the war… must be… about near on fifteen year ago'. (*The Caretaker* 18-19). Given the play is written in 1960, this would, of course, suggest the papers have been in Sidcup since the end of the War.

My intention in this chapter, then, is to argue that *The Caretaker* presents us with a demystified version of 'home' which can no longer be regarded as a guarantor of identity, rootedness, and sheltering. Through a series of theorized readings on and around the trope of the 'room'.

The study of space in relation to theatre has in recent years enjoyed special attention in theatre studies, with many arguing that space is an integral part of the theatrical event. The centrality of space in the creation of theatre is vividly summarized by the opening lines of Peter Brook's *The Empty Space* (1968) which became, according to an article in *The Guardian* (2010), 'the commandments on which modern theatre was built'(Gibbons)

I can take any empty space and call it a bare stage. A man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged. (Brook 7).

In other words, theatre, it can be said, is pre-eminently a spatial medium, capable as it is of dispensing with language, but never with space. However, theatrical space is not to be conceived as simply a fixed site in which a play is staged or a mere background against which characters act; rather, it is to be understood as a semiotic *process* that contributes to the production of the theatrical event. Hence, Anne Ubersfeld's foundational remark '[t]heatre is space'. (Ubersfeld 33).

Elsewhere, in her *Reading Theatre* (1996), Ubersfeld expands on this remark, arguing that 'space is a given that is immediately received as we read theatrical text. This is because concrete space is the (two-fold) referent of all theatrical texts'. (xviii). She goes on to outline the textual elements that constitute theatrical space – namely, the 'dialogue' and stage directions, or what she calls '*didascalia*':

The essence of this spatiality […] is found in *didascalia*, which provide: a/ place directions that are more or less precise and detailed, depending on the individual text; b/ the characters' names, indications concerning gestures and movements […] that […] allow us to understand how space will be occupied. (95-96).

In this sense, space comprises an amalgam of signifiers interacting altogether to create theatre. These signifiers structure both the stage and the characters' *kinetic* relation to it. The combination of this she calls 'dramatic space' (116).

Drawing on Ubersfeld's semiotic method, I will analyse the various meanings of dramatic space in *The Caretaker*, very much keeping in mind the importance of the characters' *occupation* of that space. (Lefebvre 93-94). I will depart, though, from Ubersfeld's tendency to read dramatic space as something 'given'. I will argue, instead, that the presentation of the 'room' in Pinter's play is, in fact, profoundly underwritten by a dynamic interplay of signifiers that unsettle the concept of 'home'. In short, dramatic space in *The Caretaker* appears, I argue, as not so much a stable sign-system as a differential or deferring process of signification.

Vital to this process, I suggest, is the spatial language Pinter uses throughout the play. Note, for example, how the first words spoken in the play – namely, Aston's invitation for Davies to 'sit down' – initiate a spatial relation between them, with Aston as host, and Davies as guest. This on-stage invitation to 'sit', to be anchored to dramatic place, is, though, immediately countered, or complicated, as Davies proceeds to evoke an off-stage world in which he has no seat: 'All them Blacks had it', he says, 'Blacks, Greeks, Poles, the lot of them, that's what, *doing me out of a seat*'. (*The Caretaker* 6). In this way, the chair (as an onstage object) serves as a relational or liminal object connecting the onstage space with the offstage. And this sense of spatial liminality, I argue, results in the dislocation of the dramatic space, that is the 'room'.

The 'room', in *The Caretaker*, is especially important because each character seems to be defined by his relation to it. Note, in particular, how Aston dwells in the room without owning it; Mick allegedly owns the room without inhabiting it; and Davies is temporarily accommodated in the room but promised residence in it – though to no avail. In other words, by virtue of the room, all three characters are spatially determined – as, respectively, a resident, a displaced landlord, and a homeless guest. The three men are, then, tethered to the room despite their claims to having a life outside of its confines. It is, in this sense, *home* three times over.

The homeliness of the room is particularly suggested by the repeated acts of return in the play. All three men get to leave the room or house at intervals, but they are all witnessed returning to the room with varying frequency – Aston three

times, Mick once, and Davies twice. (5, 34, 62, 42, 68). .Many of the returns are accompanied by the stage direction 'the door opens' – invariably, we presume, with a key since the two brothers already have keys to the room, while Davies obtains them later from Aston. (22). On a psychoanalytic reading, the image of a man entering or, re-entering, a room by opening its door with a key, a phallic signifier, evokes, of course, the fantasy of 'return to the womb' – that longing to recuperate an abandoned intra- uterine existence, that is, the primal home. As Freud argues in his 1919 essay of 'The Uncanny':

> This *unheimlich* place […] is the entrance to the former *Heim* [home] of all human beings, to the place where each one of us lived once upon a time and in the beginning. There is a joking saying that 'Love is home-sickness'; and whenever a man dreams of a place or a country and says to himself, while he is still dreaming: 'this place is familiar to me, I've been here before', we may interpret the place as being his mother's genitals or her body. (Freud 245)

The room, a closed and interior space, is, according to Freud, a common symbol in dreams for the mother's womb, and the door for female genitalia (Freud, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis 189).* '[T]he windows, and doors in and out of rooms, take over', he writes, 'the meaning of orifices in the body', whilst 'the *key* that opens it is a decidedly male symbol'. (192). We should note, of course, that many critics have observed the womb-room symbolism in Pinter's works. One such critic is Irving Wardle, who describes Pinter, as 'a writer dogged by one image the womb'. (39-40). 'Place', as Gillian Rose points out, 'is [invariably] understood in the same terms as a maternal Woman', and this is particularly true of the place that is the room in *The Caretaker*. (59).

References to an actual or literal mother are, though, few and far between in the play. We do know from Aston that his mother 'signed their [the doctors'] form, giving them permission at the hospital 'to do something to […] [his] brain' when he 'was a minor'. (*The Caretaker* 53). Aston's mother, it seems, has, in the past, been more of a presence than his father – 'That was when', Aston says, 'I lived with my mother. And my brother.' (55). But now, of course, the mother appears to be missing, if not dead; nevertheless, the room seems to be haunted by an impalpable sense of maternity, especially when Mick notes that one of the beds in the room belongs to his mother: (McAuley 173).

> MICK (*pointing to* DAVIES' *bed*) That's my bed. DAVIES What about that, then?
> MICK That's my mother's bed. (*The Caretaker* 33).

Implicit in the association of the mother with the bed is the suggestion that the mother owns the space of sleep, which Freud identifies as a psychological need 'from time to time [to] withdraw to the premundane state, into existence in the womb'. (Freud, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* 117) Moreover, the kind of sleep Aston claims to have in his mother's bed is dreamless.

> DAVIES I don't dream. I've never dreamed.
> ASTON No, nor have I.
> *(The Caretaker 20).*

which redoubles the suggestion of a primordial state, characteristic of pre-natal existence. As Freud argues, dreams are 'residues of mental activity', and 'if it [the mind] begins to stir', he writes, 'we have not succeeded in establishing the foetal state of rest'. (Freud 117). In short, the palpable presence of the mother's bed in the room can be seen as a nostalgic attempt to recuperate the lost mother by imagining a womb-like existence there.

In Bachelard's *The Poetics of Space* (1958), a phenomenological investigation of place, it is argued that the house, one's 'corner in the world', is the location of native attachment, where one's primary sense of place is founded. 'All really inhabited space', 'bears the essence of the notion of home'. (Bachelard 4-5). For Bachelard, one's consciousness is shaped by the embodied memories of the childhood house:

> In the life of man, the house thrusts aside contingencies, its councils of continuity are unceasing. Without it, man would be a dispersed being. Before he is 'cast into the world,' as claimed by certain hasty metaphysics, man is laid in the cradle of the house. And always, in our daydreams, the house is a large cradle. […] Life begins well, it begins enclosed, protected, all warm in the bosom of the house. (7).

The version of home evoked in *The Caretaker* is, though, a far cry from Bachelard's; for here life does *not* seem to begin well – the play's evocation of home, or the homely, being always already questioned by the presence of the homeless Davies, who seems compelled, as he puts it, 'to be moving about […] try[ing] to get fixed up'. (*The Caretaker* 14). Indeed, the notion of homeliness in the play seems to be more in agreement with Freud's analysis of 'the uncanny', which focuses on how in German the word for 'homely' – namely, *heimlich*, drifts in its

meaning toward an 'an ambivalence [and] finally coincides with its opposite, *unheimlich*', or un-homely. (Freud 226).

The play presents, then, a kind of riddle – namely, how can a homeless man be housed? Note that Davies appears to have no memory of his birthplace and can only remember that he has 'been around'. (*The Caretaker* 23). He cannot be tied to any address and seems apprehensive about Aston's proposition to put '*Caretaker'* 'outside the front door', fearful as he is of being found by any of his nameless pursuers. (42). Moreover, we are confused by the tramp's two names – not only, Mac Davies but also Bernard Jenkins – which makes us, like Mick, wonder if he has yet other names. As Mick puts it, 'What about the rest?' Davies, indeed, is unable to achieve any fixed identity via work, constantly being, as he says, 'give[n] the bullet'. (71). No wonder, then, that time and again, he reiterates his wish to walk to Sidcup to obtain his 'papers'. These are papers, however, that apparently he 'can't move without' – as if to suggest, absurdly, that he moves only in order to move. (14).

It is true that Davies is accommodated by Aston as a 'guest'; however, Davies's presence in the house is increasingly felt to be intrusive, particularly when Mick calls him 'an old robber […] [who] does not belong in a nice place like this'. (33, 44).Later on, Mick offers a summary of Davies's unhomely characteristics:

> What a *strange* man you are. Aren't you? You're really strange. Ever since you come into this house there's been nothing but *trouble*. Honest. I can take nothing you say at face value. Every word you speak is open to any number of different interpretations. Most of what you say is *lies*. You're *violent*, you're *erratic*, you're just completely *unpredictable*. You're nothing else but a *wild animal*, when you come down to it. You're a *barbarian*. And to put the old tin lid on it, you *stink* from arse-hole to breakfast time. (71-72).

Mick protests against Davies's strangeness or un-homeliness, but both he and Aston have backgrounds which also render them 'strange'. For instance, the story Aston relates of the mental hospital could be said to be 'open to any number of different interpretations', or even be dismissed as a bunch of 'lies'. Again, it might be said that Mick himself is 'violent', 'erratic', and 'unpredictable'. In short, the insider figures, namely the brothers, seem just as unhomely as the outsider figure, namely Davies. The play's outside-inside dichotomy is thus conceived dialectically, rather than dualistically, with the outside functioning as an alter-ego for the inside. To put it in another way, the play is marked by a profound sense of the unhomely- homely or homely-unhomely dialectic that is, as we have seen, for Freud, the uncanny.

The failing condition of the house and/or room underlines a sense of the uncanny. We learn from Aston that 'the garden' is 'overgrown' and needs 'clear[ing]', that the other rooms '[a]re out of commission' and 'need a lot of doing to', and that 'downstairs' is 'closed up'. (15). Again, Mick tells us that the 'flat' is 'unfurnished', whilst the stage direction – '*a drip sounds in the bucket*'– reminds us, every now and then, of the leak in the ceiling. (15, 28). The house's dysfunctional condition imparts, then, an overall sense of disorder which, I argue, reflects the fractured selves of its inhabitants. Mick and Aston's inability to set their actual house in order thus parallels, I suggest, their inability to master their inner selves. Central to this is Davies – 'This is my room', says Mick to him, 'You are standing in my house'. (32). We are reminded of Freud's classic line, 'the ego is not master in his own house'. (Freud 137-144).

The Caretaker, then, complicates notions of self and other by blurring the demarcation between the inside and outside. Davies, the outsider figure in the house, signifies not so much the strangeness without as within. As already mentioned, the brothers project onto the tramp many of their own unhomely or undesirable qualities and do so in order to claim homeliness as their own and proper identity. In other words, the play suggests that the brothers reject the otherness within themselves, projecting it outwards. Hence, their construction of Davies, the figure of the outsider, or stranger, as the 'other'. Indeed, the finality of the brothers' refusal to grant Davies another chance to stay in their house at the end of the last act suggests their inability to be reconciled with the otherness within themselves. Nevertheless, when at the end of the play we see the curtain descending on Davies still standing in the room and Aston 'remain[ing] still, his back to him', there is a clear suggestion that the 'other', even if denied, cannot be expelled entirely. (*The Caretaker* 76).

In *Strangers to Ourselves* (1988), Kristeva draws a parallel between Freud's analysis of 'the uncanny' and xenophobia arguing that both of them relate to the fear of facing the 'other'. She asks the question – 'How could one tolerate a foreigner if one did not know one was a stranger to oneself?' (Kristeva 182). In other words, only when apprised of our own strangeness, she would argue, are we able to overcome the fear of the foreigner. Kristeva thus makes a link between the respective fields of psychoanalysis and politics by suggesting that the figure of the foreigner is constructed by an unconscious process of 'identification-projection'. (187). The

political subject, or subject-as-citizen, projects on to the figure of the foreigner all those internal traits to which the citizen is unable to be reconciled, thus enabling the categories of the homely 'self' and unhomely 'other' to emerge '[T]he foreigner', writes Kristeva, 'lives within us: he is the hidden face of our identity, the space that wrecks our abode' (1).

In *The Caretaker*, the role of the 'foreigner' is mostly played by Davies. Note how both brothers seem particularly attentive to Davies's origins or potential racial difference – for instance, Aston inquires if Davies is 'Welsh' and Mick demands to know whether Davies is 'a foreigner' or 'born and bred in the British Isles' *(The Caretaker* 23, 31). Davies, however, views himself as very much a native – recall how he rants about the foreigners who had taken his seat at the café where he works: 'All them Greeks had it, Poles, Greeks, Blacks, the lot of them, all them aliens had it'. (6). Davies also stresses his racial superiority, by claiming that he is 'clean' and 'keep[s] [himself] up', unlike his foreign co-workers, whom he describes as 'toe-rags' with 'the manners of pigs'. (7). And he is particularly scornful of the 'Scot git' who, as Davies tells us, does not know 'how to talk to people with the proper respect' – unlike himself, of course, 'who was brought up with the right ideas. (8). Davies's xenophobia is probably most explicit when he seems unusually apprehensive about Aston's neighbours, the 'family of Indians', whom Davies

indiscriminately calls, 'Blacks', and nonsensically blames for all the noises he himself makes at night: 'Them you got. Next door. Maybe it were them Blacks making noises, coming up through the walls' (11-12).

All this suspicion of racial or national outsiders is, though, always already complicated in the play by the fact that the three men – not just Davies – do, at times, themselves appear as outsider figures. For instance, despite being the 'landlord' of the house, Mick acts, at times, as if he were intruding into his brother's private space. Observe how, at the very outset of the play, Mick suddenly leaves the room when Aston arrives:

MICK *is alone in the room, sitting on the bed. He wears a leather jacket. Silence. He slowly looks about the room looking at each object in turn.* […] *Silence for thirty seconds. A door bangs. Muffled voices are heard.* MICK *turns his head. He stands, moves silently to the door, goes out, and closes the door quietly.* (5).

From this moment on, Mick only enters the room when Aston is not there and always leaves, even if not instantly, when Aston arrives, which makes us question Mick's claim to own the house. Moreover, we are told that Mick 'live[s] somewhere else', which somehow undermines his rootedness in the house, unlike his brother Aston, who, when asked by Davies 'to find somewhere else', firmly responds – 'I live here' (44, 66).

That is not to say that Aston himself is always seen as an insider figure in the play. He, too, can sometimes appear as an outsider in the room he occupies, especially when we learn from Mick that he is only 'doing him [Aston] a favour [by] letting him live there' (72). Of course, as already mentioned, the most obvious outsider figure in the play, is Davies, whom, as we have seen, Mick describes, first, as a 'robber […][who] does not belong in a nice place like this', and next, as a 'guest'. Either way, Davies remains an outsider. It is true that they *allow* him to stay in the room, in what might be regarded as an act of considerable generosity; however, there is no promise of full integration. And indeed, at the end of the play, the brothers seem firmly united in their decision to throw Davies out. This brings us to another central question in the play, namely, the question of hospitality, which, I argue, is indissociable from the play's equivocal presentation of place and dwelling.

CHAPTER 4: A FOUCAULDIAN READING OF POWER AND SPACE IN HAROLD PINTER'S LATE PLAYS

4.1 *One for the Road (*1984*), The Mountain Language (*1988*), Ashes to* Ashes (1996)

The Birth of the Prison refers to two main issues. These are prison and criminal law. In the architectural sense, the prison remains the place where the criminal is visible, on the other hand, the criminal law remains a discourse. There is a disconnection between the prisons formed in the 18th century and law on the criminal procedure. Criminal law is created separated from the the prison. In this law, crimes are listed and re-interpreted. The conditions of criminals are handled. Prisons, on the other hand, develop as spaces where people independent of criminal law assemble. These are religious schools, army and workshops. It has been explained within the scope of the emergence of the prisons that the body became objectified with historical prototypes and how the body was tried to be made productive and useful in the army, religious schools and factories. In this respect, prison has nothing to do with criminal law. The formation of the prison conditions people into a machine by subordinating bodies in religious schools, camps, and workshops. When we think of the prison as a micro power, the modern state penetrates life and shapes daily life. It emphasizes that the modern state intervenes in the lives of subjects and citizens with administrative rules. He mentions three types of institutions. The prison that emerged after the 18th century was completely different from the previous criminal procedure. In time, the people begin to feel sorry for the criminal who was executed in the old penal method. Before death, the prisoner cries fearlessly in the face of power. The modern state secretly maintains obedience in prison in order to prevent these nervous breakdowns. For Foucault, punishment gradually ceases to be a stage. Anything that the punishment includes as a spectacle becomes a negative indicator. In this direction, punishment will be a secret part of the criminal process. In the 19th century, physical punishment ceases to be a major spectacle element. The staging of suffering is excluded from the scope of punishment. Although the main purpose of punishment was to inflict pain, in the 19th century it became directed towards property and rights. Deprivation of liberty and practices such as cells start with confinement. Because the purpose of the government has changed. The soul, not the body, is captured and subjugated (*The*

Birth of Prison 109-127). Foucault, in *The Birth of the Prison*, talks about the purposes the prison serves, while also referring to other versions of the prison. It also includes schools, military and factories in this category. As the extensive information about the functions of institutions mentioned in the previous section of prison is mentioned, the main argument of the thinker about institutions such as schools: It is the obedience of people to the information given by the experts of certain fields. The school institution, unlike the prison and the army, is based on reformation. Here, it is emphasized that the government keeps students under control through teachers and shapes them in line with the ideals of the government.

In Foucault's "Power and Knowledge", the first thing that comes to mind when power is mentioned is the army; however, he emphasizes that power is omnipresent. According to him, power manifests itself among women and men, parents and children etc. and among millions of relationships. He emphasizes that micro-struggles are everywhere and where there is power, there can be resistance. According to Bertrand Russell, in people 's imaginations, there is an unlimited the goal of power like God. The most prominent of the unlimited desires of human beings are the desire to gain power and glory. Marx's economic approach ignores the human power drive. When greed for wealth is separated from greed for power and glory, it is limited; can be satisfied with a fair amount of money to make a living. According to him, just as energy takes various forms in physics, power also has forms such as wealth, weapon power, civil authorities, and influence over thought (Russell 3-4). According to Russell's analysis of power, one of the basic motives of human beings is the love of power. Experts who satisfy this motive on the people who are attached to the institutions, while dominating the individual, also maintain the hegemony of the power over the society.

One of Pinter's overtly political plays, *One for the Road*, resists any association with any particular regime as it is set in an unspecified country and remains elusive about the geopolitical context. In addition, and as Pinter remarks he intentionally made the names in the play "non-specific" and "multi-national" (15). Drew Milne aptly notes that "political ambiguity is revealed by the way Nicolas, [a high-ranking official and an interrogator] uses cricket metaphors. This suggests English contexts, not least cricket as a favored idiom of English civil service. But intimations of a totalitarian regime do not invite readings of the play in relation to

political torture in the North of Ireland" (196). Pinter intensifies this political ambiguity even further as he, drawing upon Nicolas, the high official and interrogator in the play, maintains:

> "And you only have to look around you to see world leaders doing exactly the same thing. George W. Bush is always protesting that he has the fate of the world in mind and bangs on about the 'freedom-loving peoples' he's seeking to protect. I'd love to meet a freedom-hating people. But in the rhetoric of global politics there is a total dichotomy between words and action; and that, in part, is what I'm writing about in this play" (7).

By setting events to take place in an obviously ambiguous setting, Pinter makes the play reflect the procedures followed by any government, past or present, when investigating people. By generalizing, Pinter blamed any government and created an unexpected threat tension.

4.1.1 *One for the Road*

The physical and psychological pressure Nicholas puts on Victor, who he is questioning, proves Pinter's transition to an authoritarian power, not a disciplinary power model. The sexual abuse of his wife, Gila, the murder of his young son, and the bullying that they will be questioned again reflect an authoritarian power. in his late plays, political aspects are more evident in corrupted political systems, the violation of human rights, and exploitation of people. In *One for the Road*, Nicolas can be seen as a representative of dictatorial political system which Pinter stood against. The political system is abusive and not stated explicitly and the victims of this system are exposed to torture and their house is vandalised. Violence is carried out off the stage. Nicolas' words and attitudes reflect absolute power that he inflicts upon his victim.

The fourth chapter deals directly with some of the political plays written by Pinter during the 1970s and 1980s. In the fourth chapter three plays, *One for the Road*, and *Mountain Language* are discussed in detail to bring out power politics. At that time the cold war between the USA and the U.S.S.R. was at its peak and a preemptive nuclear attack on U.S.S.R. was being seriously considered by the cold war protagonists in the USA. Pinter exploits this theme of nuclear attack and its resultant affects in his plays. In *One for the Road* (1984), Pinter balances the moral conviction with latent irony, by showing that even those who are backed by the awesome power of the State, do have a tremendous craving for recognition and

admiration, love and respect. It is a play about the relationship between a high-ranking government official Nicolas, and his three prisoners: Victor, Gila and their son Nicky. Victor is tortured and mutilated, Gila is sexually abused and raped, and Nicky is killed. Pinter also tries to examine the psychology of the torturer, Nicolas, who looks to be a passionate man of 'considerable faith' and prepared to fight for his beliefs. He subjects his victims to any amount of horror and humiliation for the 'just cause' as he sees it. But Nicolas does not act out of pure sadism, but out of a righteous belief in 'Family, State and Religion'. In fact the play's horrific irony is that he destroys a whole family in the name of his belief in the 'patriarchal values'. Nicolas wields such a tremendous power but looks more insecure than his own victims and craves validation for all his actions. Thus, Pinter has turned a simple police state brutality into a psychologically complex work about the tortured nature of the torturer. It also shows how Pinter invests his private and personal plays with a political tension. In fact his political plays start from the personal and work outwards. He does not use a larger political canvas but the calculated ambiguity that he invests, shows that he is dealing not merely with a universal process of oppression and torture that is going on all over the world, but also with a separation between 'language and reality' which he feels is eating into the present day culture.

Pinter’s engagement with politics was a matter of internal compulsion rather than a conscious choice, as a result of which we can see that Pinter's political convictions inform his entire dramatic output particularly the plays he produced during the 1980s and the 1990s, including screenplays, poetry and also his directorial assignments.

Pinter's outrage at the hypocrisy of the western governments, particularly that of the U.S.A., claiming the moral superiority, while sanctioning the most extreme cruelties, cannot be separated from his concerns as an artist. He strongly feels that the conscience of a citizen and the preoccupation of the writer go hand in hand. Pinter's achievement is that he changed the public opinion that an artist is impotent, that 'poetry makes nothing happen', and 'a writer, at best, can be only a detached observer of world affairs'. It is evidence of Pinter’s realization that the artist can use his claim on public attention to expose the injustices carried out in the name of the so-called civilized society. Pinter was perturbed about the changes that were taking

place in the British Government policies under the premiership of Margaret Thatcher, which he felt undermined the fundamental liberties of the British people.

A major source of Pinter's anger is that language, both on the social and the political levels, is frequently used to camouflage the truth. In an extremely anguished talk on Channel Four of the B.B.C., Pinter asks, 'Is it that we are obliged to use language only in order to obscure and distort reality... to distort what is - to distort what happens, because we fear it?' (BBC World Magazine).

Thus we can see that the whole thrust of Pinter's political plays is to try to jolt our complacency about the self-righteous superiority of the Western democracies, particularly that of the U.S. The so-called outburst of Pinter's anti- Americanism in his Nobel acceptance speech is not coincidental; it has a sustained though silent potency, which he had harbored all through his adult life, giving it some oblique expression throughout his artistic creations, plays, screenplays or poetry. In fact, abusing of power and oppressive authoritative control of power pervade all Pinter's plays either directly or indirectly.

At the beginning of the play, Victor has been physically abused, and yet Nicolas greets him with "Hello," "Good morning" and "How are you?" But it does not take long for Nicolas to slip off his mask as he waves his fingers in front of Victor's face and reminds him that "I can do absolutely anything I like." This statement sums up the horror that results when an individual holds complete control over somebody else's life, especially when this individual is as brutal, sadistic and merciless as Nicolas.

But Pinter's Nicolas is not one-dimensional. He is a complex individual whom Pinter allows to speak freely for himself, "no holds barred" (8). The result, according to the playwright himself, is that the audience encounters not "a monster, although he is certainly monstrous but a man. Nicolas is a desperate man who seeks validation from his male victim, talks about his love of God, country and nature, and [is] always trying to find a philosophical basis for his actions" (9).

For Nicolas to justify the torture, rape, and murder of his prisoners, he must first establish himself as a righteous individual and a spokesman for God and the State and then prove his victims to be enemies of both. Consider, for example, the way Nicolas talks to Victor in the following scene that occurs shortly after the play

opens: “Are you a religious man? I am. Which side do you think God is on?” (33). Whether Victor is a religious man is questionable at best, though apparently no question could be thought about Nicolas being one. And since God is said to be on the side of the religious, then he is undoubtedly on Nicolas’s side (presumably against Victor and the likes of him.) To further emphasize this fact, Nicolas repeatedly claims that God speaks through him and that everyone else knows this to be the case. Later in the play, Nicolas comes back to the same question only to assert that Victor is “not a religious man” (40). In addition to being “religious,” Nicolas perceives himself as a “patriot” who belongs to a community of shared values and interests, while Victor is ostracized because of his antipatriotic views and attitudes. Nicolas, in Austin Quigley’s words, portrays himself as “one acting on behalf of a unified group against a lone dissenter, and the existence of that larger unity suffices to convert the dissenter into a traitor” (10) “only the other day...the man who runs this country announced to the country: We are all patriots, we are as one, we all share a common heritage. Except you, apparently.” And then after a brief pause Nicolas continues,

> “I feel a link, you see, a bond. I share a commonwealth of interest. I am not alone. I am not alone!” (50-1). Indeed, this assertion of belonging is undercut by the shift from “we” in the first part of the statement to “I” in the second. In addition, the repetition of the sentence “I am not alone. I am not alone!” implies the opposite, as it sounds remarkably like the trick children are taught to perform in order to comfort themselves when they are dead scared of the dark, “I am not scared. I am not scared.”

Nicolas’s definition of a “patriot” and a good citizen is to be found in his interrogation of Gila, Victor’s wife. Nicolas contrasts his female victim with her dead father who “was a man of honor” and accuses her of defaming and debasing the memory of this man who “fought for his country...He believed in God. He didn’t think, like you shitbags. He lived. He lived...He was iron and gold. He would die, he would die, he would die, for his country, for his God. And he did die...for his God… .To spawn such a daughter What a fate” (66). Nicolas’s praise of the dead father and his emphasis on the fact that the man willingly sacrificed his life for his country resonates strongly with the way Roote in The *Hothouse* repeatedly glorifies the memory of the forefathers who “gave their lives so that we might live. Who sacrificed themselves so that we might continue...The men who died in our name” (75). This system of absolute binarism between the religious, patriotic, and conforming majority, on the one hand, and the non-religious, non-patriotic and

rebellious minority, on the other, is what ultimately allows Nicolas to justify all the horrors he commits against the family, including the seven-year-old boy who was murdered because he dared to spit and strike at the soldiers who "pissed on the rugs" of Victor but whom Nicolas brazenly describes as "soldiers of honor" and "soldiers of God" (74).

Indeed, little can match the dramatic impact of the murder of a child can have on an audience, especially when the parents of the child are informed of their child's murder in such a cold-blooded manner:

> Victor mutters
> NICOLAS: What?
> VICTOR: mutters.
> NICOLAS: What.
> VICTOR: My son.
> NICOLAS: Your son? Oh, don't worry about him. He was a little prick (78-79).

The horror carried by the switch from the present tense in an earlier scene, "he is alittle prick," to the past tense here to indicate the death of the little boy is immeasurable, but it also seems to liberate Victor of his concerns for his son as he "straightens and stares at Nicolas" (78). Despite the bleak mood of the play, many critics read Victor's "defying stare" as a gesture of defiance or, as Thomas Adler writes: "Denied speech, at the end Victor still retains, however, the defiant power of actively staring at his tormentor" (6).

4.1.2 *Mountain Language*

The brutality of the state officials, oppression and bloody face of the soldier demonstrate that Pinter's late plays gets darker and more menacing than the early plays. The harassment, beating and swearing prove that these late plays are more overtly critising the management of the state affairs. This play turns out to be a protest against the silenced subject. It can be deduced that this overt act of oppression symbolizes the authoritarian power modalities.

Mountain Language, too, was inspired by a visit Pinter made to Turkey in 1985 (Billington, Life 309). But Pinter could compose only a few pages at that time and only completed the play in 1988 as things changed dramatically in his home country. In an interview with Mel Gussow quoted by Billington, Pinter remarks: "From my point of view, the play is about suppression of language and the loss of

freedom of expression. I feel therefore it is as relevant in England as it is in Turkey...it also reflects what's happening in England today—the suppression of ideas, speech and thought" (*Life* 309)

Pinter's *Mountain Language* (1988) reflects the suppression of ideas, speech and thought that was also happening in English in the 1980s. The *Mountain Language* asks a question, what if the British society also goes down the road towards oppressions? it has four scenes, taking place in a military prison camp, the first one shows a line of women supervised by one officer, one young woman is complaining to him that his dog has bitten an older woman's hand. The office repeatedly asks her the name of that dog. His absurd insistence on having this information before he can take any action can be seen as a prelude to the key statement of the play's intent Now hear this. You are mountain people. You hear me? Your language is dead. It is forbidden. It is not permitted to speak your mountain language in this place. This is a military decree." (*Mountain Language* 21). In the second scene, we see the son of that elderly woman, is also being reported by a soldier for speaking his own language and is charged with insolence. But the most significant part of this scene comes when we are shown that the woman and her son sit face to face in complete stillness, and we hear their recorded conversation, which is in their own mountain language; and the guards, who hear nothing, assume that they have absolute control over them. Pinter has tried to tell us that inspite of the oppression, the people use the language of the mind which helps them reach out to each other. The third scene is called 'The Voice in the Darkness'. It refers to the sergeant's voice, who's abusing someone for the lapse of allowing the wife of the prisoner to come inside the forbidden area, where the prisoner is kept It also refers to the imaginary exchange taking place between the husband and the wife. In the final scene we are back again in the Visitor's Room. The prisoner's face is covered with blood. His mother sits opposite him. The guard announces that the rules have been changed, that the woman can now speak in her own language, until further notice. But the elderly woman cannot speak, her son pleads her to speak but to no avail. She remains silent. The prisoner-son falls from his chair to his knees and begins to gasp and shake violently. The guard enters and sees the shaking prisoner and says: "Look at this. You go out of your way to give them a helping hand and they fuck it up."(*Mountain Language* 46). Here Pinter is trying to tell us that it could happen in

England, may be some of it even does. But more importantly what Pinter implies is that we cannot shift the moral responsibility for such actions on to the other. The terror is within us, and not without. Pinter's plays are constantly produced around the world where they are admired not just for their verbal precision, but also for their political resonance. in May 1990, Pinter, while delivering the Herbert Read Memorial lecture, talked about the misuse of language and launched a blistering attack on American policy in Nicaragua, which was so strong as to elicit a rebuttal from the U.S. Ambassador in Britain. Pinter in one of his directorial assignments also highlighted the American Government' s gravelling sycophancy towards foreign dictatorships, particularly that of Marcos in the Phillippines.

It would seem quite fair, then, to assume that Pinter intended the mountain language used in the play to become a symbol of the language of resistance employed by all those who choose not to submit unquestioningly to the authority of the State. For this reason, Billington registers some reservations about the Royal Court Theatre production of the play directed by Katie Mitchell. With dogs howling, bells clanging and helicopter blades whirring, Billington believes that Mitchell's approach sends out the wrong message as "it smacks a bit too much of [sic] policestatecliche" ("Double Bill" 1), which is something that Pinter was at pains to avoid not only in *Mountain Language* but in all his overtly political plays. Indeed, the seemingly normal settings of these plays make them more chilling as they do not allow the audience, and the Western audience in particular, the advantage of maintaining the distance they would when they watch events that seem impossibly alien. "What I miss," Billington significantly adds, "is the dry routine of dailyoppression" since with "the camera-shutter scenic effects and tumultuous sound" Mitchell's production returns the play "to a nightmare world of them rather than us" ("Double Bill" 2).

Mountain Language, like *The Hothouse* and *One for the Road*, deals with the horrors that result when brutal and corrupt bureaucracies are given unrestrained freedom to do as they wish with their prisoners and those who are related to them. The play also shows the diminutive system of classification that is employed inorder to further humiliate the captives and their relatives on the one hand and to justify acts of horror on the other. Despite its indisputable brutality, the play conveys defiant act conveyed primarily by the female relatives of the male captives. The brutality of the

state officials becomes clear as they intentionally neglect attending to the Elderly Woman whose hand had been bitten by one of the dogs the captors keep. The woman is severely injured and, although the officer notes that "the thumb is going to come off" (15), he is more concerned with a "formal procedure" (17) that, presumably, requires him to list the name of the dog: "Every dog has a name. They answer to their name. They are given a name by their parents and that is their name. Before they bite, they state their name" (17). This statement, with its utter absurdity, is intended to further increase the women's agony; after all they have been waiting in the cold weather, attacked by the dogs and harassed by the captors for eight hours. In addition, the statement shows that dogs in this unspecified state have more rights than some of its citizens; they are allowed to keep the names given to them by their parents, while the mountain people are prohibited from speaking the language of their ancestors. The facility is set up exclusively to accommodate those labeled as "mountain people" and who are declared to be "enemies of the State" for no apparent reason other than speaking a different language. Such a label draws the line between the officials and their victims and grants the former all the right to do as they desire with their victims because according to the Sergeant, mountain people are enemies of State (21). Therefore, any hint about resemblance between the people of the State and the mountain people is perceived as a punishable crime. The following example from the play powerfully illustrates this point:

> Guard: ...I've got a wife and three kids. And you're all a pile of shit.
> Silence.
> Prisoner: I've got a wife and three kids.
> Guard: You've what?
> Silence.
> You've got what?
> Silence.
> What did you say to me? You've got what?
> Silence.
> You've got what?
> He picks up the phone and dials one digit
> Sergeant? I'm in the Blue Room...yes...I thought I should report,
> Sergeant...1 think I've got a joker in here. (32-33)

> When we see the Prisoner again in Scene 4 he "sits trembling" with "bloodon his face," a clear indication that he has been tortured presumably because he, oneof the mountain people, dared to claim equality in humanity with the Guard, a man of the State.

Pinter described *Mountain Language* as a "series of brutal images," but amidst these images of horror and brutality, there are equally powerful ones of resistance and defiance. Although most comments about hope and resistance in the play usually focus on the use of the voice-over technique, Carey Perloff who directed the play in 1989 at the Classic Stage Company Repertory in NY, a production that Perloff said Pinter "seemed extremely moved by" (25) remarks that "looking back on it now, I am struck by the strength of the women in theplay...the landscape of survival in this play is decidedly female" (24). The play is infused with examples of female heroism; the resilience of these women (wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters; young and old) to wait long hours in the cold and hostile landscape and to tolerate the harassment of the officials and the attacks of their dogs in order to see their detained men; the courage of the Young Woman to walk away from the harassing hand of the Sergeant, "to turn and face the two men" (25) and boldly declare "I have come to see my husband. It is my right. Where is he?" (25); the insistence of the Elderly Woman to speak her language with her son even though it was declared forbidden and dead and although she is beaten every time she uses it; the willful choice of the Elderly Woman to remain silent when the Guard suddenly announces she is permitted "to speak in her language ...Until further notice" (47).

In *Mountain Language*, Pinter succeeds, with astonishing economy, in illustrating the brutalities that result when people are categorized into different classes according to their geopolitical locations, mother tongues, races, colors, ethnicities. In addition, the play demonstrates that victimizers can never have the absolute control they claim and dream of having over their victims since, as Pinter forcefully illustrates, "the victim's voices are not in their possession; they are above and beyond them" (Hall 20).

Roote in *The Hothouse,* Nicolas in *One for the Road* and the Guard and the Sergeant in *Mountain Language*, terrorize the prisoner in the name of the national/global interest. What is particularly disturbing about the "interrogation" sessions held in *One for the Road*, is that they seem to occur between rounds of physical torture and aim not so much at eliciting responses from the captives as they are means of inflicting further pain through verbal abuse and cruel threats against all that is supposed to be most sacred to human beings: their physical and mental wellbeing as well as the wellbeing of those closest to them. Indeed, this sense of

devastating helplessness is reflective of the playwright's growing despair over the possibility that global conditions will ever improve, a despair that was, possibly, behind his decision to write no more plays: "I've said it before, and I'll say it again," he told Billington in an interview on March 14th, 2006, "I've written 29 damn plays. Isn't that enough?" (The Guardian).

In his openly political plays, Pinter seeks to expose the injustices committed in the name of deceivingly righteous claims. His approach, however, is never one of preaching to his audience, as he knows quite well that audiences detest being preached to. Instead, Pinter focuses on victimizers, examines their hidden motivations, and allows them to speak for themselves. In his Nobel Prize speech, Pinter emphasized these points as he maintained that unlike political satire, in political theatre sermonizing has to be avoided at all costs. Objectivity is essential. The characters must be allowed to breathe their own air. The author cannot confine and constrict them to satisfy his own taste or disposition or prejudice. He must be prepared to approach them from a variety of angles, from a full and uninhibited range of perspectives, take them by surprise perhaps occasionally, but nevertheless give them the freedom to go which way they will (2).

4.1.3 *Ashes to Ashes*

Violence, torture, harassment and rape observed in Pinter's plays show that he has turned into an authoritarian power that Foucault categorizes. Devlin's psychological pressure on Rebecca and the constant physical contact indicate that Pinter no longer follows a disciplinary power. Violence and gloomy atmosphere have increased, the surrounding influence is beyond menacing. *Ashes to Ashes* is a triumph of power. In the living room of a nice house in a university town outside London, Devlin brutally interrogates his wife, Rebecca, who may be her abusive ex-lover, her psychologist, or himself. Seamlessly blending her knowledge of violence with the wider violence of the world, Rebecca reveals a mysterious association with the dead victims of unnamed political barbarisms. As in most Pinter plays, the mood is gloomy and threatening, and the speech is whimsical and elliptical. The line readings are flat and artificial, there are awkward silences and pauses, and each effortful audience member will interpret the play to some degree different from the other participants. Devlin is the academic type of fellow. He questions Rebecca, somewhat furiously, about her violent, ex-lover who thrusts his fist into her face and

forces her to kiss him, and clasps her fingers tightly and painfully around her neck. Devlin's questions initially suggest he may have been his psychiatrist. But when Devlin worries that the events he describes will happen after he meets her, the jealousy he expresses makes him seem like Rebecca's husband or lover. Rebecca explores dreamy visions and memories of extreme atrocities that strongly suggest the deportations, concentration camps, and mass killings of European Jews during the Holocaust. Eventually, Devlin will treat Rebecca like her ex. When a seemingly mundane conversation between husband and wife reveals a sadistic relationship, the couple embarks on an ominous journey into the past. Devlin investigates the reasons for his wife's possible infidelity. Lover - past? is it available? - is a fierce, strong man whose emotional influence reaches deep into Rebecca's soul. As Devlin tries to separate illusion from reality, he begins to become like the monster he fell in love with. We may have been watching a play from Pinter's early days from the beginning; Two characters who are in the middle of a seemingly innocent conversation but actually engage in a battle for inner strength. Two characters, Rebecca and Devlin, engage in an exchange where Rebecca claims she's getting sexual satisfaction from a masochistic ritual she plays with a lover in response to Devlin's questions. It is an opening image that implies a "mixture of sexual coercion and voluntary submission." and establishes the reality of the play: a world of brutality, power and domination, but also of anxiety and insecurity with Devlin's incessant questions. However, thanks to Devlin's insistent demand for a "concrete image", despite suggestions about Rebecca's dire living and working conditions - she speaks of dampness, inadequate work clothes and a lack of bathroom - workers "have great respect for her ..." they took off their caps. purity [and] faith'. This naked submission to brute masculine power is directly linked to Rebecca's retelling of the Fascist sexual ritual and is reminiscent of the earlier Pinter - the use of language to gain power. The authoritarianism that Rebecca admires and Devlin begins to envy becomes dramatically clear with Rebecca's abrupt expression: She was a guide. She would go to the local train station, go down the platform and rip all the babies from their screaming mothers' arms. Agreed on a comment that seems very clear and simple. However, I am satisfied that the play has the capacity to cover many of its subjects. Accept or reject all or any part of it. Rebecca is Jewish in the post-Holocaust world. The Jewish ordinary people painfully carry the memory of their people's history. He may be accepted and form close and loving relationships with

the Gentile world, but he remains tormented by the knowledge that what happened before could happen again. Devlin, a symbol of a gentile world, was stunned by the Jewish fear of him and angered anyone who believed he could exterminate the Jews again.

The one-act play is set in "a house in the country with a "large window" and a "garden beyond" (393). The time is "[e]arly evening" in "[s]ummer" (393). The room, where the action takes place, "darkens" and "the lamplight intensifies" during the course of the event (393). In a very Pinteresque way, the play opens in medias res with Rebecca and Devlin talking. During the course of the play, Devlin questions Rebecca and forces her to give him more concrete information about her past and about the man she defines as her ex-lover. Initially, she explains the abusive actions of the man who stands over her, makes her kiss his fist, and puts his hand round her throat. While Devlin is "compelled to ask her questions" and asks her to "define him more clearly" (400), Rebecca tells him about her lover, his occupation, and in the dreamlike sequences that ensue, she narrates the atrocities that she imaginatively witnesses. She states that her lover used to work for a "travel agency", a kind of "courier", and then she denies it by saying that it was "a part-time job" and that he was a man of high responsibilities (403). Lastly, her 'distorted' or 'invented' memory reveals that he was actually a "guide" (403). In one of the dreamlike sequences resonating with Holocaust images, she tells Devlin about a factory with "workpeople" "wearing caps" and taking them off as show of respect to her lover for his "purity and conviction" (405). She tells him that these men "would follow [her lover] over a cliff and into the sea", and "sing in a chorus" for him, and that "they were in fact very musical" (405). She also recounts that she could not find any bathroom in the factory. After a pause, she recalls that her lover "used to go to the local railway station and walk down the platform and tear all the babies from the arms of their screaming mothers" (406-7). After a silence, she suddenly says that she is upset because of a police siren they have just heard. She states that she hates it echoing away. Afterwards, abruptly she talks about the "pen" that "rolled off" when she put it on the coffee table, and they discuss if the pen is guilty or innocent (410). Having lost his authority throughout the course of the conversation, Devlin states that he is in a quicksand. Upon Rebecca's comparing his situation with that of God, Devlin refuses that "disgusting perception" and he tells her that the world without

God is like “England playing Brazil at Wembley and not a soul in the stadium [...] an absolute silence, absence, stalemate, paralysis, a world without a winner” (412).

While Devlin questions Rebecca’s authority to talk about some kind of atrocity, she denies having experienced any. In another dreamlike sequence, she tells Devlin that in “a beautiful, warm Dorset day” she witnessed some “guides” “ushering” a crowd of people “walking across the cliff and down to the sea” (416). Afterwards, she declares that she has never lived in Dorset. She suddenly changes the topic, and talks about “mental elephantiasis”, which means that “when you spill an ounce of gravy, for example, it immediately expands and becomes a vast sea of gravy” (417). While Devlin tries to change the topic and talk about more personal things, she continues to explain what is haunting her mind. She describes a railway station in a frozen city under the snow that has “veins running through it” (418). Afterwards, she tells him that she watched her “most precious companion [...] walk down the platform and tear all the babies from the arms of their screaming mothers” (419). After a silence, Devlin brings her back to ‘reality’; they talk about Rebecca’s sister and her kids. Then, she talks about seeing a comedy film, which did not make her laugh at all.

What struck her in the cinema was the man sitting next to her, who never moved or laughed and sat like a corpse. After another silence, Devlin asks her to “start again” but Rebecca says that they cannot “start again”, but “end again”, to which Devlin opposes because of the “misusing” of “the word ‘end’” (425). Rebecca states that one “can end once” and then “end again” (425). After a silence, they sing together the lines: Rebecca: (singing softly) ‘Ashes to ashes’- Devlin: ‘And dust to dust’- Rebecca: ‘If the women don’t get you’- Devlin: ‘The liquor must” (425). Afterwards, she recounts the image of “an old man and a little boy”, and of another “woman carrying a baby in her arms” (427). She describes how the baby breathes in the woman’s arms. Meanwhile, Devlin assumes the role of her ex-lover and begins to enact the first scene of the play, forcing her to kiss his fist. However, she doesn’t speak or move, and starts to speak with an echo. In the first person, she says: “They took us to the trains [...] They were taking the babies away [...] I took my baby and wrapped it in my shawl [...] And I made it into a bundle” (429). While she hides the baby under her arm, a man calls her back and stretches his hand for the bundle, and she gives him the bundle. However, when a woman she knows asks her what

happened to her baby?, she replies, “I don’t know of any baby” (432). And the play ends with a long silence. One of the many questions concerning the meanings behind the text is if it is a play on the Holocaust. Is Rebecca a witness of the Holocaust or is she haunted by the collective and cultural memories constructed in its aftermath? When Mireia Aragay asks Pinter if *Ashes to Ashes* is a play about Nazism, Pinter replies as follows:

> No, I don’t think so at all. It’s about the images of Nazi Germany; I don’t think anyone can ever get that out of their mind. The Holocaust is probably the worst thing that ever happened, because it was so calculated, deliberate and precise, and so fully documented by the people who actually did it. [...] But it’s not simply the Nazis that I am talking about in *Ashes to Ashes*, because it would be a dereliction on my part to simply concentrate on the Nazis and leave it at that. [...] The word democracy begins to stink. These things, as you can see, are on my mind. So in *Ashes to Ashes*, I’m not simply talking about the Nazis; I’m talking about us and our conception of our past and our history, and what it does to us in the present (Aragay 11).

As Pinter himself reveals, the play does not only focus on the Holocaust experience. What it reflects actually is the contemporary audience and their sense of responsibility, not only towards their actions in the present, but also for the sorrows of the past, to which their only tie is their own humanity. If one man is the seed and humanity is the tree, everybody is responsible for the other, as one should diminish by the other’s death. In this regard, Rebecca is a character who is diminished by multiple deaths she is indirect witness of through the cultural and collective memory she is exposed to. The stage direction for the time of the play is “[n]ow” (391), which addresses the contemporary audience in each production of the play. Thus, the play will aim at urging the responsibility in its audience as long as it is staged. Even though the light in the room becomes “very bright but does not illumine the room” (393), it will always illumine the conscience of the audience. On the other hand, considering the time of the play as ‘now’, bearing in mind that the play was first produced in 1996, one can easily assume that Rebecca or Devlin could not have experienced the Holocaust. As Plunka argues, “[s]ince Pinter designates that the play occurs ‘now’, which at the time of the writing was 1996, Rebecca, in her forties, could not have personally experienced the Holocaust; even if she were forty-nine years old, her birth would have been in 1947” (323). In the play, even though she identifies herself with the Holocaust survivors and recounts the events as if she personally experienced them, at the same time she openly denies having experienced them. She says, “[n]othing has ever happened to me. Nothing has ever happened to

any of my friends. I have never suffered. Nor have my friends "(413). Thus, *Ashes to Ashes* is not a play about the Holocaust. However, it is haunted by its images. Even though it addresses more universal issues, each dreamlike sequence narrated by Rebecca resonates with the Holocaust, or actually with the representations of it. Pinter's own words are noteworthy in this sense:

I think that one of the things that was happening to me when I was writing the play is the realization that what we term "atrocities" and "catastrophes" throughout the world—by the way, not, by any means, limited to what happened in the Holocaust—there is a Holocaust more or less every day of the week. Certainly the Holocaust images do stay with me. They are all contained within people's experience. [...] the woman [Rebecca] that I felt to be haunted—and, if you like, possessed—by this world around her, which, I remind you, she had never herself experienced—I mean, she had never herself gone through any of these things at all, and, I hope that that's made absolutely clear in the play. So that we're talking about, I think, we're talking about a haunted person, and a man who really essentially wants to bring her back to just the ordered state of affairs... (*Ashes to Ashes* 74-75)

In this regard, Pinter reflects upon how history is full of "atrocities" and "catastrophes" by using images from the worst atrocity ever, the Holocaust. He uses a very familiar setting, a comfortable house in the country with a garden, which might very well be in England. However, the garden beyond, "created all by Rebecca" (424), can turn out to be somewhere with a history of atrocities and catastrophes, and therefore could be placed anywhere in the twentieth century Europe. As Billington states, "this elegant country drawing-room opens up into European history" (377). Rebecca's description of the railway station, where her lover "walk[s] down the platform and tear[s] all the babies from the arms of their screaming mothers" (419), calls to mind another association with the Holocaust, but it can also be anywhere drenched in the blood of innocent people throughout the history of the world. She says "the city was frozen [...] and the snow was a funny colour. It wasn't white. Well it was white but there were other colours in it. It was as if there were veins running through it" (418). The picture drawn by Rebecca is that of a railway station in a frozen city, the surrounding area covered with snow, whose funny colour is because of the mud and blood in it. The trains in this railway station might be bound for Auschwitz. Rebecca also says: "When I got to the railway station

I saw the train. Other people were there" (418). This speech calls to mind the deportation of the victims to the extermination camps and combined with image of the railway station it is reminiscent of the entrance gates of Auschwitz.

Collective memory creates the past in the present through various artifacts such as culture, art and media. The memory of atrocities, for most people who have not experienced them, is the memory of a reality represented. As Rebecca claims nothing happened to her, the horrific images that haunt her may stem from multiple representations of the Holocaust or possibly other media atrocities around the world that haunt the minds of dozens of people who share the same collective memory (Yenigül 58). As Plunka states, "Rebecca, through her imaginative vision, has adopted the collective memory of the Holocaust as her own. She has taken on the role of bearing witness and commemorating the dead, becoming the mouthpiece for remembering the Shoah from generation to generation, or from ashes to ashes" (Plunka 323). Thus, with the effect of the representations of the Holocaust in literature, film, and documentaries, and other atrocities of the twentieth century, not least the Bosnian Genocide, Rebecca realizes the violent and horrific nature of humankind and identifies herself with the victims of the atrocities. Therefore, the "large window" of the comfortable country house becomes a screen, or an illustrated page, through which Rebecca can only see the world history full of atrocities. And the audience look through the same screen and share her vision. For her, the reality and the representation, the local and the global intermingle; when she looks down out of the window in the house in Dorset, she sees guides ushering people into the sea, which resonates with the Holocaust (Yenigül 59). However, as Devlin asks: "When did you live in Dorset? I've never lived in Dorset" (*Ashes to Ashes* 416), it can be assumed that she invents these images under the effect of her cultural memory. As has been mentioned, the images created by Rebecca's distorted memory can be associated to some of the representations of the Holocaust in art, especially in film. According to Mark Taylor-Batty, Rebecca's account of handing over a baby is reminiscent of a scene from Alan Pakula's film Sophie's Choice (1982) in which, on a railway platform, the eponymous character is obliged to choose which of her two children to hand over to be killed. Her accounts of factory workers doffing their caps to their superior, and having beautiful singing voices, are reminiscent of scenes in Schindler's List, as are accounts of people dragging luggage on cobbled streets.

(107) And also, as Susan Hollis Merritt argues, “Rebecca’s memory of witnessing refugees led into the sea to drown of the coast of Dorset, their luggage bobbing in the waves recalls scenes in Kenneth Madsen’s film A Day in October (1992)” (Taylor-Batty 107). These associations show the effects of cultural memory on Rebecca’s individual memory. She appropriates those images from the representations of the Holocaust on screen, and she assumes the role of the victims

Ashes to Ashes reveals the effects of cultural memory on individuals with images created with the theme of the Holocaust. It encourages the audience to empathize with the victims to understand the horror of the events. Just like Rebecca did, with a shared sense of responsibility. As Taylor-Batty argues, “Rebecca, then, represents ‘a psychic process of remembering, repeating and working through’ and crucially, initiates the same process in us through the dislocated and dislocating structures of trauma” (110). Because Rebecca's memoirs are incomprehensible and misleading, some are simply fiction from works of art, and their reliability is questionable. Moreover, the truth about the experience of traumatic events, especially the Holocaust, is about resistance. Therefore, Rebecca does not reveal any truth about the Holocaust or any other atrocities. But it reveals the terrifying nature of traumatic events. That is why he resists the destructive power of such terrible events and tells the audience this through his speeches as well as his silence (Yenigül 61).

CONCLUSION

This study has explored the disciplinary power and the "other spaces" through the lens of Michel Foucault's surveillance studies with reference to Harold Pinter's early and late plays which have political content. In this dissertation, the panoptic gaze is observed and it is deduced that disciplinary power dominates in the early plays of Pinter, especially in the plays of *the Hothouse* and *the Dumb Waiter* and it is also deduced that authoritarian power dominates throughout the latest plays of Pinter. As to whether Foucault and Pinter differ in implementing power, Foucault's closed spaces, prisons; asylums reverberate through Pinter's dystopic heterotopic spaces. Both of them have different traits in visibility of authoritative power. While in Pinter's plays senior managers are visible to the audience and readers, the surveillant is invisible in Foucault's *Panopticon*. Moreover, Foucault devises different kind of heterotopias. He refers to heterotopia of crisis, of deviation, of illusion, of compensation, of par excellence, of time, but in Pinter's plays, it is predominantly observed that heterotopia of deviation is ascertained in the political plays.

If either *the Dumb Waiter* or The *Birthday Party* may be judged to contain any political implication, it can only be in their reflection of a threat to individual autonomy. During the 1950s and 1960s the reemergent Anarchist movement drew attention to this, partly in response to the increasing bureaucratisation of Western society. To convey this threat, Pinter employed figures drawn from the somewhat unreal world of the gangster movie, characters who are in no sense associated with the power of the state.

The regulated aggression and violence of the interrogation and its association with authoritarian hierarchical organisations appear to have fascinated Pinter since the late 1950s. Having appeared in *the Birthday Party*, it was to reemerge in the *Hothouse* written in 1959. The play was uncharacteristically a satirical peace about the hierarchy of an undefined institution for unspecified reasons held patients. In his career he apparently felt that such a display of antipathy toward his characters and their profession could have easily been interpreted as reflecting a political stance. In *the Dumb Waiter* and *The Birthday Party* violence and the threat of violence were tools of both repression and resistance in the context of a hierarchical organisation's attempt to neutralise a dissenting individual. (Peacock 139-140).

Stanley's constant interrogation by Goldberg and McCann in *the Birthday Party*, Ben and Gus fighting each other for supremacy, that any one of them will be murdered on Wilson's orders in that tiny room in *the Dumb Waiter*, that patients will rise up and rebel against the tyranny and injustice of the managers, and all the crimes that Roote committed as a manager, and the other managers' attempts to take over by constantly committing crimes in *the Hothouse*, and Davies's constant search for shelter in the house of Mick and Aston brothers by hiding his identity in *the Caretaker* which are actually seen as a comedy genre turn Pinter's plays into further menacing and dystopic heterotopias.

McCann and Goldberg's constant manipulation by an organization and Stanley's inability to be an individual in *the Birthday Party*, The orders Ben and Gus got through a dumb waiter and their constant surveillance by Wilson proved that disciplinary power prevailed in these early plays. Likewise, the abuse of the patients staying in asylum by the administrators, the failure of the people who come for inspection from above to perform their duties well, and the abuse of the power in the hands of the administrators have shown that disciplinary power can also be abused in *the Hothouse.* There is corruption, state power, and systematic physical mental abuse of the patients. The play is accordingly about the panoptical place and the corruption that creeps into the institutional authority. The institution is in a state of decay under bureaucracy. All seemingly omnipotent administrators are employed to fulfil commands of a higher and visible authority.

In *the Caretaker*, the fact that Davies infiltrates the house with the character of the caretaker in order to hide his identity and find shelter indicates that Davies breaks up between the two brothers and that there is some kind of control mechanism. In a play full of uncertainties, Pinter's pauses and silences seem to dominate the play. The fact that Davies constantly throws his caretaker duty on Mick proves to us that there is a power struggle again.

However, when Pinter’s late plays are taken into account, Pinter’s having written overtly political plays and at the same time letting the subjects such as harassment, rape and frequent violence in the scenes reveals that these plays move away from Foucault's disciplinary power, and reveals the use of a more authoritarian power. Pinter’s overtly political plays, *One for the Road, Mountain Language* and *Ashes to Ashes* concerns the oppressive, authoritarian operations of power because

Pinter's concern with the more public terrain of politics paved the way for a transition which is from disciplinary power to authoritarian power, the space remains steady though.

Although one can see the political aspects of his early plays in which characters struggle for domination and their attempts to dominate the others, the political intentions are not overt yet. In his early plays, there is an existential fear that characters feel in that way. Although his early plays do not criticize political systems, international wars, the political aspects can be considered by means of the relationship between an individual and organisation and the power struggle for preserving individual's identity in a world which is full of threat. On the other hand, in his late plays, political aspects are more evident in corrupted political systems, the violation of human rights, and exploitation of people. In *One for the Road*, Nicolas can be seen as a representative of dictatorial political system which Pinter stood against. The political system is abusive and not stated explicitly and the victims of this system are exposed to torture and their house is vandalised. Violence is carried out off the stage. Nicolas' words and attitudes reflect absolute power that he inflicts upon his victim.

In addition to the tortures Nicolas applied to Victor, the sexual torture he inflicted to his wife, Gila rendered the late plays a symbol of authoritarian power beyond menacing. Soldiers, in the *Mountain Language*, like Nicolas tormented the prisoners inside, and a rather frightening, more abusive power prevails in his late plays rather than in Pinter's early plays. Likewise, in the play *Ashes to Ashes*, Rebecca is subjugated by unjust use of Devlin's authority and power. It is deduced that disciplinary power cannot be observed in these late plays of Pinter. Rather, the late plays of Pinter stand for the authoritarian power, but the main purpose for Pinter is to criticize this mode of power politics.

In addition to the panoptic gaze, Foucault's heterotopia was observed as a kind of heterotopia of deviation and heterotopia of compensation. Foucault states that the heterotopias of deviation are those 'other' spaces in which the behaviour of the inhabitants is deviant. In "Of Other Spaces", the examples of such spaces are rest homes, psychiatric hospitals, the prisons, almshouse, the asylums. Pinter's sanatorium in *the Hothouse* is contextualised through Foucault's heterotopia of deviation. Moreover, it is concluded that Lebensraum comprises a heterotopia of

compensation in *the Birthday Party*. Besides, Rebecca and Devlin are in a room separated from the garden by a glass panel. In the course of the play, the room in which they are positioned gets darker as the lamplight becomes very bright. When compared to the bright and sunny garden, Devlin's interrogation room stands for a dystopic heterotopia.

As can be seen from the analysis of the plays, Pinter's seven different plays were handled both within the framework of the panoptic gaze and within the framework of heterotopia, and it was revealed that the disciplinary power prevailed in the plays he wrote in the 1950s, on the other hand, in the plays he wrote after 1980, it was seen that he resorted to authoritarian power to explicitly criticize violence, rape, harassment and abuse.

REFERENCES

Pinter, Harold, *Ashes to Ashes in Harold Pinter: Plays 4*. London, Faber and Faber, 2012 [1996]), pp. 395-433

_____, *The Birthday Party, in Harold Pinter: Plays 1* (London:Faber & Faber, 1991), pp. 2-81

____, *The Caretaker, in Harold Pinter: Plays 2* (London: Faber and Faber, 1991), pp. 5-76

_____, *The Dumb Waiter, Harold Pinter: Plays 1* (London: Faber and Faber, 1991), pp. 113-149

_____, *The Hothouse, Harold Pinter: Plays 1* (London: Faber and Faber, 1991), pp. 189-328

_____, *Mountain Language, Harold Pinter: Plays 4* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), pp. 251-267

_____, *One for the Road, Harold Pinter: Plays 4* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), pp. 223-247

_____, *The Room, Harold Pinter: Plays 1*. Methuen, 1976.

_____, 'A Play and its Politics: A Conversation between Harold Pinter and Nicholas Hern', in *One for the Road* (London: Methuen, 1985), pp. 7-24

_____, 'Writing, Politics and *Ashes to Ashes*', interviewed by M. Aragay and R. Simo, *Various Voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948–1998,* 1st edn (London: Faber, 1998), pp. 58-70

_____, 'Writing for Myself' (1961), *Pinter: Plays 2*, pp. vii- xi

Aragay, Mireia "Writing, Politics, and *Ashes to Ashes*: An Interview with Harold Pinter". Francis Gillen and Steven H. Gale, eds. *The Pinter Review: Annual Essays 1995 and 1996.* Tampa, Florida: U of Tampa P. 4-15 1997.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 3rd edn (London: Allen & Unwin, 1967 [1951]), p. xxix.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*, trans. by John R. Stilgoe (Boston: Beacon Press, 1994 [1957]), pp. 4-5.

Bensky, Larry. "The Art of Theatre No. 3" *Paris Review*, 39 (Fall 1966) <https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4351/harold-pinter-the-art-of-theater-no-3-harold-pinter> [accessed 20 December 2021].

Billington, Michael. *The Life and Work of Harold Pinter*. Faber and Faber, 1996.

Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996 [1968]), p. 7.

Coppa, Francesca. "The sacred joke: comedy and politics in Pinter's early plays." *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 43–55.

Chaudhuri, Una. *Staging Place: The Geography of Modern Drama*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1997, p. 93.

Crampton, Jeremy W., and Stuart Elden. *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography.* 1st ed., Ashgate, 2007.

Crelinsten, Ronald D.. "In Their Own Words: The World of the Torturer." *The Politics of Pain: Torturers and Their Masters.* Ed. Ronald D. Crelinsten and Alex P. Schmid.Boulder: Westview Press, 1995. 35-64.

Dukore, Bernard. *Harold Pinter*. London: Macmillan. 1988.

Elden, Stuart. "There is a Politics of Space because Space is Political." *Radical Philosophy Review*, vol.10 no.2, 2007, pp. 101-116.

Esslin, Martin. *Pinter The Playwright*. 6th ed., Methuen, 2000.

Foucault, Michel. "Of other spaces." *Diacritics*, vol 16, no 1, 1986, pp. 22–27.

_____, Power/Knowledge: *Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, 1972-1977. Pantheon Books, 1980.

_____, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Penguin Press, 1977.

_____, *History of Sexuality Vol 1: An Introduction.* New York Vintage, 1980.

_____, "Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978" *Security, Territory, Population*, Palgrave, 2007. pp 363.

Freud, Sigmund. 'The Uncanny', *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans.by James Strachey, 24 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1955 [1948]), XVII, pp. 217-252 (p. 245).

Gale, Steven H. *Butter's Going Up: A Critical Analysis of Harold Pinter's Work*. Duke University, 1977.

Gibbons, Fiachra 'The Prayer of Peter Brook', Guardian, Sunday 17 January 2010 <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2010/jan/17/peter-brook-eleven-twelve> [accessed 10 December 2021]

Gillen, F. "Nowhere to go": *Society and the individual in Harold Pinter's The Hothouse*. Twentieth Century Literature, 1983 29(1), p. 86-96.

Gordon, Robert. *Harold Pinter: The theatre of Power.* Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press, 2012.

Grbin, Miloje. "Foucault and Space" *Sociological Review*, vol 49, no 3, 2015, pp 305-312
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320184686_Foucault_and_space. Accessed 20 February 2019

Grimes, Charles Vincent. *A Silence Beyond Echo: Harold Pinter's Political Theatre*. 1999. New York University, PhD Dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses

Gross, Miriam. "Pinter on Pinter." *Critical Essays on Harold Pinter*. Edited by Steven H. Gale, G.K. Hall&Co, 1990, pp. 37-44.

Gussow, Mel. "A Conversation (Pause) with Harold Pinter." *Critical Essays on Harold Pinter*. Edited by Steven H. Gale, G.K. Hall&Co, 1990, pp. 15-34.

Hall, Ann. "Voices in the Dark: The Disembodied Voice in Harold Pinter's *Mountain Language*." *The Pinter Review,* 1991, pp. 17-22.

Halwas, Andrea. *A knock at the door: Politics in the Plays of Harold Pinter.* 2007. University of Calgary, Master Thesis. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Hollis, James R. *Harold Pinter: The poetics of Silence*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, trans. Edmund Jephcott, ed. by Gunzelin Noerr, California: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Keegan, John, *The Second World War*, Pimlico, 1997.

Kelman, Herbert C. "The Social Context of Torture: Policy Process and Authority Structure." *The Politics of Pain: Torturers and Their Masters*. Ed. Ronald D. Crelinsten and Alex P.Schmid. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995. 19-34.

Kristeva, Julia. *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. by Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991[1988]), p.182.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space.* Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell, 1991.

Lemke, Thomas. "The Subject and Power." *Foucault, Governmentality and Critique*. Routledge, 2012, pp. 1-12.

Luckhurst, Mary. "Torture in the Plays of Harold Pinter." *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama*. Edited by Mary Luckhurst. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, pp.358-369.

McAuley, Gay. *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), p. 173.

Merritt, Susan H. "Major Critics, Strategies and Trends in Pinter Criticism." *Critical Essays on Pinter*, Edited by Steven H. Gale, G.K. Hall&Co, 1990, pp. 307-41.

Merritt, Susan H. “Pinter and Politics.” *Harold Pinter: A Casebook*. Ed. Lois Gordon. NY& London: Garland, 1992, pp. 129-160.

Merritt, Susan Hollis. “Harold Pinter’s *Ashes to Ashes*: Political/Personal Accounts of the Holocaust”. Francis Gillen and Steven H. Gale, eds. *The Pinter Review: Annual Essays 1999 and 2000.* Tampa, Florida: U. of Tampa P. 2001.

Milne, Drew. “Pinter's Sexual Politics” *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*. Ed. Peter Raby. UK: Cambridge UP, 2001, 195-211.

Mskhaladze, Darina. “Politics and Harold Pinter’s Plays.” *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, vol 9,no 4, 2017, pp.389-392.

Nederman, Cary. “The Prince: Analysing Power.” Niccolo Machiavelli. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2005.

O’Toole, Fintan, “Our Own Jacobean”, *The New York Review of Books*, 7 October 1999 <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1999/10/07/our-own jacobean>

Pattie, David. “1979-89: Thatcherism and The Theatre.” *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama*. Edited by Mary Luckhurst. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, pp 389-392.

Peacock, D. Keith. *Harold Pinter and The New British Theatre.* Greenwood, 1997.

Perloff, Carey. "Harold Pinter's *Mountain Language*." Aug. 2001. Crimes of War.1 March 2006 <http//:www.crimesofwar.org/culture/pinter.html.>

Plunka, Gene A. *Holocaust Drama: The Theater of Atrocity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge U. P. 2009.

Rabinow, Paul, ed. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984. Print.

Rose, Gillian. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), p.59.

Rouse, Joseph. “Power/ Knowledge.” *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, Edited by Garry Gutting, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 95-112.

Russell, Bertrand. *Power: A new Social Analysis.* Routledge Classics, 2004.

Sartre, Jean Paul. *Anti-Semite and Jew*, trans. George Joseph Becker, 1st edn (New York: Schocken, 1965.

Sandbrook, Dominic. *Never Had it So Good: A History of Britain from Suez to the Beatles*. Little Brown, 2005.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Smith, Woodruff D. The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism. Oxford University Press, 1989. 104

Sönmez, Esra M. *(Non)-Spectacles of Discipline: Institutions in the Plays of Stoppard, Wesker, Pinter, and Nesin.* 2020. Boğaziçi U. file:///C:/Users/pc/Downloads/628561.pdf

Straub, Ervin. "Torture: Psychological and Cultural Origins." *The Politics of Pain: Torturers and Their Masters*. Ed. Ronald D. Crelinsten and Alex P. Schmid. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995. 99-128.

Taylor, Mark C., *Disfiguring: Art, Architecture, Religion*, University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Taylor-Batty, Mark. "What Remains?: *Ashes to Ashes*, Memory and Atrocity". Craig N. Owens, ed. *Pinter Et Cetera*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing 78-98, 2009.

Ubersfeld, Anne. quoted in Chris Morash and Shaun Richards, *Mapping Irish Theatre: Theories of Space and Place* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.33.

Yenigül, Anıl. *Witnessing and Testimony of Traumatic Events and Function of Cultural and Collective Memory in Harold Pinter's Ashes to Ashes.* 2012. University of Barcelona.

http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/bitstream/2445/28894/1/M.A.%20Dissertation.%20An%C2%BFl%20Yenig%C3%BCl.pdf

Wardle, Irving. '*The Birthday Party', Encore*, 5 (1958), 39–40.

West-Pavlov, Russell. *Space in Theory: Kristeva, Foucault, Deleuze*. Rodopi, 2009.

TURNITIN REPORT

ORIGINALITY REPORT

15%	14%	3%	3%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	revistia.org Internet Source	4%
2	www.mhsl.uab.edu Internet Source	2%
3	acikbilim.yok.gov.tr Internet Source	1%
4	www.architects.nsw.gov.au Internet Source	1%
5	jcoeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq Internet Source	1%
6	esse2022.uni-mainz.de Internet Source	1%
7	analepsis.files.wordpress.com Internet Source	1%
8	www.atilim.edu.tr Internet Source	<1%
9	www.hse.ru Internet Source	<1%

10	academicworks.cuny.edu Internet Source	<1 %
11	docplayer.net Internet Source	<1 %
12	serialsjournals.com Internet Source	<1 %
13	Basil Chiasson. "The Late Harold Pinter", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2017 Publication	<1 %
14	moam.info Internet Source	<1 %
15	Submitted to Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology Student Paper	<1 %
16	Miloje Grbin. "Foucault and space", Socioloski pregled, 2015 Publication	<1 %
17	www.iasj.net Internet Source	<1 %
18	Submitted to Atilim University Student Paper	<1 %
19	Mary F. Brewer. "Harold Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter*", Brill, 2009 Publication	<1 %

20	Submitted to Trinity College Dublin Student Paper	<1 %
21	dokumen.pub Internet Source	<1 %
22	Submitted to Napier University Student Paper	<1 %
23	Submitted to American College of Sofia Student Paper	<1 %
24	pure.royalholloway.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
25	www.ub.edu Internet Source	<1 %
26	Submitted to City University Student Paper	<1 %
27	Submitted to University of Santo Tomas Student Paper	<1 %
28	fpd-bd.com Internet Source	<1 %
29	www.academypublication.com Internet Source	<1 %
30	Submitted to University of Bath Student Paper	<1 %
31	Submitted to University of Birmingham Student Paper	<1 %

32	acikerisim.maltepe.edu.tr Internet Source	<1 %
33	monoskop.org Internet Source	<1 %
34	static.freereferats.ru Internet Source	<1 %
35	www.gecekitapligi.com Internet Source	<1 %
36	felsefe.ksu.edu.tr Internet Source	<1 %
37	open.library.ubc.ca Internet Source	<1 %
38	researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au Internet Source	<1 %
39	www.docme.ru Internet Source	<1 %
40	Austin E. Quigley. "Pinter Problem", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2015 Publication	<1 %
41	Submitted to University of the Arts, London Student Paper	<1 %
42	create.canterbury.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
43	curve.carleton.ca Internet Source	

		<1 %
44	ir.amu.ac.in Internet Source	<1 %
45	Submitted to Goldsmiths' College Student Paper	<1 %
46	Pinter's Female Portraits, 1988. Publication	<1 %
47	acikarsiv.ankara.edu.tr Internet Source	<1 %
48	discovery.ucl.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
49	eprints.lancs.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
50	era.ed.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
51	faculty.uobasrah.edu.iq Internet Source	<1 %
52	uir.unisa.ac.za Internet Source	<1 %
53	www.goodreads.com Internet Source	<1 %
54	www.mendeley.com Internet Source	<1 %

RESUME

Name and Surname: Gülten Silindir Keretli

Education: PhD English Culture and Literature

Degree	**Field**	**University**	**Year**
Undergraduate	English Language and Literature (Full-ride scholarship)	Çankaya University	2009
Master	English Language and Literature	Ankara University	2014
PhD	English Culture and Literature	Atılım University	2023

Work Experience:

Work place	**Position**	**Year**
Kilis 7 Aralık University	Research Assistant	2010-

Academic Experience Abroad

Erasmus Staff Training (2017) Západočeská univerzita v Plzni/ Plzen Czech Republic.

Erasmus Staff Training (2013) Universita degli Studi di Foggia/ Italy.

Visiting Scholar (2012) University of Cambridge, Researcher at Cambridge University

Foreign Languages: English (C2) French (B1)

Publications: Book Chapters and Articles

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten (2022). "The Transition from Domestic Sphere to International Sphere in Pinter's Political Play: *Ashes to Ashes*" European Journal of Language and Literature, 8(1), 33-42.

SİLİNDİR Gülten (2019). "An Ontological Approach to Existentialist Theatre and Theatre of the Absurd in the Works of Jean-Paul Sartre and Samuel

Beckett" International Journal of Business, Human and Social Sciences- Paris, 13(7), 1020-1024.

The Representation of Ideologies in Electronic Media for Children and Young Adults, Bölüm adı: "*Wolfwalkers:* A Representation of Oliver Cromwell's Reign in Ireland through Animation" (2021), ERDEM AYYILDIZ Nilay, SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Editor: Nilay Erdem Ayyıldız, ISBN:1-5275-7771-6

Hegel Paris'te: Fransız Hegel Okuması, Der. Sadık Erol Er İstanbul: Otonom Yayıncılık, Bölüm adı: (Mudimbe, V. Y., Bohm, A. (2016). "Hegel'in Fransa'da Alımlanışı") (2016), ER Sadık Erol, Otonom Yayıncılık, Editör: Sadık Erol Er, Basım sayısı:1, Sayfa Sayısı 520, ISBN:9789756056851

Heidegger Paris'te Fransızların Heidegger Okuması, Bölüm adı: (Biyoiktidar ve Teknoloji: Foucault ve Heidegger'in Düşünme Yöntemi) (2014), SİLİNDİR Gülten, EKİNCİ Özgül, Otonom yayıncılık, Editör: Doç Dr. Sadık Erol Er, Basım sayısı:1, Sayfa Sayısı 486, ISBN:978-975-6056-65-3

Nietzsche Paris'te Fransızların Nietzsche Okuması, Bölüm adı: (Deleuze'un Nietzsche'si) (2013)., ER Sadık Erol, SİLİNDİR Gülten, Otonom Yayıncılık, Editör:Sadık Erol Er, Basım sayısı:1, Sayfa Sayısı 352, ISBN:9789756056554

Kelly Michael (2022). "Sartre ve Lefebvre Heuristik Bir Yönteme Doğru" Çev: Gülten Silindir Keretli. ÖZNE Felsefe Dergisi (36), 401-412.

SİLİNDİR Gülten (2016). "Comic Vision and Comic elements of the 18th Century Novel, *Moll Flanders* by Daniel Defoe" Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 230-238., Doi: 105505

Cheryl Johnson Odim (2013). "Ortak Temalar Farklı Bağlamlar" çev: Gülten Silindir. Özne Felsefe Dergisi, 10(8), 261-275.

SİLİNDİR Gülten (2011). "Challenging The Status Quo Of Women In The Early Twentieth Century In The Works Of *Diana Of Dobson s* and *Trifles*" Journal of Social Sciences, 1(1), 76-82.

Presentations:

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten (2022). A Foucauldian Reading of Power and Space in Harold Pinter's Dramatic Output. 16th ESSE European Society for the Study of English Conference, Johannes Gutenburg University, Mainz.

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten (2021). Collective Memory of the Holocaust and Blitz in Pinter's Political Plays, *The Hothouse* and *Ashes to Ashes*. Theatre and Drama Studies Conference.

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten (2019). The literary figure that goes beyond borders: Harold Pinter". The Sixth International Western Cultures and Literary Studies Symposium.

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten (2019). Hybridity and Multiculturalism in Zadie Smith's novel *White Teeth*. 13th International IDEA Conference.

SİLİNDİR KERETLİ Gülten (2017). Unreliability And False Memory In Julian Barnes' *The Sense Of An Ending*. The Fifth International Western Cultures and Literary Studies Symposium.

SİLİNDİR Gülten (2017). The Queens of Pathetic Tragedy: Belvidera, Isabella and Anna Bullen acted by the prestigious English actress Elizabeth Barry. IDEA Conference.

SİLİNDİR Gülten (2015). Comic vision and comic elements in the 18th century British novels *Moll Flanders, Joseph Andrews, Tristram Shandy.* The Fourth International Western Cultural and Literary Studies Symposium.

Date: 07.12.2022