

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

**POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION IN HAROLD
PINTER'S PLAYS**

NURGÜL ŞENER
113667012

PROF. DR. NAZAN AKSOY

İSTANBUL
2018

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION IN HAROLD PINTER'S
PLAYS

NURGÜL ŞENER
113667012

PROF. DR. NAZAN AKSOY

İSTANBUL
2018

Politicization and Personalization in Harold Pinter's Plays
Harold Pinter'in Oyunlarında Politikleştirme ve Kişiselleştirme

Nurgül Şener
113667012

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Nazan Aksoy
İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi
Jüri Üyesi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Rana Tekcan
İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi
Jüri Üyesi: Doç. Dr. Fakiye Ozsoysal
İstanbul Üniversitesi

Nazan Aksoy
Rana Tekcan
Fakiye Ozsoysal

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih :5.6.2018.....

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı:57.....

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Harold Pinter
- 2) Pintervari
- 3) Politikleştirme
- 4) Kişiselleştirme
- 5) Güç Mücadelesi

- 1) Harold Pinter
- 2) Pinteresque
- 3) Politicization
- 4) Personalization
- 5) Power Struggle

PREFACE

I was a passive follower of literature world before meeting my precious and beloved professor, Ünal Norman who enlightens my way through the drama world. When I started taking her Literature classes, I realized that analysing a drama, its background and possible effects of cultural interaction strongly appealed to my interests. After analysing plays from different kinds of literature, I realized similar patterns and different interpretation of certain metaphors in each culture, as well. Then, I decided to focus further on comparative studies not to find absolute similarities or differences but to find out how each culture and literature are unique and at the same time how literature is so universal. Finally, I met Harold Pinter and his play, *Mountain Language* which broadens my horizons. The more I read Pinter, the more I internalize the weaker voices of people who are affected deeply by arbitrary games and political desires of global agents. The world is not as peaceful as it is depicted, so I decided to compare Harold Pinter's plays with real-life events to find not similarities or differences but to invoke people to be aware of universal problems of humanity. Pinter helped me to revise my ideas to be a better world citizen, hence I try to reach other people that might not aware of voiceless and innocent people around the world. Therefore, first, I would like to thank and dedicate this study to Ünal Norman, my colleague and friend, Ebru Asal because of her precious help, during the process of writing this thesis and I am so grateful for their support of my family. Finally, I would like to thank my dear husband, Safa Burak Güner, because of his endless support, trust and love.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Harold Pinter and His Work.....	1
1.2. The Aim of the Study	7
CHAPTER 2	11
POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF RELATIONSHIPS.....	11
2.1. Politicization of Family Relationships	11
2.2. Politicization of Friendships and Partnerships	23
CHAPTER 3	37
POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF SOCIAL GATHERINGS	37
CHAPTER 4	51
POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF SPACE AND IDENTITY	51
4.1. Politicization and Personalization of Space	52
4.2. Politicization of Identity.....	64
CHAPTER 5	68
POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF LANGUAGE	68
5.1. Politicization and Personalization of State Language	69
5.2. Politicization and Personalization of Interrogations and Repeated Instructions	76
5.3. Politicization of Pauses and Silence.....	82
CHAPTER 6	89
CONCLUSION.....	89
WORKS CITED	93

ABSTRACT

Not only Harold Pinter was one of the most prominent playwrights of his era but also, with his distinctive dramatic style which is called *Pinteresque* he is still unique and influential. His plays are divided into three categories which are respectively “Comedy of Menace”, “Memory Plays” and “Political Plays” that is not a valid division because his plays cannot be considered political and non-political. Since personal is political, all plays of Harold Pinter are political because they are quite personal. Describing Harold Pinter’s plays in a specific and sharply defined theoretical framework could harm originality and purpose of his style. He was not a simple follower of a theory, instead he tried to put the real-life examples on the stage alive. The main purpose of this study is to analyse how Pinter depicted that personal matters are politicized, and political issues are personalized to protect status quo or struggle for the power. The politicization and personalization are analysed in terms of relationships as family and friendships, social gatherings, protecting of space and identity shifts, language as state language, interrogations and silence.

Key words: Harold Pinter, Pinteresque, Politicization, Personalization, Power Struggle

ÖZET

Harold Pinter sadece kendi devrinin öne çıkan oyun yazarlarından biri değildi aynı zamanda, *Pintervari* diye adlandırılan kendine özgü dramatik tarzıyla hala emsalsiz ve etkilidir. Pinter'ın oyunları sırasıyla “Tehdit Komedi” , “Hatıra Oyunları” ve “Politik Oyunlar” olarak üç gruba ayrılır, bu kategorileştirme geçersizdir çünkü onun oyunları politik ve apolitik olarak değerlendirilemez. Kişisel politik olduğu için Harold Pinter'ın bütün oyunları politiktir çünkü onlar oldukça kişiseldir. Harold Pinter'ın oyunlarını belirgin ve keskin bir şekilde tanımlanmış teorik çerçeveye tanımlamak Pinter'ın tarzının amacına ve özgünlüğüne zarar verebilir. O, bir teorinin basit bir takipçisi değildi onun yerine, gerçek yaşam örneklerini sahnede capcanlı bir şekilde yansıtmaya çalışır. Bu çalışmanın ana amacı Pinter'ın, statükoyu korumak ve güç mücadelesi için kişisel sorunların nasıl politikleştirildiğini ve politik konuların nasıl kişiselleştirildiği göstermesini incelemektir. Aile ve arkadaşlık ilişkileri, sosyal toplantılar, mülkiyetin korunması ve kimlik değişikliği, devlet dili, sorgulamalar ve sessizlik olarak dil, açılardan politikleştirme ve kişiselleştirme incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Harold Pinter, Pintervari, Politikleştirme, Kişiselleştirme, Güç Mücadelesi

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Harold Pinter and His Work

One of the most prominent and influential British dramatists of the era was Harold Pinter who wrote plays, screenplays, poems, as well. Having had an artistic personality, he was a dramatically powerful political activist. Due to his idiosyncratic dramatic style including the unknown threat, menace, and failure of communication, the term, *Pinteresque*, has entered drama terminology and English language as an adjective. Since Pinter's plays have a suspended menace atmosphere and the loss of linearity of the dialogues, his earlier plays were defined as the variation of absurd theatre; however, The Swedish Academy defines *Pinteresque* in a detailed way:

Pinter restored theatre to its basic elements: an enclosed space and unpredictable dialogue, where people are at the mercy of each other and pretence crumbles. With a minimum of plot, drama emerges from the power struggle and hide-and-seek of interlocution. Pinter's drama was first perceived as a variation of absurd theatre, but has later more aptly been characterised as 'comedy of menace', a genre where the writer allows us to eavesdrop on the play of domination and submission hidden in the most mundane of conversations. In a typical Pinter play, we meet people defending themselves against intrusion or their own impulses by entrenching themselves in a reduced and controlled existence. Another principal theme is the volatility and elusiveness of the past.

Pinter's career as a playwright started with *The Room* in 1957. His early works, which were between 1957-1968, were described by the critics as "Comedies of Menace", later plays between 1968-1982 as "Memory Plays", and the last ones between 1980-2000 as "Political Plays". Pinter's plays have been studied for a long time; however, most of the people who have studied these plays got the wrong way by putting his plays in definite

categories. Because of Pinter's distinctive style, one cannot determine without any doubt that any of his plays belongs to political plays category, without interfering with memory. As Austin Quigley summarizes, it is "very difficult to argue that the plays as a group exemplify the large general truths of any existing theory about the nature of the society, personality, culture, spirituality" (*Pinter, politics and postmodernism* 7). Because his dramatic style does not fit in an absolute theoretical ground, it is rather hard to analyse his dramas under schemes of any theory. Beyond shaping his works within the border of a theory, in his own words Pinter explained, "I'm not a theorist. I'm not an authoritative or reliable commentator on the dramatic scene, the social scene, any scene. I write plays when I can manage it, and that's all. That's the sum of it" (*Plays One* vii). As a response to the critics who thought that even though Pinter did not categorize his works based on a theoretical concept, he was walking on the edge of the postmodern theory, Harold Pinter claimed the following:

If I am to talk all I prefer to talk practically about political matters, but that's no more than a pious hope, since one invariably slips into theorizing, almost without noticing. And I distrust theory. In whatever capacity I have worked in the theatre, and apart from writing, I have done quite a bit of acting and a certain amount of directing for the stage, I have found that theory, as such, has never been helpful; either to myself, or, I have noticed, to few of my colleagues. (*Plays Three* ix)

Pinter clarified his reasons why he did not classify his works under a theory by saying that he did not control the characters or the plot as he simply did not trust the theory or the rules in a societal discourse.

Furthermore, his dramatic style bears some influences of the 20th century since throughout the century, the humanity has suffered a great deal from mass destructions, world wars, nuclear bombing, genocides, and some chaotic traumas which have had many long-term effects. Within this utter chaotic world, fundamental elements of the society have been affected in terms of politics, culture, and personal perspectives. Pinter was not a

playwright who was just highly engaged in the romance of an upper-class family, also the 20th century world was not a romance itself; therefore, he created characters and environment within these chaotic relations of power struggle, and he did not write controlled dramas or allegorical characters who represent specific political affinities; instead he let the quite natural environments and dialogues create themselves. Pinter himself described the way he created the dramas as follows:

I have usually begun a play in quite a simple manner; found a couple of characters in a particular context, thrown them together and listened to what they said, keeping my nose ground. The context has always been, for me, concrete and particular, and the characters concrete also. I've never started a play from any kind of abstract idea or theory and never envisaged my own characters as messengers of death, doom, heaven or the milky way or, in other words as allegorical representations of any particular force, whatever that may mean. (*Plays One ix*)

Pinter mainly set his dramas in a closed environment, such as a room, a hospital, or a prison. He was predominantly intrigued with the power relations between two people, or between the very powerful system and a human. This natural setting of characters and environment lead Pinter's dramas to be interpreted as a work of realism; nevertheless, he regarded;

I'm convinced that what happens in my plays could happen anywhere, at any time, in any place, although the events may seem unfamiliar at first glance. If you press me for a definition, I'd say that what goes on in my plays is realistic, but what I'm doing is not realism. (*Plays Two ix*)

There are already many elements of social situations in all his plays, such as war suffering, tortures in closed rooms physically or psychologically, and language dictations; mainly power struggles between and among people, and power struggles between individual and authority or the system. "Pinter's plays, from *The Room* to *Party Time*, seem to me remarkably concrete, precise explorations of obsessive themes. Territory. Fear. Dominance" (Billington 26). Nevertheless, the voice of these struggles has become a little higher towards his late plays. Due to this dramatic

increase, many critics have started to redefine all his dramas as “political”, but they have pointed out the later dramas as “openly political”. His early plays might have been mostly affected by the political contradiction which was very ominous during the Cold War; hence, it is possible to say that the unknown threat in his early plays is not just about absurdism but is also about the characteristic of the Cold War. Because of this, it can be said that Pinter’s early plays are political and very ominous, just like the Cold War itself. Pinter’s later plays are “openly political” as the terrible things such as, wars, invasions and abusing of human rights were happening quite openly. There is no longer ominous fear, but the fear there is quite concrete. Michael Billington has a different viewpoint for this division;

What is foolish, however, is to expect him to write exactly as he did in the fifties and sixties. He has moved on and so has the world. And if he is now more openly concerned than he was with the moral coarseness, spiritual barbarism and brutish conformity of our age, that is no bad thing. Pinter is today a visibly committed writer. (29)

Putting the plays into sharp categories may cause misconceptions, since Pinter was not a simple representative of any political affinity, or he was not totally against certain politicians or political spectrums.

The politics of Harold Pinter’s work are not derived from any ideological affinity with a specific political position, or indeed from any clearly defined ideological base or contemporary party politics. Pinter’s dramatic and poetic works do not scrutinise government politics or rail against those politics in a thinly veiled dramatic polemic. (Garner 1)

Therefore, if one identifies Harold Pinter’s works as the products of the “angry playwright” which the popular media characterized him as (qtd in Garner 1), one must end up deflecting the perception and purpose of Harold Pinter’s literary posture. As it was mentioned above, Harold Pinter was born in a quite chaotic world like a boiling cauldron, he experienced the Second World War; and finally, he grew mature during the Cold War.

My early reading was rather shapeless and disjointed, mainly, I believe, to do with the dislocation of a childhood in wartime. I was evacuated twice (once to Cornwall, where I more or less saw the sea for the first time) went to a number of schools and kept turning to London more bombs, flying bombs and rockets. It wasn't a very conducive atmosphere for reading. (Pinter, *Plays Four* viii)

Pinter, listened to, and observed everything which was occurring around him. Unsurprisingly, he started to engage in the political upheavals under the identity of a thoughtful world citizen. He believed that showing some reactions to terrible actions of the countries is everybody's responsibility.

Artists don't influence politics much: The only thing that will influence politics certainly in this country (America), and in my own country, is the voters. I do take the point that if I say something someone might listen. At the same time, I don't talk as an artist; I talk as a man. Everyone has quite essential obligation to subject the society in which we live to moral scrutiny. (qtd in Merritt 181)

Again here, Harold Pinter could not be taken a nationalistic citizen of a country, since he stood up as an anti-apartheid activist against the horrible actions of any country which killed or hurt massive civilians. Additionally, as Mel Gussow states "As a citizen, Pinter became a member of an anti-apartheid organisation and he was horrified at the events he saw taking place in Vietnam and South Africa" (qtd in Garner 1). Also, as F.J. Bernhard states:

Pinter shares with his realist contemporaries' commitments to what seem totally realistic situations, characters, and language. His dramatic situations are commonplace: a tramp discusses with two brothers the possibility of his becoming caretaker for their ramshackle flat; a young man loses his composure at his birthday party because of the presence of two men he does not know; a couple speculate about a matchseller outside their bungalow and finally invite him inside. The character as commonplace as the situations; unheroic people from the urban middle and lower classes. And the dialogue is a meticulously accurate description of ordinary speech. Of such grain have the realists of the Osborne school concocted a yeasty bread of social protest. (185)

Along with these, Harold Pinter and Arthur Miller visited Turkey after the military coup in 1980. Pinter visited prisons and witnessed abuses of human rights, after which he publicly condemned the foreign policy of the United States of America and United Kingdom following the Second World War. All his universal concerns have shown up in his dramas as a natural reflection of events in the world.

In conclusion, many critics divided Harold Pinter's dramas chronologically as "Comedy of Menace", "Memory Plays", and "Political Plays". On the other hand, he had a dramatic feature that dramaturgy has gained a new terminology *Pinteresque* which helps us not to detour while describing his dramas. When one thoroughly studies his dramas, poems, and short stories, and also comprehends the messages between the lines of his speeches and experiences, it can be noticed that none of his plays is engaging in politics without including any unknown threat or memory.

Harold Pinter and his works cannot be categorised under the scheme of any theoretical affinity, or any ideological and political structure. Pinter's dramas have a distinctive character which makes them universal literary masterpieces. Undoubtedly, there are many references to post-war effects both psychologically and psychically, and the violation and corruption of the state power; however, these references cannot be labelled as pure political, or items of realism. Nevertheless, these real-life samples do make his plays the universal voice of the humanity against abuses of human rights. Sharply categorizing and theorizing Harold Pinter's plays lead us to damage his plays' natural and realistic characteristic, due to which Pinter's plays may lose the core factors that make them masterpieces. Harold Pinter tried to exhibit minor happenings in almost all our lives which are basically the puzzle parts of the big picture. These experiences, dialogues, memories, relationships, and struggles in his plays are real and quite personal because all of them belong to humankind. Humans do, have and experience all these concepts, and are exposed to them. On the other hand, these memories,

relationships, struggles and speeches contain powerful and extremely realistic political dictations, since politics also belong to people, and it is human-made. Hence, Harold Pinter's plays are political; that is why, they are definitely personal, as well. Nevertheless, his plays have nothing to do with realism, theory, and politics; even though they are quite realistic and highly engaged in political issues, they are not representative of any political and theoretical affinity, they are rather just little samples of our lives.

1.2.The Aim of the Study

During the 20th and 21st century, the humankind has suffered from the bloodthirsty situations, such as wars and invasions which have been conducted for the sake of bringing and maintaining democracy by the so-called first world and civilized countries. Due to these dreadful actions and their consequences, the line between right and wrong, good and bad, ethical and unethical has almost vanished, and it has become all grey. Bringing, maintaining and keeping democracy safe has got the shape of a killing machine for innocent people. Although the concept of democracy should have been there for people, instead it has been metamorphosed into a weapon for the western countries to be sure their status quo continues. In the light of these misconceptions, individual and collective lives have been ambivalent.

Politics is a human-made notion which cannot be separated from the personal life. Globalization and mutualisation of the cultures, and politics, especially politics of western countries has turned out to affect people's lives in both first world and third world countries. Besides, that policy has started to cut and paste, recut and re-paste these lives, which is exactly a paradoxical vicious circle, and it only stops its savage cutting and pasting behaviours when the so-called civilized, great countries are satisfied, and ensure that everything has been ruined painfully. Furthermore, thousands of

people are dying somewhere in the world every day while the western part of the world is watching how their businesses go perfectly there. The western civilized people's politics become the life of a Palestinian boy. That policy decides under which circumstances the boy is born, how the boy lives, and when the boy dies. Because a human with various characteristics, personalities, feelings and actions is like the miniature of the world, people are affected by the happenings, so their actions have started to reflect the small samples from the whole world. Nothing can be claimed as just personal and without any reference to politics, and vice versa. Therefore, personal has been political. As a conclusion, Harold Pinter's plays are political, because they are personal.

As it is mentioned above, towards the end of the 20th century and in the 21st century, political turbulences have deeply affected personal lives. Since Harold Pinter's plays are an almost precise illustration of the real world, political themes come to light within the personal situations, even in the most private and daily ones. Also, Ronald Knowles states that, "understanding Pinter involves understanding the society as the twentieth century draws a close" (18). The term "the personal is political"^{vi} which appeared in the 1960s and 1970s with the claims of second-wave feminists can be a definition for Harold Pinter's plays, as in his plays there are many personal situations in which characters act politically to reach the same rights with the so-called privileged people. Here political or politicization means getting the same rights and putting a balance between private matters and "political" matters which do not involve emotional or individual concerns of everyday life. In other words, Pinter's works demonstrate how the states' policies have affected, or still affect, the individual who is the core element of the society on the stage. "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 individuals" (Garner 1). Also, Pinter's drama cannot be defined simply as

political and personal as Austin Quigley states, “Rather than showing that the personal is the political by dissolving the personal into the political, Pinter has, effectively dramatized the converse: that political is, among other things, the personal” (*Pinter, politics and postmodernism* 10). Namely, relations in Harold Pinter’s dramas are deeply affected by the social and political developments. Overall, this study mainly aims to explain how personal actions in Harold Pinter’s drama are politicized, as well as, how political issues in these plays are personalized. The other purpose is to demonstrate how politics and personal affairs are evolved inner actively and interactively in power struggles. Therefore, “politicization” will be used with the meaning of “control” or “manipulate” throughout the text.

Personalization and politicization in Harold Pinter’s plays will be analysed under four sections. In the first section, personalization and politicization of relationships will be discussed in terms of family relationships, such as husband and wife, father and son; and social relationships, like boss and worker, friends and partners. Throughout this section, how the politics of western countries affect not only the third world countries which have been exploited for a long time but also their own countries’ social lives will be elaborated. In the second section, personalization and politicization of social gatherings in Pinter’s dramas such as celebrations, parties and family dinners will be examined. Via this part, there will be claims as to how social gatherings try to conceal the unbearable agony of wars and violence, and how people act politically in such an environment. In the third section, personalization and politicization of space and identity will be explained with various items, a room, a house, furnishing, changing clothes and names. That section will cover the problems of how characters try to keep their personal circles safe, and how they are confused about their identities and the concepts of self, also how they survive on identity shifts from extremely serious traumas. The last section is about personalization and politicization of language which will be

covered with *Pinter silence*, interrogations, repeated instructions, mother tongue, the official language, officer language and politician language. The question of how daily life communication fails and evolves under certain circumstances will be pointed out in the part.



CHAPTER 2

POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF RELATIONSHIPS

The core concept of Harold Pinter's drama is based on relationships which appear mostly as a power struggle between individuals, or between individuals and authority through the people. Accordingly, the relationships are the common elements of Pinter's plays. Personalization of political affairs and politicization of personal matters can be realized through the relationships. The relationships in Harold Pinter's plays are centred around the family concept which are between and among husband and wife, father and son, mother and son; friends such as roommates, and partners, such as workers, boss and employees. These power struggles among the individuals are foremost components of politicization of the relationships because while an individual is trying to survive in that power struggle, that person ends up being political in her or his speeches, actions and memories, as well.

2.1. Politicization of Family Relationships

Pinter's characters are the players of some kinds of games. When people are younger, they play some children games, and they decide on the roles, create the rules altogether, and when they get older, it is assumed that they stop playing games. But in fact, they do not stop, they continue to play games but in a different way; they get different roles, such as being a mother, wife, father, husband in their private lives, and they all participate in the society as a worker, boss, teacher, doctor, and so on. Besides, they do not set the rules altogether; an individual wants to create the rules by oneself, and that individual desires to dominate the others. The protagonist is already chosen; on the other hand, the rest of the cast attends to the games sometimes consciously, but mostly unconsciously. Games form people's relationships. (Berne, *Games People Play*) As a matter of fact, since Harold

Pinter's characters try to dominate in the family games, they have to fight for the power which is needed to ensure their identities and roles.

Before the feminist waves, gender roles were sharply defined as men working and being responsible for "more" important matters, yet women staying at home and being responsible for raising children. Later, issues have continued to evolve, and these important matters have become responsibilities of only political leaders. Because of this division of responsibilities, people have begun to power struggle to survive in the cruel world.

Even though critics have not defined Harold Pinter's early dramas as political for a long time, *The Birthday Party* (1957) includes various political and politicized personal relationships. From the first scene, it is recognised that Meg and Petey are wife and husband, but their dialogue is quite political. They are having an everyday conversation in their kitchen while Petey is having his breakfast, but especially when Meg desires to get some approval and compliments, Petey does not find her questions nice even though he tries to please her.

MEG. I've got your cornflakes ready. Here's your cornflakes. (Stage directions)

Are they nice?

PETHEY. Very nice.

MEG. I thought they'd be nice. (Pinter, *Plays One 3*)

Again, in the same scene, Meg continues asking the same questions, even when she knows they are very nice.

PETHEY. I've finished my cornflakes.

MEG. Were they nice?

PETHEY. Very nice.

MEG. I've got something else for you.

PETEY. Good.

(Stage directions)

MEG. Here you are, Petey. (Stage directions)

Is it nice?

PETEY. I haven't tasted it yet.

MEG. I bet you don't know what it is.

PETEY. Yes, I do.

MEG. What is it, then?

PETEY. Fried bread.

MEG. That's right.

(Stage directions)

PETEY. Very nice.

MEG. I knew it was. (5-6)

Although Meg is sure about her breakfast, she asks how they are; yet, as far as it is implied there, Petey replies only to please her. In Turkish, there is an expression for this kind of situations as “being political” or “acting politically” which means that you hide your real feelings or thoughts either not to offend the other person, or to avoid any tension that can ruin the relationship or your status. These conversations show how the personal relationship on the level of husband and wife can be politicized. People use political behaviours to survive in their daily lives.

On the other hand, Stanley has opposite attitudes towards Meg's same questions. Stanley acts nervous, and Meg tries to convince and satisfy him maybe because whether she wants to flirt with him or dodges potential problems that can damage the social circle of the residents of the house.

MEG. What are the cornflakes like, Stan?

STANLEY. Horrible.

MEG. Those flakes? Those lovely cornflakes? You're a liar, a little liar. They're refreshing. It says so. For people when they get up late.

STANLEY. The milk's off.

MEG. It's not. Petey ate his, didn't you, Petey?

PETEY. That's right.

MEG. There you are then.

STANLEY. All right, I'll go on the second course. (9)

It is not certain whether Petey or Stanley is telling the truth about cornflakes; however, the last part of the conversation gives the signal that Stanley is aware of the other choice, because of which he claims that the cornflakes are horrible, and the milk is off so that he can get the second course. Stanley acts politically to eat the other food by telling a simple lie. Later, he manages to get the second course. In conclusion, an ordinary issue, such as getting the most desired one, is politicized and interpreted here as a power struggle.

On the one hand, even though Meg and Stanley sometimes have the mother-son relationship, sometimes they seem like they are having an affair; Petey and Stanley are like two people who talk mostly about weather and daily subjects. Regardless of having formal conversations, Petey is the only person who realizes that McCann and Goldberg are after something that Stanley will suffer from much.

PETEY (broken). Stan, don't let them tell you what to do!

They exit.

...

MEG. Where's Stan?

Pause.

Is Stan down yet, Petey?

PETEY. No... he's....

MEG. Is he still in bed?

PETEY. Yes, he's... still asleep.

MEG. Still? He'll be late for his breakfast.

PETEY. Let him... sleep.

Pause. (80-81)

Besides, *The Room* (1957) has been defined as *absurd drama*. Although it bears many elements of absurdism with unknown fear, ominous others and no specified place and time, the play has a dramatic feature which differentiates it from the absurdist dramas. That distinctive feature is called as *Pinteresque* because *The Room* (1957) includes certain realistic elements such as a place which is not specifically named but can possibly be found somewhere in the real world. The most important thing in the play is the existence of real relationships and conversations. The play is about a large house with a basement, downstairs and upstairs. In the middle, a room is allocated for an old couple, Bert and Rose. At the beginning of the scene, they are sitting in their room, and Rose is forming monologue since Bert is not responding. Their relationship is rather different. Rose is talking about many things to terminate the silence, as she is afraid of the basement, and through the end of the play we learn that she has a past which is unknown for Bert and other characters. She may be trying to hide her past with monologues on unrelated things.

ROSE. Here you are. This'll keep the cold out.

(Stage directions)

It's very cold out, I can tell you. It's murder.

(Stage directions, BERT begins to eat)

That's right. You eat that. You'll need it. You can feel it in here. Still, the room keeps warm. It's better than the basement, anyway.

(Stage directions)

I don't know how they live down there. It's asking for trouble. Go on. Eat it up. It'll do you good. (85)

This one-sided conversation goes on like that until Bert leaves the house. Bert neither talks nor gives any signal which shows he has no interest in what Rose says. After an intruder enters their private circle, suddenly, Bert starts to regard Rose continuously.

(He stops at the door, then goes to the window and draws the curtains. It is dark. He comes to the centre of the room and regards the woman.)

BERT. I got back all right.

ROSE. (Stage directions) Yes.

BERT. I got back all right.

Pause.

ROSE. Is it late?

BERT. I had a good bowl down there.

Pause.

I drove her down, hard. They got it dark out.

ROSE. Yes. (109)

Because politics affects the smallest unit of the society, family, the relationship is corrupted between the family members. Quite naturally, just like how people are affected by occupying forces in their countries, the uninvited guest violates their personal space, and Bert and Rose go under a change. Bert has started to talk, while Rose has started to give short

responses. Since Harold Pinter's plays are reflection of the real society, it is implied here that occupiers in one's country, immigrants, or refugees affect frames of people's relationships. It can be claimed that personal relationships are politicized with the help of political affinities around them.

In *The Homecoming* (1964), Ruth and Teddy have been married for six years. They have been on a Europe tour and later one night, they end up in Teddy's father's house. At the beginning of their conversation, Ruth intends to leave early, yet Teddy plans to stay. Also, Teddy wants Ruth to stay in line, but it is in a quite polite way. He kindly asks her to behave properly. It is opposite of Bert and Rose's relationship as Teddy is an educated person which is mentioned in the play later.

RUTH. Do you want to stay?

TEDDY. Stay?

Pause.

We've come to stay. We're bound to stay... for a few days.

RUTH. I think... children.... might be missing us.

TEDDY. Don't be silly.

RUTH. They might.

TEDDY. Look, we'll be back in a few days, won't we? (Pinter, *Plays Three* 29-30)

Ruth does not want to stay, and she uses their children as an excuse for not staying in England without realizing that the children might have already missed them because of the Europe tour. After Ruth has decided to stay, Teddy starts to use the idea of missing children to persuade her not to stay. Children are the political weapon of their relationship. Having children and missing them are extremely personal; however, it turns out to be rather political to dominate the relationship.

(....)

(He leans to her.)

MAX. Eh, tell me, do you think the children are missing their mother?

(She looks at him.)

TEDDY. Of course they are. They love her. We'll be seeing them soon. (59)

After Teddy's family members start to show some interest in Ruth, Teddy has changed his attitude towards the idea of missing the children. Instead of Ruth, even though she does not need any help from Teddy, Teddy answers his father's questions. That children are missing their mother is Teddy's tool to manipulate both his wife and family. For him, Ruth is just a complimentary element in his life, not a separate individual.

While Teddy and Lenny are talking about the philosophical aspect of the table, suddenly Ruth interrupts them giving a very arousing example of moving her leg with her underwear and restricting the observations. Moreover, she starts to give some information about her history (61). Upon foreseeing the danger of the disclosure of Ruth's previous life, he offers to go to America.

TEDDY. I think we will go back. Mmnn?

Pause.

Shall we go home?

RUTH. Why?

TEDDY. Well, we were only here for a few days, weren't we? We might as well cut it short, I think.

RUTH. Why? Don't you like it here?

TEDDY. Of course I do. But I'd like to go back and see the boys now. (62)

Family relationships are used to manipulate, control, and maintain the sovereign. Teddy does not keep a relationship with his wife democratically, but dominantly. He wants Ruth to stay in line and act according to Teddy's desires. Teddy asks Ruth to go to bed, but she refuses. Even if she says she is not tired, he insists her to get into bed. Instead of sleeping, Ruth wants to go out to have some air. When Teddy loses his control over her, he acts hysterically. Suddenly, Teddy chews his knuckles (31-32).

Except for Teddy and Ruth, there are Teddy's two brothers, his father and his uncle. They all live together. Max is not a very affectionate father, and his relationship with his sons and his brother is not a "normal" one. They usually insult each other. The dead mother of the house was like the bridge which connects the family. All of them talk about her as a good memory.

On the other hand, Teddy was expecting his father to miss him a lot, but he tried to have them chucked out because Max had considered Ruth as a whore. Later on, Max learned from Ruth that Teddy has three boys. Max has changed his attitude towards Teddy. It can be deduced here that Max respects women if they are mothers. Since those times the effect of the second wave feminism had just started, women were protesting the gender responsibilities originated in everyday inequalities. The effect of the trending topic can be observed through the attitudes of Max towards Ruth.

MAX. All yours, Ted?

Pause.

Teddy, why don't we have a nice cuddle and kiss, eh? Like the old days? What about a nice cuddle and kiss, eh?

TEDDY. Come on, then. (51)

The family starts to talk about Teddy's life in the USA. It is implied that Teddy is the only one in the family who gets a doctorate degree in Philosophy. Lenny wants to ask some questions about Christian theism; however, Teddy does not answer it by saying, "That question doesn't fall within my province" (59). Lenny continues asking questions, but again Teddy says, "If they're within my province" (60). Even though they are brothers, Teddy acts politically not to be in an awkward position. In a normal conversation, Teddy politicized the topic by refusing to answer.

Because Teddy got married to a woman who is beneath himself, he tries to prove himself and dominate the others by using his educational studies (67). "You wouldn't understand them" (69).

In *A Slight Ache* (1958), Edward and Flora are husband and wife who are having breakfast with a conversation about flowers in the garden. While they are talking, a wasp intrudes their conversation. Getting rid of it, later killing it, seems very natural and predictable in a daily life circumstance; however, it turns into Edward's power show-off.

EDWARD: Lift the lid. All right, I will. There he is! Dead. What a monster. (Stage directions)

FLORA: What an awful experience.

EDWARD: What a beautiful day it is. Beautiful. I think I shall work in the garden this morning. Where's that canopy? (Pinter, *Plays One* 158)

Edward acts like that he has killed a dragon, and since he has proved his power on that insect, he feels satisfied. On the contrary to his wife's comprehension, he interprets this experience as "beautiful".

At the beginning of the conversation, Edward is quite normal, but when he notices the Matchseller who stands at Edward's back gate, he starts to question Matchseller's existence. After the knowledge of Matchseller's existence and Flora's opinions about him, Edward has changed.

EDWARD: I've no work to do this morning.

FLORA: What about your essay? You don't intend to stay in the scullery all day, do you?

EDWARD: Get out. Leave me alone.

FLORA: Really Edward. You've never spoken to me like that in all your life.

EDWARD: Yes, I have. (162)

The political decisions around affect the individual's attitudes. Here, the Matchseller's existence both politicizes Edward's attitudes towards his wife and personalizes the Matchseller's presence in Edward's thoughts. A simple presence of another person becomes the topic of other people's conversation. What is more, the politics of an individual shapes another individual's politics. Edward's change is reflected in Flora, too.

FLORA: Don't come in.

EDWARD: Well?

FLORA: He's dying.

EDWARD: Dying? He's not dying.

FLORA: I tell you, he's very ill.

EDWARD: He's not dying! Nowhere near. He'll see you cremated.

FLORA: The man is desperately ill!

EDWARD: Ill? You lying slut. Get back to your trough! (177)

After this conversation, Flora has been through a great deal. She enters the room, and she talks about the preparation of the house and the garden for the Matchseller but calls him Barnabas. She gives the Matchseller's tray full of matches to Edward, then Flora and Matchseller leave together. Due to Edward's personalization of the presence of the Matchseller, Flora takes her guard, and she decides to play politics. To survive in her relationship with her husband, she detours her actions.

A Night Out (1959) is mainly about a mother and a son's relationship. Mrs. Stokes is a dominant character who controls her son with psychological pressure about the family memories and norms, and understandably, her son, Albert is very submissive because of his mother's pressures. Since Mrs. Stokes is sinisterly authoritarian, her relationship with Albert evolves into political conflicts. She plays little games to persuade or deter Albert to do something. While Albert is looking for his tie, she is constantly asking him to do something else, such as changing the light bulb in Grandma's room which has not been used by anybody for a long time or preparing the dinner table. She changes the topic of the conversation suddenly to distract her son's attention so that he cannot leave the house. While Albert is asking for his tie, she starts to check dinner table to eat dinner together, even though she knows he is going out. All Mrs. Stokes's actions are political dramas which make their personal relationship quite a political one. She uses the memories, mothering and family norms to control his life.

MOTHER: Your father would turn into in his grave if he heard you raise your voice to me. You're all I've got, Albert. I want you to remember that. I haven't got anyone else. I want you... I want you to bear that in mind.

ALBERT: I'm sorry... I raised my voice.

(*Mumbling.*) I've got to go. (334)

Actually, she is not sincere about what her dead husband would think of Albert's behaviours, and Albert apologizes but not due to being really sorry. Mrs. Stokes tries to prevent Albert from going out, Albert apologizes to calm her. Both utilize the political nature of memories. They politized the personal relationship with the help of affections and taking the things lying down.

Albert takes the advantage of being the only person that she has got and tells white lies to sedate her.

ALBERT: (with his arm around her): I won't be late. I don't want to go. I'd much rather stay with you.

MOTHER: Would you?

ALBERT: You know I would. Who wants to go to Mr. King's party?

MOTHER: We were going to have our game of cards.

ALBERT: Well, we can't have our game of cards.

(Pause.)

MOTHER: Put the bulb in Grandma's room, Albert. (335)

Mother's insist here is the typical Pinter's power struggle between two people. In these authority wars, even though Mrs. Strokes and Albert seem to have normal and usual negotiations between mother and son, in deep downs, each of them is struggling to dominate one another. Because every policy draws its weapon which is mostly violence, towards the end of this war, Albert's outrage starts using the clock as a weapon. Unlike Edward's violence, Albert's intention is not just a show-off, it is a real outburst.

2.2. Politicization of Friendships and Partnerships

As Harold Pinter's plays mostly deal with power struggles between and among people, between an authority and people; people try to survive in social relations with the help of politics. Especially social relations require certain political behaviours to control the friendship or dominate the relationship. As it is mentioned in the first part, Pinter's characters are playing adult games and they need these games in the social environments to dominate the relationship or to survive in the power struggle. In the concept of family, the power relations are mainly based on bloodline and age factors, such as parents rule and run the house; however, in friendships, the hierarchy is not as obvious and definite as in the family circle. Therefore, the battle of power between friends or partners occurs much

more seriously and competitively. Defining the rules and roles should be monitored carefully and wisely, in which case, relationships are politicized because of the power struggle.

As it is mentioned in the previous chapter, although Harold Pinter's first plays were not defined as political, all his plays contain many political and politicized relationships. In *The Dumb Waiter* (1959), there are two men in a classical *Pinteresque* room, and as the stage directions state these two men are wearing some kind of formal clothes. Ben is reading a newspaper and Gus is doing trivial things. From the first scene, it can be deduced that Ben is the character who dominates the relationship because whenever Gus acts unreasonably, Ben stops reading, starts to watch Gus; when their eyes meet, Gus stops what he is doing (113). The sentences which are produced by Ben are mostly imperatives that shows domination of the relationship.

BEN. Don't waste them! Go on, go and light it.

GUS. Eh?

BEN. Go and light it. (125)

Ben is dominating, yet, Gus is also struggling by playing little games with the words.

BEN. It's a figure of speech! Light the kettle. It's a figure of speech!

GUS. I've never heard it.

BEN. Light the kettle. It's common usage!

GUS. I think you've got it wrong.

BEN (menacing). What do you mean?

GUS. They say put on the kettle.

BEN (taut). Who says?

(Stage directions) I have never in all my life heard anyone say put on the kettle.

GUS. I bet my mother used to say it. (125-126)

(...)

BEN. Gus, I'm not trying to be unreasonable. I'm just trying to point out something to you.

GUS. Yes, but –

BEN. Who's the senior partner here, me or you?

GUS. You.

BEN. I'm only looking after your interests, Gus, you've got to learn, mate. (126)

By insisting on trivial matters, Gus tries to take part in the ruling organism, but Ben reinforces his status by emphasizing being the senior there. The figurative language problem is politicized as an argument in this power struggle. Gus is using an unimportant issue to struggle. In this power war, this is a verbal torture to gain authority over the partner as “a fight for dominance” (Esslin, *The People Wound* 75). Later, Ben grabs Gus with two hands by the throat (Pinter, *Plays One* 126). It seems that Gus and Ben are having a quarrel due to figurative language, but this is not the case. What happens is a normal conversation turns into a torture as Gus wants to share the authority; while, Ben does not want to lose his power. Two common people can start a fight over sharing authority just like political leaders who erupt wars to catch up the rate race and exploit poor countries more.

In *The Dumb Waiter*, Ben and Gus are waiters with guns, they are sending the limited food of theirs upstairs. Gus threatens Ben's authority by insisting on little issues and asking some questions (127-128). The biggest problem lying between the lines is that Gus starts to question the authority.

GUS. (...) Why doesn't he get in touch? I feel like I've been here years. (He takes his revolver out of its holster to check the ammunition.) We've never let him down, though, have we? We've never let him down. I was thinking only the other day, Ben. We're reliable, aren't we? (137)

The intention of Gus is not to earn the authority's trust, but rather to determine his gain in return of his loyalty to the authority. Later, when everything that they have is consumed, Gus begins to resist and rebel.

GUS. What are we supposed to drink?

(BEN sits on his bed, staring.)

What about us?

(Stage direction)

I'm thirsty too. I'm starving. And he wants a cup of tea. That beats the band, that does.

(BEN lets his head sink on to his chest.)

(...)

We send him up all we've got and he's not satisfied. No, honest, it's enough to make the cat laugh. Why did you send him up all that stuff? (Thoughtfully.) Why did I send it up? (141)

These two common people are hands and tools of the authority. They give whatever the authority commands, but they cannot satisfy it. Moreover, the authority requires them to accomplish a dirty job which is mentioned as killing someone and cleaning after the job (131). Like the authorities of the modern world, they make the community do illegal business and pay taxes even if people do not have enough money for their survivals. The more people give, the more authority desires and gets. Also, towards the end of the play, Ben makes Gus remember his duty and repeat the instructions (142-143). Like in the play, there are some people who want to stand against the authority, but there are also others who obey the authority and force the rest to obey it through their authority over people. However, it cannot be

said that this submission is just simply due to fear; it is also due to survival instincts. People need to survive in this power struggle, for which they politicize their relationships.

In *The Birthday Party* (1957) there are two partners, Goldberg and McCann appear out of blue. When their interrogation style is considered, one can infer that there is the IRA presence, which is an extremist organization in Ireland. These two people tend to establish dominance over each other; nevertheless, these are not as obvious and violent as in *The Dumb Waiter*. The relationship between them is a kind of preparation for the crueller one in *The Dumb Waiter*.

MCCANN. What now?

GOLDBERG. Don't worry yourself, McCann. Take a seat.

MCCANN. What about you?

GOLDBERG. What about me?

MCCANN. Are you going to take a seat?

GOLDBERG. We'll both take a seat. (Stage direction) Sit back, McCann. Relax. What's the matter with you? I bring you down a few days to the seaside. Take a holiday. Do yourself a favour. Learn to relax, McCann, or you'll never get anywhere. (21)

Goldberg tries to govern McCann but in a nice and polite way. By making having a seat a political matter, McCann aims to maintain his position and ensure who is in charge. This small matter is used for a power struggle. Accordingly, the personal matters are politicized with small trivial discussions.

Towards the end of the play, because McCann calls Goldberg as Nat, Goldberg seizes McCann by his throat (70). The power struggle is getting harsher and more violent. Using first names is a way of balancing the status, that is why Goldberg acts furiously. In addition to this, he adds how he got his position after a long sermon with full of rises and falls (71-72). He also

tells about his father's memory "I lost my life in the service of others, he said, I'm not ashamed. Do your duty and keep your observation" (72). "And that's why I've reached my position, McCann. Because I've always been as fit as a fiddle. My motto. Work hard and play hard. Not a day's illness" (72). On the one hand McCann tries to get some equality in their partnership; on the other hand, Goldberg is not willing to give up his status quo. From Goldberg's short professional sermon, it can be drawn that he is aware of his authority, and he is aware that doing the service of others ruins his life; however, it also helps him to climb the ladder in the bureaucracy. The politics of the system has deeply affected both his personal and professional life.

In *The Hothouse* (1958) firstly it seems that there are some doctors or kind of officers who keep the record of the patients. Because Gibbs calls Roote as "sir" and gives reports about the patients, it can be deduced that Roote is the person who is in charge (Pinter, *Plays One* 189). Since Roote has some difficulty in remembering the patients' conditions, and dates, it can be understood that he has some problems in ruling the house (190-191). Due to this situation, Roote is trying to make his authority powerful by giving justification, and he is aiming to ensure his status quo.

ROOTE: I was standing where you're standing now. I can tell you that. Saying yes sir, no sir and certainly sir. Just as you are now. I didn't bribe anyone to get where I am. I worked my way up. When my predecessor ... retired ... I was invited to take over his position. And have you any idea why you call me sir now? (196)

Here, through giving information about how he managed to come to that position, Roote's intention is to justify his status. Also, he encourages Gibbs to regard him as "sir" by giving the signals of promotion. It is a perfect example of how power relations and group dynamics are constructed through indirect language which he uses to encourage people to do things for him in disguise of promotion, welfare, and patriotism.

ROOTE: (...) After all, they're not criminals. 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 judgement, to help them regain their confidence, confidence in themselves, confidence in others, confidence in ... the world. What? They're all people specially recommended by the Ministry, after all. They're not any Tom, Dick or ... er ... Harry. (197)

Although having patients and helping them are very personal and common, Roote politicizes the situation and manipulates the violation of human rights with the help of constitution and government. By referring to this passage, it can be concluded that Roote and his co-workers are not actual doctors, and the people who are called as patients are not patients. In addition to this, "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, *Harold Pinter* 104).

ROOTE: The men who gave their lives so that we might live. Who sacrificed themselves so that we might continue. Who helped keep the world clean for the generations to come. The men who died in our name. Let us drink to them. After all, it's Christmas. Couldn't be more appropriate. (Pinter, *Plays One* 272)

In this part, Roote is pleased with the death of some co-workers. It is quite political as he can strengthen his status quo with the deaths of both his team members and the patients who have no names. According to İbrahim Yerebakan, "When one has a critical look at the subtext of the play it certainly becomes a parable of the systematic destruction of an "inferior" human race by a superior nation bent on mass death" (*Political Dimensions of Harold Pinter's Dramatic Art* 61). He states that *The Hothouse* has some similarities with the modern European history in terms of the massacre of nameless Jewish victims because they were regarded as inferior, and the hot places refer to gas chambers in Auschwitz (62). Additionally, the reference of "Christmas" can be an interpretation of killing Jews in the name of God.

ROOTE: That's my Christmas cake! You can't spit out my Christmas cake!

LUSH: Stuff it!

(Stage direction)

ROOTE: You've insulted me, you've insulted the cook, and you've insulted Jesus Christ. (Pause) We've got no room for unhealthy minds in this establishment. (Pinter, *Plays One* 301)

Again, a daily and personal topic, which is a religious celebration, is politicized by manipulating the spitting out the cake into insulting Jesus Christ. Furthermore, to maintain his dominance, Roote personalizes the spitting out the cake by altering the matter into insulting him. As the politicians do, Roote manipulates people's religious identities to keep his status quo and authority safe.

In *The Caretaker* (1959), at the beginning of the first scene, there are two men, Aston and Davies. Since Aston offers Davies a seat, it can be assumed that Davies is an outsider (Pinter, *Plays Two* 5-6). This play deals with the post-colonial immigration (Garner 1) to Europe mainly from the so-called third world countries, and Davies's experiences with the fear of "foreigners".

DAVIES. Ten minutes off for a tea-break in the middle of the night in that place and I couldn't find a seat, not one. All them Greeks had it, Poles, Greeks, Blacks, the lot of them, all them aliens had it. And they had me working there ... they had me working...

(Stage direction)

All them Blacks had it, Blacks, Greeks, Poles, the lot of them, that's what, doing me out of a seat, treating me like a dirt. When he come at me tonight I told him. (Pinter, *Plays Two* 6)

Because of his fear of outsiders, he tries to find a safe place without the presence of Blacks, Greeks and Poles. Actually, in the beginning, Aston is very nice by providing a bed (9) and a pair of shoes (11) for Davies. Later, Aston wakes Davies up, since Davies was making noise in his sleep; instead of apologizing, he tries to dominate relationship by accusing the Blacks (20-21). His fear or disgust affect his relationship with Aston. Davies is afraid and hesitates to interact closely with Aston due to Aston's possible interactions with Blacks (16).

Furthermore, when Mick, who is Aston's brother and who claimed to be the landlord of the room, enters the room, he reacts violently against Davies (27). Mick is also suspicious of and not comfortable with "foreigners".

MICK. You a foreigner?

DAVIES. No.

MICK. Born and bred in the British Isles?

DAVIES. Yes, I was! (31)

As it has been shown, all the residents of the room do not trust each other very much because of the fear of people from different nations and ethnical origins. Moreover, Mick might have worked or stayed in the colonies (48). Due to the threat of foreigners, or outsiders, Mick and Davies do not trust each other; however, discovering both of their existence in the colonies makes them interact with ease. Besides, Mick offers Davies to have the job of being the caretaker of the building just because Davies has been in the colonies.

It can be drawn here that the social happenings and political approaches for this socializing affect even common people's lives. As it is given in the play, the migration from Africa to Europe, and from poor European countries to England have some dramatical effects on people's daily lives. Under usual circumstances, people tend to practice and find

many alternative ways to communicate and live with other people, or they set some principles to live together, such as being organized, honest and financially competent; nevertheless in this play, partners do not interact with each other until they discover their partners' ethnical origins and the amount of the interaction they have had with "other" people from different ethnical groups. For them, the core principle of living together is to be pure blood, not an outsider. To sum up; on the one hand, political affairs and approaches politicize even common individuals' lives; on the other hand, personal problems which are living together and sharing a bathroom can become the problem of the whole society which leads to the political posture of the countries.

In *Victoria Station* (1982), as typical in Harold Pinter's plays, there is an unknown atmosphere of menace throughout the play. First of all, there are two characters who are a controller and a driver, and they have an awkward relationship. Like Hegelian theory, Controller is a master and Driver is a slave, which states that these two people are connected to each other, a master does not mean and function anything without the existence of a slave. Their relationship is bound to that theory.

At the beginning of the play, Controller asks Driver to go and pick a passenger in Boulogne, but when Driver does not get in action, the language of Controller is getting harsher and harsher. To ensure his authority, he begins to use a threatening language (Pinter, *Plays Four* 196-197).

CONTROLLER. (...) Because I haven't, 274. I'm just talking into this machine, trying to make some sense out of our lives. That's my function. God gave this job. He asked me to do this job, personally. I'm your local monk, 274. I'm a monk. You follow? I lead a restricted life. I haven't got a choke and a gear lever in front of me. I haven't got a cooling system and four wheels. I'm not sitting here with wing mirrors and a jack in the boot. And if I did have a jack in the boot I'd stick it right up your arse. (198)

It makes Driver a slave to clarify and guarantee Controller's function. Moreover, he manipulates the idea of divine power by defining himself as a monk and stating that God gives this job to him personally. The fact that Driver does not know the station of Victoria changes the direction of the conversation.

DRIVER. Well, I honestly don't know what I've been doing all these years.

CONTROLLER. What have you been doing all these years?

DRIVER. Well, I honestly don't know.

Pause.

CONTROLLER. All right 274. Report to the office in the morning. 135? Where are you? 135? Where are you?

DRIVER. Don't leave me.

CONTROLLER. What? Who's that?

DRIVER. It's me. 274. Please. Don't leave me.

CONTROLLER. 135? Where are you?

DRIVER. Don't have anything to do with 135. He's not your man. He'll lead you into blind alleys by the dozen. They all will. Don't leave me. I'm your man. I'm the only one you can trust.

Pause.

CONTROLLER. Do I know you, 274? Have we met?

Pause.

Well, it'll be nice to meet you in the morning. I'm really looking forward to it. I'll be sitting here with my cat o'nine tails, son. And you know what I'm going to do with it? I'm going to tie you up bollock naked to a butcher's table and I'm going to flog you to death all the way to Chrystal Palace.

DRIVER. That's where I am! I knew I knew the palace. (202-203)

Although Controller threatens him, Driver does not want to be abandoned because there is no purpose without a master for a slave. Even if Driver receives frightening swears from Controller, he may still change his attitude due to the fear of not having an authority at all. This is also related to the theory of Saussure which is a binary opposition that interprets this situation as the existence of a master depending on the existence of a slave. All in all, opposite things complete each other's existence.

The New World Order (1991) is typical *Pinteresque* drama which characterizes a victim and a victimizer. A blindfolded man is a victim who is being tortured by two victimizers, Des and Lionel (Pinter, *Plays Four* 271). Des and Lionel are assumed to be interrogators, and because of their position, they already have authority over the blindfolded man who is a lecturer in theology (237) and have probably criticized "received" ideas of the despotic system (276). The system tries to gain power control by silencing the intellectuals who are questioning the received ideas instead of simply accepting them. Since he does not accept their ideas, they assume that he is ignorant by stating "The level of ignorance that surrounds us" (275). In the end, they feel proud by silencing him and leaving him with no voice and no sight. "I mean once – not too long ago – this man was a man of conviction, wasn't he, a man of principle. Now he's just a prick" (276). During the interrogation, instead of asking questions directly to the victim, they prefer to insult him with using quantifying adjectives which mostly describe "weakness". Furthermore, there is a menace in their sentences which foreshadows what they will do to him and reveals what they did to him.

LIONEL. Well, he probably has the *faintest* idea.

DES. A faint idea, yes. Possibly.

(Stage direction)

Have you? What do you say?

Let's put it this way. He has *little* idea of what we might do to him, of what in fact we are about to do him.

LIONEL. Or his wife. Don't forget his wife. He has little idea of what we're about to do to his wife.

DES. Well, he probably has *some* idea, he's probably got *some* idea. After all, he's read the papers. (273)

However, except their power over the victim, Lionel and Des themselves are in power struggle. Whatever Lionel says, Des tries to correct by repeating in new versions such as, correction of faintest into faint (273). In this power struggle, swearing words are politicized to fight. Once Lionel calls the victim as "cunt" (273), he uses a different word, "prick" (275). Des manipulates words to dominate Lionel.

DES. You called him a cunt last time. Now you call him a prick. How many times do I have to tell you? You've got to learn to define your terms and stick to them. You can't call him a cunt in one breath and a prick in the next. The terms are mutually contradictory. You'd lose face in any linguistic discussion group, take my tip. (275)

The most striking part of the play is definitely the part where Lionel feels pure after torturing an intellectual who threatens their authority and Des's justification of this feeling by saying "Because you're keeping the world clean for democracy" (277). Lionel establishes his power by killing a man, Des tries to maintain his authority with language correction; however, both of them actually are strengthening the ultimate authority.

To sum up, all of these characters mentioned above struggle for the power in their personal relationships, including friendships, and professional relations, such as colleagues or partners. In Harold Pinter's plays, characters are subconsciously involved in politics in their personal relationships because personal is political. Politics affects each and every piece of our lives, and the line between political and personal is disappearing gradually.



CHAPTER 3

POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF SOCIAL GATHERINGS

There are various types of roles for humans in every aspect of life. Due to these roles, people must bear different identities such as being a teacher in school, a daughter at home, or an aunt in family. As it was mentioned in chapter two, people take part in adult games (Berne). Each game requires a different set of norms and specific identities which are called as “micro-cultures”. Microcultures are the moderators that provide specific roles for each identity. Individuals behave in a certain way for each identity that they characterize in different social circles. It is quite common to see that people feel more comfortable in their private lives with people that they are close to; yet, same people can be more dignified and controlled in their workplaces, and that is completely acceptable. Accordingly, in Harold Pinter’s plays, people have different identities in social gatherings from their family lives. However, the social norms of Harold Pinter’s social gatherings are not so “normal”. As in their personal relationships, the social dynamics of gatherings are deeply affected by the political upheavals and approaches of the period. Because the characters in Pinter’s plays are in struggle for authority, in social organizations and environments, they politicize norms and issues of the gatherings to dominate the group or survive in the power struggle. Also, as the theory of Bakhtin, people sometimes experience grotesque and they need to hide their agonies with carnivalesque to survive. So, Pinter’s characters use parties and celebrations to hide or cope with the cruel wars of power.

In Harold Pinter's plays, social gatherings take place as parties, celebrations and family dinners which are quite personal and everyday gatherings; however, the central core of Pinter's plays is a power struggle, that is why, the relationships in the plays are politicized, or political matters in the group are personalized.

The menacing presence of IRA and McCarthy interrogation style makes *The Birthday Party* (1957) a political play. Beyond being a political play, it includes carnivalesque characteristics, such as having a birthday party for Stanley. Nevertheless, in this play, on the contrary of the other carnivalesque events, this is a real birthday party. The strange thing here is that except Goldberg, McCann and Stanley, the other attendants have no idea what they are covering with relish to forget or pacify their agony. Meg plans to celebrate his birthday by giving a small gift (Pinter, *Plays One* 29), but Goldberg's plan is to catch Stanley in his most vulnerable moment (26).

By encountering McCann and being exposed to his menacing and obstinate questionings, Stanley finds himself in the middle of a violent interrogation (35-36). With Goldberg's attendance, this interrogation session evolves into psychological torturing and manipulation (41-42). After the series of endless and meaningless questions without linearity (43-45), Stanley begins not to speak at all. Throughout the celebration, Goldberg and McCann torture Stanley with their manners and speeches. "McCann switches out the light, comes back and shines the torch in Stanley's face" (51).

GOLDBERG. Agreed. But tonight, Lulu, McCann, we've known a great fortune. We've heard a lady extend the sum total of her devotion, in all its pride, plume and peacock, to a member of her own living race. Stanley, my heartfelt congratulations. I wish you, on behalf of us all, a happy birthday. I'm sure you've never been a prouder man than you are today. Mazoltov! And may we only meet at Simchahs! (Lulu *and* Meg *applaud.*) Turn out the light, McCann, while we drink the toast. (50)

Goldberg and McCann's reactions are completely different in party time compared to one on one conversation. They are pretending as they are partying and enjoying themselves. It is quite normal to have different approaches in social environments and private life, but here the birthday party disguises their real intention. Furthermore, before the party, while McCann states "You betrayed our land" (46), and Goldberg claims "You betray our breed" (46), they have a different language and attitude in the party. This is also a kind of torturing because they deliberately ruin possibly one of Stanley's happiest moments. They abuse personal and private matters to ensure their authority and power, just like governments do. The system, which Goldberg and McCann symbolize, politicizes the social gatherings.

Albert in *A Night Out* (1959), as mentioned before, is very oppressed by his mother emotionally which affects his character and makes him very reserved and anti-social. Even if he is a good football player, because of being an introvert, he cannot show up and present himself in the party (Pinter, *Plays One* 339). Besides having an overprotective mother, it seems that Albert works under heavy stressful circumstances in the workplace as well, most probably due to capitalist and rat race working conditions. All employers need to have some parties to get away from this stress. However, due to the fact that the effect of competitive working habits follows the employers even in the football field, it is not possible to say that they are completely away from the office. Mr. King, who is the employer or the head manager, says "Also it gives a sense of belonging. Work together and play together. Office work can become so impersonal. We like to foster ... to foster something ... very different. You know what I mean?" (350).

Furthermore, even though they are not in the office or in a professional meeting, some workers cannot help themselves but talk about the topics related to their jobs and office matters. Hence, out of blue, Gindey, one of Albert's colleagues in his office, begins to talk about his qualifications and the capacity of his strength in his profession (350). This is

also a power struggle in the professional life in which the ideology of the modern world charges them this position of being the best in the field. It is the politicization of the personal desires in the professional life. In other words, people want to be promoted or the best, not because of instinctive dynamics, but due to the impact of system's requirements to survive.

After an incident of touching a lady with the intention of harassment, Gindey calls Albert outside to discuss that occasion. All these happenings are just private matters, but Gindey diverts the topic into his position in the company because this is the only way in which he can feel superior to the others. "I'm talking to this man on behalf of the firm! Unless I get a satisfactory explanation, I shall think seriously about recommending his dismissal" (358). This is precisely what states and governments do with their state power. They organize fancy gatherings, national holidays, football matches and other carnivalesque meetings to divert people's attention from the serious problems, or to take their power for granted. In other words, both Gindey and authorities abuse their power to manipulate the people who work under or for them. Like the politics behind these social gatherings, to maintain its dominance and power, a state could abuse its people by deciding on behalf of them and using their labour force.

There are two men, Stephen and Roger who are presumably businesspeople or politicians in *Precisely* (1983) which is defined as not a play but a sketch. They are talking in a superior way about the upheavals around them. Furthermore, they are quite comfortable and seem to have a celebration with their drinks. It can be said that this play is the first political upper-class play which does not deal with the effects of politics on the lives of working class and middle class. Stephen and Roger are the people who rule the other common people, and they do not care about what really happens to the public; they are just interested in the statistics. They decide on facts and think instead of public.

STEPHEN. Time and time again. Twenty million. That's what we've said. Time and time again. It's a figure supported by facts. We've done our homework. Twenty million is a fact. When these people say thirty I'll tell you exactly what they're doing – they're distorting the facts.

ROGER. Scandalous.

STEPHEN. Quite. I mean, how the hell do they *know*?

ROGER. Quite.

STEPHEN. We've done the *thinking*.

ROGER. Quite.

STEPHEN. That's what we're paid for.

ROGER. Paid a bloody lot too.

STEPHEN. Exactly. Good money for good brains.

They drink.

Thirty million! I mean ...!

ROGER. Exactly.

STEPHEN. I'll tell you, neither I nor those above me are going to put up with much longer. These people, Roger, these people are actively and wilfully deceiving the public. Do you take my point?

ROGER. I'd put the bastards up against a wall and shoot them. As a matter of fact, I've got a committee being set up to discuss that very thing.

ROGER. Really? Well done. (Pinter, *Plays Four* 217)

Stephen and Roger have a tendency of seeing themselves in the position of “thinking”, and they try to justify their great amount of money with their great brains. In addition to this, while they are drinking in a nice environment, they are talking about the desire of killing or punishing the people who are stating “real” facts. These people can be assumed as journalists who are trying to announce politicians’ cruel actions. In other words, Stephen and Roger are in delusion which implies that journalists are the ones deceiving people, not politicians. Moreover, they have a committee

to kill the people who are not obedient. As a result, behind the scene of having a drink in an upper-class environment, they are the people who are responsible for bloody, disgusting and cruel actions. They are masquerading the abhorrent and grotesque activities behind these kinds of celebrations. They also praise themselves by killing more people. “Another two million. And I’ll buy you another drink. Another two for another drink” (219). They masquerade and use carnivalesque language for their grotesque activities.

Additionally, to cover all their dirty jobs, they are accusing journalists of committing a crime which is telling the truth to the public. In Stephen’s opinion, people are happy unless journalists make them face the reality.

STEPHEN. You see, what makes this whole business doubly disgusting is that the citizens of this country are behind us. They’re ready to go with us on the twenty million basis. They’re perfectly happy! And what are they faced with from these bastards? A deliberate attempt to subvert and undermine their security. And their faith. (218-219)

The bitter thing here is that people tend to accept the happenings around them with ease, or they do not comprehend the fact that the number of deaths is not only statistics but they are real humans. Harold Pinter would definitely show how politicians manipulate people’s perception by arranging various organizations to divert people’s attention away.

Party Time (1991) is the first play of Harold Pinter which had fairly different characters and plot. That play is certainly out of Pinter’s style. First of all, the play does not take place in a gloomy, messy and depressive environment as it was in the previous plays; on the contrary, there is a very large and luxurious room. There is an on-going party which is relatively different from the party in *A Night Out* because partiers are not from the middle class and working people; they are very rich and away from the everyday problems of society. However, Pinter masked the politics of the real world with the party. During 1990-1991, political dynamics changed with the influence of the United Nations and the USA Gulf War, beginnings

of Balkan Wars, some attempts of a communist coup in Soviet Russia, and thanks to the coup, the beginning of the dissolution of USSR. Within the lights of these upheavals, during the play, while some people are having fun, the effect of a police state can be seen via the information that comes from the street to the room. This is a precise picture of the world in those days. Some parts of the world were like paradise, but the rest was exactly like hell. Moreover, even in the same society, some people were in agony and suffering; whereas, the others, especially the upper and governor classes ignored these pains and tortures; sometimes even became the reason of these sufferings. On the one hand, some people are talking about tennis clubs, swimming pools and blackheads. They have a party out of stress, fight and problems of the world. All of them are quite out of the format of *Pinteresque* characters.

TERRY. Real class. I mean, what I meant to say, you play a game of tennis, you have a beautiful swim, they've got a bar right there –

GAVIN. Where?

TERRY. By the pool. You can have a fruit juice on the spot, no extra charge, then they give you this fantastic hot towel –

GAVIN. Hot?

TERRY. Wonderful. And I mean hot. I'm not joking.

GAVIN. Like the barber.

TERRY. Barber?

GAVIN. In the barber shop. When I was a boy.

TERRY. Oh yes?

Pause.

What do you mean?

GAVIN. They used to put a hot towel over your face, you see, over your nose and eyes. I had it done thousands of times. It got rid of all the blackheads, all the blackheads on your face. (Pinter, *Plays Four* 281-283)

On the other hand, one of the partiers walks through the other with a question which disturbs the atmosphere of the party, so the others quickly evade the inconvenience by pretending nothing happened. As Pinter stated, “It never happened, nothing ever happened. Even while it was happening it wasn’t happening. It didn’t matter. It was of no interest. The crimes of the United States have been systematic, constant, vicious, remorseless, but very few people have actually talked about them” (Art, Truth & Politics 6). The person who talks about what actually happened is Dusty.

DUSTY. Did you hear what’s happened to Jimmy? What’s happened to Jimmy?

TERRY. Nothing’s happened.

DUSTY. Nothing?

GAVIN. Nobody is discussing this. Nobody’s discussing it, sweetie. Do you follow me? Nothing’s happened to Jimmy. And if you’re not a good girl I’ll spank you.

DUSTY. What’s going on?

TERRY. Tell him about the new club. I’ve just been telling him about the club. She’s a member.

GAVIN. What’s like?

DUSTY. Oh, it’s beautiful. It’s got everything. It’s beautiful. The lighting’s wonderful. Isn’t it? Did you tell him about the alcoves? (Pinter, *Plays Four* 285)

There is a similarity with the other plays of Harold Pinter which is having a character who questions what happens, but when she or he is silenced, she or he becomes submissive to survive in that environment, like Sara Johnson in *Mountain Language* (1988), Gila in *One for the Road* (1984) and Blindfolded Man *New World Order* (1991).

Likewise, another woman in the party comes through the door with a statement about the things outside the luxurious room while the rest is talking about other things.

TERRY. The cannelloni is brilliant.

DUSTY. It's first class. The food is really first class.

TERRY. They even do chopped the liver.

GAVIN. You couldn't describe that as a local dish.

MELISSA *comes through the door and joins them.*

MELISSA. What on earth's going on out there? It's like the Black and Death.

TERRY. What is?

MELISSA. The town's dead. There's nobody on the streets, there's not a soul in sight, apart from some ... soldiers. My driver had to stop at a ... you know ... what do you call it? ... a roadblock. We had to say who we were ... it really was a trifle ...

GAVIN. Oh, there's just been a little ... you know ...

TERRY. Nothing in it. Can I introduce you? Gavin White – our host. Dame Melissa. (286-287)

With the help of Melissa's statement, it can be concluded that the laissez-faire upper-class people are having a party upstairs; yet, roadblocks and roundups are set up by the soldiers in the streets. There are even some people who went missing like Jimmy. Another attempt of Dusty's to learn what is happening is suppressed again by Terry, but this time the silencing method is much harsher.

DUSTY. I keep hearing all these things. I don't know what to believe.

MELISSA. (*to GAVIN*) What a lovely party.

TERRY. (*to DUSTY*) What did you say?

DUSTY. I said I don't know what to believe.

TERRY. You don't have to believe anything. You just have to shut up and mind own your business, how many times do I have to tell you? You come to a lovely party like this, all you have to do is shut up and enjoy the hospitality and mind your own fucking business. How many more times do I have to tell you? You keep hearing all these things. You keep hearing all these things spread by pricks about pricks. What's it got to with you? (287-288)

Through the play, it is understood that Jimmy is Dusty's brother, and when she asks about him once again, Terry states "that it's not up for discussion, that it's not on anyone's agenda" (296). However, Dusty insists that it is on her agenda (296). In the same conversation, Gavin states that "So odd, the number of men who can't control their wives" (297). When the time of the play, 1991, and non-conformist characters of the play's sexes are taken into consideration, saying that these lines also refer to the effects of second-wave feminist movements cannot be wrong. Melissa and Dusty are the female characters, and especially Dusty is quite non-conformist and tries to defend her ideas relatively strongly. In addition to this, Davin's statement is quite a strong argument for this reference. There were many women in that period who were struggling for their rights in the male dominance. Another example for feminism-related problem is that when Dusty asks about when her husband, Terry, is going to kill her, in her words "put an end to it" (301), he describes it in a very cruel and maniac manner which is also a sign that Terry is in violent against her (302). However, he still loves her just because she is the mother of his children (302). All of these are signs of women movements to gain the right of making decision on whether having a baby or not and evading sexual and physical violence or being respected not just as a mother but as an individual.

Pinter here depicted a scenery which shows that for the ruling class, human life is less important and valid than money or materialistic things, such as swimming pools, tennis clubs and so on, and they are also in such a higher place that people who are suffering cannot reach their position physically and psychologically. “It is an extremely unusual thing these days to find that you are getting real value for money. You take your hand out of your pocket and you put your money down and you know what you’re getting. And what you’re getting is absolutely gold-plated service” (310). The value of everything starts to be measured with money. Melissa is not sorry for her friends’ death, but she is so sorry for the death of clubs (311). Clubs have more significance for these people. This is another way to segregate their upper-class lives from those of lower people because the segregation and alienation of the society’s realities are the key to keeping their status quo safe and strong. Partying is a tool to cover the real pains of the world and maintain their status quo unbroken. *Party Time* shows “oppression of high society and the guns behind the glitter” (Morley, *Party Time* and *Mountain Language*).

The only character from the streets is Jimmy. He is seen on stage in a very sad scene and speech that shows how the state takes everything from him, even his name. “Don’t hear don’t breathe am blind” (Pinter, *Plays Four* 314) and “The dark is in my mouth and I suck it. It’s the only thing I have. It’s mine. It’s my own. I suck it” (314). He is silenced, nobody cares what happens to him or to the other people who are in the streets not in cocktail rooms.

When *Party Time* is compared to *Celebration* (1999) which is the final play of Harold Pinter, it has fairly distinctive characteristics. This time setting is not a segregated room, but it is a restaurant where two families come together to celebrate Lambert and Julie's wedding anniversary and a couple called Suki and Russell are together to celebrate Russell's job promotion. The setting has a different purpose; it is not a detached room; on the contrary, it is a restaurant where common people come together and socialize while they are eating. Pinter's depiction leads to the deduction that the segregation and power struggles are not so obvious like *Party Time*, but they are homogenous in common places and everyday life. Also, when the time of the play is considered, the fear of "others" in *The Room*, *Caretaker*, *A Slight Ache* and *Party Time*, and 1960's obsession with the loss of Britain (qtd in Garner 13) have vanished, so the sign of the multiculturalism foreshadows in *Celebration*. The owner or the manager of the restaurant, Sonia says, "I've often said, 'You don't have to speak English to enjoy good food.'" (Pinter, *Plays Four* 482). She has positive attitudes towards foreigners. "Oh I think foreigners are charming" (501).

On the other hand, even though the customers come to that restaurant to celebrate some special occasions, it is not possible to say that they are having healthy communication and fun. Especially, even though it is Lambert and Julie's anniversary, they cannot talk properly. They insult each other and use a slang language. Likewise, the other customers, Russel and Suki, seem to be celebrating Russel's job promotion; nevertheless, his real intention is a confession on his affair with a secretary (442-443). Thanks to this confession, Suki starts to talk about her earlier sexual affairs (445). Even though all customers talk about high culture elements, such as classical music, ballet, opera and running charities; violence in childhood from their parents lays between the lines, or sexual affairs behind the filing cabinets appear in the conversations. This social gathering conceals "naked aggression" (478) of Lambert, uncontrolled open sexual desires of all the

characters and unbearable domestic violence in childhood memories. All these desires and subliminal childhood problems are the origins of the power struggle. In addition to this, all characters have stepped forward in their social status; for example, Russel is a banker who has tried a lot to gain the trust of authorities, Suki is a school teacher who was a secretary before, Prue and Julie run charities with the help of their husbands' money, and Matt and Lambert are strategy consultants (494-496). Although they have managed to climb higher on social ladders, they need certain popular activities to help them keep their loose status quo. No matter how arrogant they are, no one objects or silences Waiter's interjections (484) because they want Waiter to be aware of their so-called knowledge of Hollywood, opera and so on. Other's realization ensures their existence in that social ladder and masquerades their ignorance. This social ladder shifts refer to money markets of the 1980's that have led a great amount of wealth (qtd in Garner 14). With the globalization of the world, even common people have ended up struggling for the authority by disguising their uncontrolled desires and violence in social and civilized gatherings.

All in all, Pinter indicated that individuals and their relationships are small samples of the whole society. As the world is getting bigger and more sophisticated, people's relations are evolving, as well. The politics is intruding into everyday conversation. On the other hand, the world is developing, the power struggle is becoming more sinister than ever. Due to the fact that the struggle for authority has been affecting the individuals' lives quite deeply, to keep the authority safe, violence has reached the top, but it has shapeshifted. In spite of the developments in the world, people have suffered from the most bloody and cruellest occurrences of all times. Since people have to survive in these awful experiences, they have started to conceal their agonies through carnivalesque social gatherings. They pretend to have fun and live their lives happily, but deep down, they are hiding the post war traumas, the domestic violence in their childhoods or their sexual

and financial greed. All these issues must be the consequences of power-oriented political approaches and methodologies that affect people's both personal and social lives. Pinter gave the impression that while life is getting better and luxurious, the power struggle, and the sacrifices and massacres made to maintain authority are getting more serious, bloody, merciless, and cold blooded. In addition to this, authorities are reinforcing the ways to keep people silent and ignorant not via physical tortures openly any longer, but keeping people busy with worldwide organizations, festivals and luxurious lives, and normalizing or justifying their bad deeds under the name of bringing democracy or keep democracy safe.

CHAPTER 4

POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF SPACE AND IDENTITY

Gloomy, simplistic, and dark settings specify the idiosyncratic dramatic style of Harold Pinter which are defined as *Pinteresque* spaces. As it has been stated before, the main theme of Pinter's drama is based on power struggle between individuals, or between individuals and dominant authority; on the other hand, his earlier plays, which also involve relationships, are grounded with power struggle to ensure safety of personal spaces and circles against unwelcomed or unexpected intruders. The characters sometimes intentionally, but mostly instinctively end up fighting for the sake of their personal spaces in Harold Pinter's plays. Because Pinter was not a playwright who would give a depiction of romantic setting just to attract the attention of the audience, instead he chose to portray people in gloomy and confined rooms. As it was mentioned earlier, Harold Pinter illustrated samples of life experiences on stage; hence, everything he designed for a play was depicted on purpose. Due to the post-war effects, people used to justify their existence with owning some materialistic items, such as personal properties like rooms, beds, personal elements, and so on. The political upheavals affected people's understanding of possession because political is personal.

Moreover, some characters undergo identity shifts to save their personal spaces or to obtain strength and authority. Since political deeds influence and mostly ruin people's social and private lives, some characters in Harold Pinter's plays take on different identities officially to hide their real names in order not to be captured and tortured at the end, or unofficially to evade psychological tortures of dominant characters and authority. To survive in power struggles, people may have to use different identities.

4.1. Politicization and Personalization of Space

A house or a room is considered to be the places which protect people from outside elements physically and give the impression of a shelter for metaphysical concepts. Therefore, as an instinct, people tend to protect their personal habitats, and history is full of keeping them safe or yearning for more places. The question is whether people have a tendency to shield their spaces just due to instinctive temptations, or these personal habitats signify fairly divine motivations. According to Gaston Bachelard, “For our house is our corner of the world. As it has often been said, it is our first universe, a real cosmos in every sense of the word” (*The Poetics of Space* 4). So, people gain a corner from the world via a house and a room, and that is why, people need a shelter to exist in the world; whereas they have the impetus to defence these places. On the other hand, defining and justifying the “self” occur through “othering”; while defining what the other is, people define their identities, and vice versa.

There is no dearth of abstract, “world-conscious” philosophers who discover a universe by means of the dialectical game of the I and the non-I. In fact, they know the universe before they know the house, the far horizon before the resting-place; whereas the real beginnings of images, if we study them phenomenologically, will give concrete evidence of the values of inhabited space, of the non-I that protects the I. (5)

Nonetheless, shelters do not only signify protection from the outside world, they also intend to imprison and confine the limits. Even though houses and walls can protect people from outside dangers, they may discriminate the layers.

(...) we shall see the imagination build “walls” of impalpable shadows, comfort itself with the illusion of protection – or, just the contrary, tremble behind thick walls, mistrust the staunchest, ramparts. In short, in the most interminable of dialectics, the sheltered being gives perceptible limits to his shelter. (5)

When people are born, they start to grow up in a house where they experience many events and life stories which create their first memories. Having memories let individuals exist in the universe, to protect these memories is highly crucial since it ensures existence. There are other life experiences outside of the house; however, they are not as valuable as the ones which occur inside. As Bachelard stated, “Memories of the outside world will never have the same tonality as those of home,” (6). Furthermore, he adds that “The house we were born in is more than an embodiment of home, it is also an embodiment of dreams. Each one of its nooks and corners was a resting-place for daydreaming” (15).

I must show that the house is one of the greatest powers of integration for the thoughts, memories and dreams of mankind. The binding principle in this integration is the daydream. Past, present and future give the house different dynamisms, which often interfere, at times opposing, at others, stimulating one another. In the life of a man, the house thrusts aside contingencies, its councils of continuity are unceasing. Without it, man would be a dispersed being. It maintains him through the storms of the heavens and through those of life. It is body and soul. It is the human being’s first world. (7)

In Harold Pinter’s dramatic style, houses and rooms are also subsidiary for plots of the plays. The characters are in a struggle for power; meanwhile, the personal spaces play their roles in these political actions. Some characters in Pinter’s stage are obsessed with their personal belongings, like houses, rooms, beds, and so on. These obsessions can be explained with the attachment of memories and daydreaming to the spaces. These emotional attachments are essential to be successful in a power struggle. If individuals successfully fit in their places and create attachments, they may have the purpose and reason to fight for authority. Besides, Pinter himself stated that “Before you manage to adjust yourself to living alone in your room, you’re not terribly fit and equipped to go out to fight battles” (Pinter, *Funny and Moving and Frightening*: Pinter 236). The importance and role of places in Harold Pinter’s plays are explicated in detail by Austin Quigley:

His preoccupation with confined spaces, with small rooms, with constraining circumstances and brief events provides a context for exploring the complexities of local pictures, the instability and indispensability of verbal interaction, the shifting status of social realities, the precariousness of attempts to establish general agreement and the riskiness of anyone's efforts to function as leader or spokesperson for a social group. For the Pinter of these plays, the local picture in all its simplicity and complexity precedes and succeeds any large one, and national political action, if it were to make sense at all, would have to be an extension of, and not a substitute for, the daily activity of people coping with self and other in the local space his characters inhabit. (*Pinter, politics and postmodernism* 9-10)

As it was claimed above, house is the first place where people have an induction into the universe. Therefore, a house is the small world and the beginning of the comprehension of the universe. These houses or any spaces where people create their memories are the tools to achieve an existence in the universe. When people create emotional bonds with personal spaces, they begin to internalize these spaces. In other words, “this house that “clings” to its inhabitant and becomes the cell of a body with its walls” (Bachelard 46). After these bonding process, “The house requires the physical and moral energy of a human body” (46), hence, protection of the house means protection of the body. With the intention of protection of houses, rooms and beds, Pinter’s characters are actually struggling to protect their bodies.

One of the most prominent themes of Harold Pinter’s plays is the dialect of inside and outside. The unknown menace and fear of others are characterized by placing these fears outside of a room or a house. Gaston Bachelard interpreted that “Philosophers, when confronted with outside and inside, think in terms of being and non-being” (212), or “Open and closed for him, are thoughts” (212), so here it can be deduced that being inside physically can be the understanding of being and existing; however, being in a closed environment metaphysically might be a sign of having conformist and oppressed ideas. When it comes to Pinter’s characters and the relationship between people and spaces, fear of the outside and outsiders

can be interpreted as characters inside of a building having the fear of losing their status and power both physically and metaphysically. Furthermore, “you feel the full significance of this myth of outside and inside in alienation, which is founded on these two terms. Beyond what is expressed in their formal opposition lie alienation and hostility between two”, said Jean Hyppolite (*La Psychanalyse*ⁱⁱ 35, adapted from Bachelard 212). This idea is almost a precise reflection of Pinter’s style. As the main interest in Harold Pinter’s plays is establishing dominant authority, putting people inside or outside is also a tool for controlling. That is why “The dialectics of *here* and *there* has been promoted to the rank of an absolutism according to which these unfortunate adverbs of a place are endowed with unsupervised powers of ontological determination” (Bachelard 212).

One of the most distinctive plays of Harold Pinter is definitely *The Room* in terms of possessing and protecting a space. First of all, the setting is quite simple.

Scene: A room in a large house. A door dawn right. A gas-fire down left. A gas stove and sink, up left. A window up centre. A table and chairs, centre. A rocking-chair, left centre. The foot of a double-bed protrudes from alcove, up right. (Pinter, Plays One 85)

A room in a large house specifies the place of the individual in the world. Interpreting the scene with full of kitchen objects as “kitchen sink realism” cannot be a strong argument because Harold Pinter’s plays do not intend to give certain messages or images; on the contrary, they are real scenes and examples from the real life, and their purpose is just to reflect what the real life is. Furthermore, as it was stated before Pinter did not follow any kind of theoretical framework. Besides, the door being dawn might be interpreted as a leak to the outside world. Gaston Bachelard had a similar interpretation for the doors:

For the door is an entire cosmos of the Half-open. In fact, it is one of its primal images, the very origin of a daydream that accumulates desires and temptations: the temptation to open up the ultimate depths of being, and the desire to conquer all reticent beings. The door schematizes two strong possibilities, which sharply classify two types of daydream. At times, it is closed, bolted, padlocked. At others, it is open, that is to say, wide open. (Bachelard 222)

Moreover, doors also have many interpretations in terms of specific situations. For example, doors arouse curiosity of what kind of things are behind them; on the other hand, they can have some negative connotations such as hesitation, temptation, desire, security, welcome and respect (224). If a door is not just standing there, but has been activated, which is opening and closing, that leads to this interpretation: “The gestures that make us conscious of security or freedom are rooted in a profound depth of being” (224).

As Martin Esslin claims, “a room, a room with a door; outside the door a cold, hostile world” (*Pinter The Playwright* 51). In the very beginning of the scene, Rose states that “It’s very cold out I can tell you. It’s murder” (Pinter, *Plays One* 85), “Still, the room keeps you warm” (85). Assuming the outside is cold while the inside is warm, she is referring to how outside is hostile and cruel, whereas inside of the house is welcomed and secure. Choosing the winter time of the year is also a kind of reference to security. Maybe it was not Pinter who chose the winter time, but it was Rose to make the outside look more cruel and harsh.

In any case, outside the occupied house, the winter cosmos is a simplified cosmos. It is a non-house in the same way that metaphysicians speak of a non-I, and between the house and the non-house it is easy to establish all sorts of contradictions. Inside the house, everything may be differentiated and multiplied. The house derives reserves and refinements of intimacy from winter; while in the outside world, snow covers all tracks, blurs the road, muffles every sound, conceals all colors. As a result of this universal whiteness, we feel a form of cosmic negation in action. (Bachelard, 41)

Question bombardments of Rose about “the basement” and “the people who live in the basement” can be related to both fear of others and subconscious references to basements. Also, Gaston Bachelard had another argument for the level of the housing. According to him, “The dreamer constructs and reconstructs the upper stories and the attic until they are well constructed. And, as I said before when we dream of the heights we are in the rational zone of intellectualized projects. But for the cellar, the impassioned inhabitant digs and re-digs, making its very depth active” (18). Therefore, Rose has irrational ideas about the people who inhabit the basement just because of people’s instinctive fear of downstairs. Again, according to Bachelard, the cellar is the first and foremost *dark entity* of the house (18). To make it a much clearer argument, Jung in his *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*ⁱⁱⁱ gave an example “Here the conscious acts like a man who, hearing a suspicious noise in the cellar, hurries to the attic and, finding no burglars there decides, consequently, that the noise was pure imagination. In reality, this prudent man did not dare venture into the cellar” (qtd in Bachelard 19). According to Jung, instead of facing the fear in the cellar, looking for the origins of noise in the attic is easier. Rose assumes that the people who live in the basement “... are foreigners” (Pinter, *Plays One* 87). Similarly, “the creatures moving about in the cellar are slower, less scampering, more mysterious” (Bachelard 19). Likewise, Rose does not go and check what is in the basement, rather she asks some rhetorical questions to her husband, to the property owner and to the couple who come into Rose’s room.

In the attic, fears are easily “rationalized.” Whereas in the cellar, even for a more courageous man than the one Jung mentions, “rationalization” is less rapid and less clear; also it is never *definitive*. In the attic, the day’s experiences can always efface the fears of night. In the cellar, darkness prevails both day and night, and even when we are carrying a lighted candle, we see shadows dancing on the dark walls. (19)

When Mr. and Mrs. Sand say the vacant room is number seven, Rose has been bothered and her attitudes towards them have changed. In addition to this, on Riley's arrival who is described as a blind man of colour, Rose's evening is disturbed (Pinter, *Plays One* 106). All of these are because of the fear of outsiders and of losing the property. Also, because Riley is a man of colour, Rose gets the feeling of superiority complex by saying "I'm one ahead of people like you" (106). For all the intruders, she thinks that they stink the place out (107). The reason behind and the origin of Rose's fear is not just based on psychoanalytic arguments; but also, she is a typical representative of the British society at that time. Garner states that "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." (Garner 3). So, the political actions of the countries affect personal lives in terms of possession and security because individuals tend to attach their memories to houses where they inhabit. Accordingly, people are afraid of losing their memories which are attached to rooms and houses. Personal spaces are politicized with the effect of the political actions of governments.

As these plays were written within a year of each other, *The Room* and *The Birthday Party* have a similar attachment to a house and praising of a property. In *The Birthday Party*, Meg praises her boarding house by saying "Yes! And this house is very well known, for a very good boarding house for visitors" (Pinter, *Plays One* 10). When Stanley learns that two strangers would come soon, he also starts to question and panic because of fear of his personal circle being intruded (14-15). In *The Birthday Party*, the fact that these two people come to visit and take Stanley is a reference to IRA's presence. Their political actions are taking the shape of intruders who invade and harass personal safety circles of common people like Stanley

who used to be a musician before. Again here, people's personal circles are disturbed by the political actions.

The big country house with a well-kept garden is the setting of *A Slight Ache*. Bachelard believed that putting too much care into perfecting a house is merely a metaphor for perfecting themselves as people and it gives the idea of creating and renewing by their hands (69). Edward's disturbance because of the Matchseller causes the loss of pleasure of having a beautiful garden (Pinter, *Plays One* 159-160). Also, the references from Edward's conversation with Flora, such as "Belgian Congo", "essay on space and time" (161), and with the Matchseller, such as "Africa's always been my happy hunting ground. Fascinating country" (167) can be construed with the Matchseller's ethnicity which might be from African origins. Correspondingly, Edward's xenophobia against people with African origins is similar to the fear of Rose against Riley who is described explicitly as a man of colour. Due to their xenophobia and the fear of losing their properties, both Rose and Edward do not leave their safety circles; they ask questions or send other people to check the "others". Like Rose, after the invasion of his place, Edward begins to be rude and harsh in his attitudes towards both the Matchseller and his wife. "God damn it, I'm entitled to know something about you! You're in my house, on my territory, drinking my wine, eating my duck! Now you've had your fill you sit like a hump, a mouldering heap" (179). As it is seen in his statements, like Rose, he also starts to have superiority complex. Their xenophobia stems from the threat of losing authority and control over the personal properties. However, both lose their authority; Rose loses her eye-sight and Edward shifts his position with the Matchseller. In my opinion, here Harold Pinter perfectly demonstrated how European paranoia spread dramatically after massive immigration from African and Eastern countries to Europe, and how that paranoia affected not just immigrants, but also European people negatively. The immigration and subsequently the paranoia occurred because politicians

and governments were trying to earn more money which led to the adjustment of new rules and acts affecting every human being's life destructively. In conclusion, personal becomes political, and political life intrudes personal lives.

In *The Dumb Waiter*, the story takes place in the basement where Gus and Ben who are pictured as gunmen or bodyguards are waiting for the orders from upstairs where the boss, the figure of authority, controls them and demands different things unceasingly from them. Therefore, it can be said that the level of the house is the representation of bureaucracy. The people who have control over others occupy upstairs, whereas other people who are governed by authority exist downstairs. In other words, Gus and Ben have guns and plan a stratagem to kill someone, Pinter puts them in the basement because the plan is grotesque, that is why it should be carried out in a dark and frightening place where people cannot go and visit with ease. On the other hand, Gus and Ben are afraid of the unknown terror. Here, Pinter portrayed the dilemma of bureaucracy quite successfully since even though Gus and Ben seem to be antagonists or villains with the guns and being in the basement, people upstairs are the real source of menace and terror by giving orders of murders and exploiting the people who are in their service.

Albert in *A Night Out* does not want to go down to the cellar to get a bulb for his dead grandma's room with his best trousers and white shirt (332-333) as the subliminal reference of the cellar is dirty. As it was mentioned before cellar is the darkest place of a house, and anything related to dirtiness and darkness lays in basement and cellar.

With the concept of the winter season in *The Caretaker*, inside of a building is made warm and secure compared to the outside (Pinter, *Plays Two* 4). Different from other plays of Harold Pinter, the scene is full of unrelated tools, such as a kitchen sink, a step ladder, a coal bucket, a lawn-

mower, a shopping trolley, boxes, sideboard drawers, gas stove, rolled carpet, boxes, a clothes horse, a small electric fire, electric toaster and so on. These irrelevant materials are the references to multiculturalism, and they are in the same room, like immigrants and local residents living together, but there is no integration and connection. On the other hand, they can be tools of communication for people who have different cultural and ethnical origins. For example, sharing the shoes (62) can be “Two pent-up human beings communicate by means of the same symbol” (Bachelard 83). According to Bachelard, drawers are “hiding places in which human beings, great dreamers of locks, keep or hide their secrets” (75). Because Davies has changed his name for a reason which is unknown to the audience (Pinter, *Plays Two* 18), and it can be presumed that he is hiding some secrets. Also, the drawers can hide the “problem” related to Aston’s thoughts which can be presumed that he had been tortured to keep silent (55). As for the “Buddha” statue, it is a sign of cultural integration, so it can be seen even in Protestant England, but because of hate against immigrants in those days, when they executed The National Act, Mick hurls the Buddha statue and breaks it (72). Through the play, many utterances about “Greeks, Poles and Blacks” (6), “family of Indians” (11), “in the colonies” (48) and the xenophobia against blacks by avoiding using the same toilet with Blacks (16) are the references to immigration from different countries to Europe, especially Britain, as well. Being Welsh (23) is a dangerous thing for Davies, so he tries to skip the question since this is a power battle that he needs to win. Later, it is understood that it is quite crucial to be born and bred in the British Isles (31). Aston and Mick are trying to keep their property not only safe but also away from foreigner, while Davies who is not pure-blood English tries to exist in these racist environments. Pinter showed both sides of the event; local people are nervous and afraid of losing their countries with the attached dreams and memories, while immigrants who have the intention to have better living standards suffer from ethnical,

cultural and existential problems. Consequently, all of them show how the political activities politicized common people's personal lives.

Exterior. Front area of a basement flat.

Winter. Night.

Rain falling.

Short stone flight of steps from street.

Light shining through the basement door.

The upper part of the house is dark.

(...)

Interior. Room.

The room is large and long. A window at one end looks out to a small concrete yard. There are doors bathroom and kitchen.

The room is comfortable, relaxed, heavily furnished.

*Numerous side tables, plants, arm-chairs, book-cabinets, bookshelves, velvet cloths, a desk, paintings, a large double bed. There is a large fire in the grate. (Pinter, *Plays Three* 143)*

The depiction of winter and rain outside implies the warmth and comfort inside; however, the basement is quite different from the concept of both Pinter's basement and the general perception. First of all, the basement does not have a negative connotation; on the contrary, it is fully furnished and warm. The segregation here is between interior which is warm and comfortable and exterior which is cold and dangerous. The room has undergone several changes in summer, it has a different view in day and night when there is no furniture, and the walls are bare. These descriptions can claim that the basement is not really a basement, but the subconscious depictions of characters. The three people, Law who is pictured as the property owner, Jane who is portrayed as a quite young woman, and Stott who is an old friend of Law, start to live together; nevertheless, because the room is very convenient and magnificent, power struggle appears through the play in their one-on-one conversations. Law is bothered by stayover

guests through saying “Don’t you think it’s a bit crowded in that flat, for the three of us?” (155), “She sullies this room. She dirties this room” (158). Yet, Jane tries to gain the room by using her sexual attraction “It’s your place. Then we could be happy again. Like we used to” (157). At the end of the play, the same scene is repeating itself with different roles of Stott and Law (164). Again like Rose and Edward, Law loses his personal space while he is trying to save it. However, saying that Law is the owner of the room can be a misleading argument because it is a possible deduction that Stott is the real owner, but all of them are the illusions of Law. The important thing is that spaces affect people’s actions in power struggle.

In summary, Edward, Bert, Rose, Mick, Aston and Law are in a struggle to gain control over their personal circles or protect their existence in the universe as protection of the properties means the protection of the bodies. In those times, due to political decisions of various countries, wars, state violence, tortures and economic reasons, a lot of people had to migrate to other countries in search for new opportunities and living conditions; however, these immigration and cultural movements caused many sufferings for both immigrants and residents. Political actions and decisions of governments and politicians influence and ruin people’s personal lives. Therefore, politics cannot be defined without taking personal aspects into consideration.

4.2. Politicization of Identity

One of the distinctive aspects of *Pinteresque* drama is power shift between victim and victimizer, and master and slave. The shift in positions is the result of power struggle; unlike typical absurd drama, identities are not stable which is quite realistic in terms of real-life experiences. In Harold Pinter's drama, the characters are always in power struggle even when they are in the position of authority because they need to keep their status quo safe. Parallel to politics of space, people attach themselves to the objects to assure their existence in the universe. Besides, in this harshly political world, people need different stratagems to survive, such as having a different role in each relationship. Since Harold Pinter's plays are samples of real-life relationships, identity shifts are quite natural to witness in a political environment.

Shifting from an environment to another one leads to an identity shift, as in *A Night Out*. Albert has been exposed to his mother's oppression which is a kind of psychological violence at his house. Albert's mother does not let Albert act with his free will because she oppresses her son by keeping her authority through his dead father and grandmother's possession over the house (Pinter *Plays One* 334, 335, 341). When Albert realizes that the whore he goes with lies about the girl in the picture in her house, he refused to be abused with the dominance of non-existing characters and it was finally his breaking point which made him threaten and torture her at the end (372). He reflects his aggression for his mother over another woman. His identity changes according to the spaces. Good and submissive Albert in his mother's house, and bad and aggressive Albert in a whore's house.

The Lover (1962) is the masterpiece of Harold Pinter in terms of identity shift to survive in power struggle. Sarah the wife and Sarah the whore, and Richard the husband and Max the lover are actually the same

people who are a married couple. With high-heeled shoes and a very tight dress (Pinter *Plays Two* 162), Sarah becomes the whore who is having fun with her lover in her house during the afternoon while with her low-heeled shoes and her husband Richard, she is the ordinary wife. What is more, when Richard comes wearing his tie, he is the husband of Sarah the wife, but whenever he enters the house with a suede jacket and no tie (163), he becomes the lover of Sarah the whore. To suppress their ids, which is the basic instinctive feeling like the desire of eating and having sex defined by Sigmund Freud, they are altering their characters, and Richard and Sarah are trying to satisfy their uncontrollable sexual desires which are against the social boundaries of the marriage, such as having sex with a park-keeper (166). To fight and survive the authority of social norms, they choose to make their alter egos appear. Sarah becomes a prostitute not just out of her desire, but also Richard pushes her to be one to satisfy his sexual desires and ego which is the desire to control his wife and to decide on her role. Sarah is shaped with Richard's fantasies, and he thinks differently when Sarah is the wife with "Great pride, to walk with ..." (175), and later he starts to forbid her to entertain her lover in Richard's premises (177). It is understood with Richard's statement that Sarah desperately needs to play the role of a whore to survive in the relationship. When Richard forgets his role and comes in with his sober suit and tie on, Sarah shifts into her role of the wife to survive in the power struggle (183-184).

In contrast to Sarah, Ruth was a prostitute in a different way in *The Homecoming*. Ruth is married for six years (Pinter, *Plays Three* 39), she does not want any more children (78), she decides to be a prostitute if they assure to provide a flat with at least three bedrooms and a bathroom, a personal maid, and legalized signatures (84-85) which is different from Sarah's agreement (Pinter, *Plays Two* 181). Even though it seems that her father-in-law and brothers-in-law force Ruth to be a prostitute, Ruth makes her own decision to take up such a living. With the help of Teddy's biting

his knuckles (Pinter *Plays Three* 31-32), it can be said that he has some dominance over her and tendency of violence, and to get rid of this violent and dominant husband, she chooses not to be a submitted wife and mother. Being a prostitute is not a destiny, but it is a profession with legal agreements and living. The birth control and decision of her profession give her freedom, and all of them are the influences of second-wave feminist movements. In both situations of Sarah and Ruth, their identity shifts are the means of gaining power over their bodies and sexual decisions which stems from political and social movements of feminists. However, Sarah is shaped by her husband's influence due to the fact that *The Lover* is earlier than *The Homecoming*, and the effects of feminist movements are not observed strongly in Sarah's situation, but it should not be interpreted that Sarah is totally oppressed. On the other hand, in *Celebration*, identity shift of Suki from being a secretary having sexual affairs behind filing cabinets to a wife of a rich businessperson (Pinter, *Plays Four* 443-445) is in the positive and upright direction. However, her upright rising is not directly related to feminist manifestos; it is rather based on the power struggle in professional life as a plumb secretary (445). To exist, be powerful and realized, Suki needs this identity shift.

The identity shift in *The Caretaker* is the change of Davies' name to survive in the ethnocentric environment. To disguise his Welsh identity (Pinter, *Plays Two* 23) to get a job, he has changed his name to Bernard Jerkins (18). With the help of this altering, he also shifts his identity through pretending to be born and bred in British Isles (31), and if he cannot go to Sidcup and get related papers proving his identity (18), he will lose his identity and existence in the power battle. In *The Birthday Party*, Stanley also changes his name to avoid threats and menace of IRA (Pinter, *Plays One* 44). Changing names help people struggle with the menace and survive in power battles, so the personal things like changing names are politicized due to a power struggle. Losing identity can also be seen in *The Birthday*

Party, smashing Stanley's glasses (57) and broken drum (61) are the signs of Stanley's loss of his intellectual and artistic identity.

As a conclusion, characters of Harold Pinter undergo various types of power and identity shifts to escape from physical tortures, fight and win power battles in every aspect of their personal lives, exist in the society and be realized by the society. Like real people, the characters do not choose these power and identity shifts consciously; political actions and social movements drive them into these roles. Therefore, Pinter's plays are political and personal at the same time.

CHAPTER 5

POLITICIZATION AND PERSONALIZATION OF LANGUAGE

Language is considered as the beginning of life. One of the most important faculties which differentiates a human from an animal is speaking by using a language. In addition to this, with the development of civilisations and cultures, language has started to vary, so the number of languages has increased. Despite all the developments in every aspect of life and increase in the number of languages, language is becoming more useless in terms of qualified and fruitful communication. Languages have evolved to become more complex but less sincere. At the same time, oppression and nationalistic ideologies have caused the death of many languages.

On the other hand, due to many causes, such as globalization, intercultural marriages, migration because of wars, and immigration out of hope to find more alternatives which are the main motivations of imperialism, societies have begun to be the embodiment of various cultures and multilingualism. Here, Pinter was interested in the activities and policies of states to impose monolingualism in the embodiment of official language, usage of language in politics by politicians and officers, the language in interrogations and instructions and losing and failing in communication in spite of developments in communication tools and techniques. However, although Robert Gordon claims “that the playwright had abandoned the philosophical complexity and multi-layered ambiguity of his previous work to become a writer of didactic protest plays” (*Harold Pinter: The Theatre of Power* 163), Harold Pinter’s aim cannot solely sermon politicians, as it was mentioned several times in the introduction part, Pinter tried to portray realistic impression of life on the stage. With the development of the concept of nation-state, states have started to impose an

official language and oppress local languages, and Pinter created a space for the voiceless. As Quigley explains Pinter's usage of language in his plays:

The language of a Pinter play functions primarily as means of dictating and reinforcing relationships. This use of language is not, of course, exclusive to a Pinter play and is a common component (...) in all language; but, in giving this use of such extensive scope, Pinter has (...) made his work unavailable to any critical analysis based on implicit appeals to the reference theory of meaning. (*The Pinter Problem* 52)

5.1. Politicization and Personalization of State Language

With the help of modernization and globalization, the diversity of language has been growing dramatically. Pinter's main interest was relationships and power struggle between people and the politics in these power struggle-oriented relationships conducted with some tools, such as language. As it was stated before, language has started to diverse and bear multi-layered meanings, so miscommunication and use of language have accelerated the fierce of power fights among individuals. Meanwhile, existence of a country where one language is spoken can be a far-fetched assumption, due to many factors like migrations, wars and intercultural marriages which are all results of globalization. That is why countries have started to be multicultural and multilinguistic. "But it often actually suits a nation-state to ignore its multilingualism, for economic, social or, regularly, political and ideological reasons. It is easier (and cheaper) to teach (and govern) a population in one language" (Millar, *Language, Nation and Power* 19). So, countries tend to ignore other languages than their own due to several reasons; for example, in France "ability in the 'correct' form of French is considered to be the chief marker of 'Frenchness'. Even those who are bidialectal, or bilingual, are considered to be in some way *unrepublican* by many of their fellow citizens" (24). Therefore, using official accent and accurate grammar can be interpreted as a symbol of "real and true citizen" of a nation. That is why "civic nationalism leads to monolingualism" (26).

At the heart of the spread of monolingualism lie power differentials. Those who have more power (whether economic or political, or both) are able – whether consciously or not – to impose their language on those with less power (or, in a democratic age, less access to the centre of power). Those with less power may also move towards the use of the majority language by compulsion or, as regularly, by a sense of demoralization about their native languages and cultures. (27)

The rationale behind the imposition of an official language in *Mountain Language* (1988) is to assure the unity to rule a country which does not refer to assurance the safety of the public; on the contrary, ensuring the safety of their status quo. Because if everybody in a society speaks the same language, it is easier to control what they think and what they should not think; however, other languages threaten the status quo of the state since the government cannot control public's thoughts in a foreign language. When linguistic aspects are taken into consideration, thinking, speaking and writing is safer, easier and more creative in one's mother tongue, so in this way, the state can easily control all people who live in that country. In *Mountain Language*, the old woman speaks in a strong rural accent (Pinter, *Plays Four* 258) which is actually the mountain language; but in the play, Pinter chose to describe it as “strong rural accent” because he did not want to localize that problem in a specific country or a language.

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. You cannot speak your language to your men. It is not permitted. Do you understand? You may not speak it. It is outlawed. You may only speak the language of the capital. That is the only language permitted in this place. You will be badly punished if you attempt to speak your mountain language in this place. This is a military decree. It is the law. Your language is forbidden. It is dead. No one is allowed to speak your language. Your language no longer exists. Any questions? (255-256)

The repeated instructions are to emphasize and impose the idea. Officer speaks with the power given to him by an ultimate authority. The officers do not even let prisoners who are completely under their control speak the mountain language because they do not want to jeopardise their own

authority. As it was mentioned earlier, using a perfect grammar and accurate accent are the qualifications of being a real and truthful citizen. Also, when the old woman does not understand the official language, Guard asks “Whose fault is that?” (259). Not speaking the official language is considered as a flaw in being a citizen. Furthermore, calling them “mountain people” is already othering these people and their language which emphasizes that they are not citizens of the country unless they speak the official language of the state. It is openly stated that “they are enemies of the state” (255) as they are mountain people. It can also be construed when a young woman states that she does not speak the mountain language, the officers exclude her and her husband from the ‘enemies’ group by saying “He doesn’t come from the mountain. He’s in the wrong batch” (257). Consequently, the official language ensures the unity, true citizenship, control of thoughts, the safety of authority, and it is a safe and legal way to silence and oppress different ideas that can threaten the status quo.

The ability of speaking is interpreted as a human function by Joseph Conrad in *Heart of Darkness*, too. The savage woman who is a native resident does not know a human language, she howls when she tries to say something. In *Mountain Language*, the officer asks the name of the dog which bites the old woman’s finger and he adds that “Before they bite, they *state* their name. It’s a formal procedure. They state their name and they bite” (Pinter, *Plays Four* 254). That statement implies that the mountain people are in a lower position than the dogs. Similarly, in *Heart of Darkness*, local people who have a different language from the hegemonic state language are not considered to be complete human beings. Therefore, states dehumanize the people who do not speak the official language of the state. On the other hand, emphasizing that dogs also have to follow the formal procedure is another sinister imposing way to remark that even the animals follow and obey state rules; if they skip the rules, they will be shot

(254). Again, the officer tries to imply mountain people are beneath animals.

The other distinguishing element is the formal usage of language by Officer. Pinter usually preferred to use contractions and phrases, but this instruction (255-256) is perfectly formal and grammatical. In the conversation between Officer and Sergeant, the contractions appear again, because the first speech which forbids mountain language is a public speech and it needs to be threatening, solemn and controlling, which Pinter wisely chose to show.

You called him a cunt last time. Now you call him a prick. How many times do I have to tell you? You've got to learn to define your terms and stick to them. You can't call him a cunt in one breath and a prick in the next. The terms are mutually contradictory. You'd lose face in any linguistic discussion group, take my tip. (275)

The statesmen should be persistent even in their humiliation to make tortures controlled and ordered. Garner also states that "Pinter demonstrates how this precision in the use of language is essential to maintaining the clean, ordered, and bureaucratic torture" (10).

Political language, as used by politicians, does not venture into any of this territory since the majority of politicians, on the evidence available to us, are interested not in truth but in power and in the maintenance of that power. To maintain that power it is essential that people remain in ignorance, that they live in ignorance of the truth, even the truth of their own lives. What surrounds us therefore is a vast tapestry of lies, upon which we feed. (Pinter, *Art, Truth & Politics* 3)

In *Precisely*, it is not directly stated if the characters are politicians, but they are talking about the political upheavals around them. They are talking about the number of deaths (Pinter, *Plays Four* 215); however, they are bothered by the journalists who claim the number is higher than it seems. Moreover, the voice of threat is seen here, too. "I'd put the bastards up against a wall and shoot them" (216). "You will be badly punished if you attempt to speak your mountain language in this place" (*Mountain*

Language 255). In addition to that, even though Terry in *Party Time* is not described as a politician, he tries to silence Dusty who asks questions about Jimmy's situation (284). Terry also uses threatening language to control Dusty. "And if you're not a good girl I'll spank you" (284). Nevertheless, Terry, Officer and Roger do not exactly say that they are going to kill in public; instead, they use a mild language because they are "forming an effective dominant culture that aestheticizes language to justify and conceal state violence" (Wentz, *The Transformative Linguistic Politics of Mountain Language* 5). On the other hand, in *No Man's Land* (1974), Hirst and Sooner speak in an elegant manner with sophisticated vocabulary which is a way to conceal and masquerade their dirty ideas, and behaviours because according to George Orwell, "In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible" (2239). Politicians and officers ensure their authority and power dominance via wise and mild usage of language in the embodiment of threat and menace.

Additionally, although the politicians or dominant characters in Harold Pinter's plays have perfect grammar and accent, if they see any threat to their authority, they start to use quite a harsh and slang language. "But if thought corrupts language, language can also corrupt thought" (Orwell 2240). Because their ideas and ideologies are harsh, threatening and full of hatred, their language also breaks the rule. "Look at this. You go out of your way to give them a helping hand and they fuck it up" (Pinter, *Plays Four* 262). "They are shithouses" (255), "Your *father*? How dare you? Fuckpig (240) "He didn't *think*, like you shitbags (240), "Motherfucker" (274), "You keep hearing all these things spread by pricks about pricks" (288). Using offensive language against a group of people is a way of excluding and othering.

Another method of othering is overuse of the pronoun "we" while trying to justify one's actions. "we've said it time and time again, haven't we?" (215), "We've done our homework" (215), "Leave street to us" (307),

“Who’s us?” (307), “We’ve got dozens of options. We could suffocate every single one of you at a given signal...” (302), Lionel to Des by meaning “you” as “we”; “Because you’re keeping the world clean for democracy” (277), “We can do that ... Their daddies are in our business. Which is, I remind you, to keep the world clean for God” (246). As it is shown in the examples, concentrating on the superiority of “our” faculties publicise “other’s” flaws. Politicians use language as a tool of discrimination behind the mask of “keeping the world clean for democracy or God”. Furthermore, not to make themselves equal with victims, these victimizers who are authorities in Pinter’s plays try to call people as numbers instead of stating their names. For instance, in *Hothouse* the officers do not record the patients with their names, but they use numbers to identify them. “How’s 6457 getting on?” (Pinter, *Plays One* 189). Since the authorities cannot bear the possibility of being in the same position with their prisoners, they give numbers instead of names to dehumanize and otherize them. According to Pinter, “These people are of no moment. Their deaths don’t exist. They are blank. They are not even recorded as being dead. ‘We don’t do body counts,’ said the American general Tommy Franks” (Art, Truth & Politics 8). For the politicians and authorities, these people are not humans because they do not share the same language, culture and ethnical similarities. For example, in *Precisely*, Roger and Stephen who can be assumed as authorities or politicians talk about massive numbers of casualties, but in fact they feel nothing, as they do not count them as human beings. “Oh ... you know ... fifty ... sixty ... seventy” (Pinter, *Plays Four* 217), “Another two million. And I’ll buy you another drink. Another two for another drink” (219), “It’s twenty million. Dead” (219)

People need language to exist; in other words, it is essential for people to speak their mother tongue to gain status in the society. Forcing an official language for the people who do not actually share that official language as a native language is a way to protect the status quo and authority as it is a

more convenient way to rule and control public with ease. When the issues of banning local languages or encouraging people to speak an official language rather than their local languages are being taken into consideration, it would not be wrong to say that the dominant powers try to control these people's not just speeches, but also their thoughts. Furthermore, because authorities need to control people's minds, they need quite formal, controlled, manipulating, assimilating and superior language. That is why, their use of language differs in terms of tone and format, such as over repetition of instructions, too formal, consistent and excessive frequency of "we" language to otherize people. Politicians sometimes speak in quite an elegant manner, whereas they sometimes lose control, and they start to use slang, offensive and even pornographic statements. Moreover, for justification of their powers and positions, they tend to connect their authorities to a divine concept, like God and democracy. As Pinter also stated, "Because language is discredited and because spirit and moral intelligence are fatally undermined, the government possesses carte blanche to do what it likes" (Pinter, *Various Voices* 188). To sum up, politicians, states people and authorities use language to guarantee their power and status quo and control what people think.

5.2. Politicization and Personalization of Interrogations and Repeated Instructions

Due to the power struggles in Harold Pinter's plays, characters are in a fight even in their personal relationships to gain control over the relationship through various questioning and repetitions. Some interrogations are not intended to get information; nevertheless, even common people conduct these types of interrogation sessions to dominate other people which is a way of politicizing personal relationships. The purpose of these interrogations and instructions is to control and dominate the relationship and be persistent and committed in physical and psychological tortures. The instructions are being turned into habits which kill consciousness of individuals; they start not to question but try to comprehend their actions and analyse possible consequences of actions. In personal lives, individuals alter their actions into habits via instructions; in politics, politicians use instructions to have people take up a habit which kills their cognitive skills.

In *The Dumb Waiter*, Ben and Gus are gunmen, and they are waiting for their duty. Then, Gus starts to rebel against the authority when he feels hungry and disappointed; even though they have sent all the food to the boss, the boss is not satisfied and keeps asking for more. In addition to this, when Gus begins to question the authority of the boss and objects sending more to upstairs; to control him and to keep both the status quo of the boss and his dominance over Gus, Ben initiates the repeated instruction sessions although they have executed several times in the same way before.

GUS. I know. I don't like doing a job on an empty stomach.

BEN. (*wearily*). Be quiet a minute. Let me give you your instructions.

GUS. What for? We always do it the same way, don't we?

BEN. Let me give you your instructions.

(... *The instructions are started and repeated automatically.*)

When we get the call, you go over and stand behind the door.

GUS. Stand behind the door.

BEN. If there's a knock on the door you don't answer it.

GUS. If there's a knock on the door I don't answer it.

BEN. But there won't be a knock on the door.

GUS. So I won't answer it.

BEN. When the bloke comes in –

GUS. When the bloke comes in –

BEN. Shut the door behind him.

GUS. Shut the door behind him.

BEN. Without divulging your presence.

GUS. Without divulging my presence. (Pinter, *Plays One* 143)

After Ben successfully diverts Gus' attention away, Gus starts to remind Ben of the instruction, "You've missed something out" (143). Later, at the end of this instruction session, Gus leaves the room (144). Ben successfully protects the status quo of the boss and his power in this partnership via repeated instructions which prevents Gus from questioning the authority of the boss. Habit is the ultimate deadener.

Instructions session is a little different in *Victoria Station* because Driver is not willing to follow the instructions of Controller. However, Controller has some techniques to apply; for instance, he tries to control Driver with the help of references to a divine power, like God (Pinter, *Plays Four* 198). Controller tries to prevent Driver from disobeying the authority by asking questions, giving references to a divine power, but his last attack is more successful which is announcing another driver. Controller pretends to give up on Driver and diverts his attention into 135 (202). After this deviation, Controller has Driver obey him. Thanks to instructions, Controller also prevents Driver from asking questions about the passenger who is going to be picked up at Victoria Station.

Apart from repeated instructions, interrogations are the main conversational styles of Harold Pinter's plays. Like instructions, interrogations are also another way to politicize relationships because interrogators try to put people under pressure by asking questions unceasingly. The main purpose is not to get answers from people, but interrogators intend to silence people who are questioned with many meaningless questions which do not generally have exact answers. This process causes people not to think clearly and it kills their reasoning skills. These interrogations are defined as a typical style of McCarthyism, which is a type of accusation without having a proper evidence. This type of questioning can be found in *The Hothouse*, *The Birthday Party*, *One for the Road* and *The New World Order*. In these type of interrogations, people who are being questioned are accused of some unknown and indefinite crimes.

With the sudden appearance of McCann and Goldberg in *The Birthday Party*, Stanley has exposed to their question bombarding. The presence of IRA and vengeance of Stanley's leaving the organization appear in the conversations which are not explicitly revealed in the play. McCann and Goldberg aim to accuse Stanley and force him to accept his guilts. Not waiting for Stanley to answer the questions, the purpose of McCann and Goldberg is to suppress him with rhetorical and meaningless questions.

GOLDBERG. Webber, what were you doing yesterday?

STANLEY. Yesterday?

GOLDBERG. And the day before. What did you do the day before that?

STANLEY. What do you mean?

GOLDBERG. Why are you wasting everybody's time, Webber? Why are you getting in everybody's way?

STANLEY. Me? What are you –

GOLDBERG. I'm telling you, Webber. You're a washout. Why are you getting on everybody's wick? Why are you driving that old lady off her conk?

(...)

STANLEY. What the –

GOLDBERG. What did you wear last week, Webber? Where do you keep your suits?

MCCANN. Why did you leave the organization?

GOLDBERG. What would your old mum say, Webber?

MCCANN. Why did you betray us?

(...)

GOLDBERG. Did you stir properly? Did they fizz?

STANLEY. Now, now, wait, you –

(...)

GOLDBERG. You don't know. When did you last have a bath?

STANLEY. I have one every –

GOLDBERG. Don't lie.

MCCANN. You betrayed the organization. I know him. (Pinter, *Plays One* 41-42)

In the first questioning, Stanley still tries to answer questions and object their accusations, but after many pointless questions, Stanley has been silenced, suppressed and tortured psychologically. In other words, Stanley is in such a position that he cannot act with his own conscious. Petey's broken remark shows how Stanley is altered, "Stan, don't let them tell you what to do!" (80).

They begin to woo him, gently and with relish. During the following sequence STANLEY shows no reaction. He remains, with no movement, where he sits.

(...)

GOLDBERG. Keep a table a reserved.

MCCANN. Help you acknowledge the fast days.

GOLDBERG. Bake you cakes.

MCCANN. Help you kneel on kneeling days.

GOLDBERG. Give you a free pass.

MCCANN. Take you for constitutionals. (76-77)

It seems that there are few doctors are in a sanatorium, but actually, it is an institution with gas chambers, soundproof rooms and corrupted staffs in *The Hothouse*. Gibbs and Cutts put Lamb in a soundproof room with a pair of earphones. Like Stanley's situation, at the beginning of the interrogation, Lamb is still able to understand and answer questions.

CUTTS. Do you ever get fits of depression?

LAMB. Well, I wouldn't call them depression, exactly –

GIBBS. Would you say you were a sociable person?

LAMB. Well, that's not a very easy question to answer, really. I try, I certainly try to be sociable, I mean I think it should be the aim of anyone interested in human nature to try to mix, to better his understanding of it. I –

(...)

CUTTS. After your day's work, do you ever feel tired, edgy?

GIBBS. Fretty?

CUTTS. Irritable?

GIBBS. At a loose end?

CUTTS. Morose?

GIBBS. Frustrated? (247)

At the end of the interrogation, Lamb states that the extraordinary sound gives him quite start (254) which is a torturing tool to make him silent or confess by killing his cognitive faculties. To erase his thoughts, Gibbs asks him not to think a thing (243). The most awful part is that Lamb is a member of staff, and the authorities over him test their torturing method on him (243). Finally, they put Lamb into a position which is still, staring, as in a catatonic trance (328).

Interrogations in earlier plays are generally based on verbal and psychological tortures; however, latest plays include more violent scenes with psychological and physical tortures. Along with these, in *One for the Road*, the interrogator, Nicolas, questions all family members with a McCarthyistic interrogation. Nicolas asks some questions not to get an answer, he just tries to torture Gila psychologically.

NICOLAS. When did you meet your husband?

GILA. When I was eighteen.

NICOLAS. Why?

GILA. Why?

NICOLAS. Why?

GILA. I just met him.

NICHOLAS. Why?

GILA. I didn't plan it.

NICOLAS. Why not?

GILA. I didn't know him.

NICOLAS. Why not? (Pinter, *Plays Four* 237-238)

In *The New World Order*, there is a blindfolded man and two interrogators, Des and Lionel. In Pinter's plays, characters get quieter in time. Namely, through the latest plays, tortures are becoming more frequent, and suppression leads characters to be voiceless as the authorities and

politics are becoming much harsher. Likewise, the blindfolded man does not talk at all during the whole play which implies that psychological and physical tortures are far crueller.

The more world is developed, the more politics grows punitive. Every piece of personal lives begins to be involved in politics as a part of power struggle. Because of the effects of wars and military coups, even common people start to adopt such repeated instructions and interrogations to dominate relationships. Language is a feature of human beings, but politics interferes with daily lives so dramatically that language is getting the shape of a torturing material through interrogations and instructions.

5.3. Politicization of Pauses and Silence

Harold Pinter was famous for his pauses and silences in his plays; although he was not the founder of these pauses and silences, he was one of the perfect executors. Opposite of general tendency, his works tell a lot when the characters do not talk. Because Pinter did not want to imply symbolic meanings, he preferred silences to uncover the nakedness. Also, because Pinter believed his plays were quite natural everyday events, he stated that “Given characters who possess a momentum of their own, my job is not to impose upon them, not to subject them to a false articulation, by which I mean forcing a character to speak where he could not speak, or making him speak of what he could never speak” (Pinter, *Plays One* xii). He summed up his *Pinter silence* and functions in details:

There are two silences. One when no word is spoken. The other when perhaps a torrent of language is being employed. This speech is speaking of a language locked beneath it. That is its continual reference. The speech we hear is an indication of that which we don't hear. It is a necessary avoidance, a violent, sly, anguished or mocking smoke screen which keeps the other in its place. When true silence falls we are still left with echo but are nearer nakedness. One way of looking at speech is to say that it is a constant stratagem to cover nakedness. (xiii)

What makes *Pinter silence* and *pause* important is the way of giving the real message which is impossible to define with words. Without these pauses and silence, acting lacks the message on the stage and emphasis gets lost in prose. "... the unsaid becomes sometimes more terrifying and more eloquent than the said. Pinter actually *writes* silence, and he appropriates it as a part of his dialogue" (Hall, *Directing the plays of Harold Pinter* 163).

There are three very different kinds of pauses in Pinter: Three Dots is a sign of a pressure point, a search for a word, a momentary incoherence. A Pause is a longer interruption to the action, where the lack of speech becomes a form of speech itself. The Pause is a threat, a moment of non-verbal tension. A Silence – the third category – is longer still. It is an extreme crisis point. (163)

Another distinguishing factor of his plays is a failure in communication which causes silence and pauses, as well. However, in Pinter's plays, these failures are often erupted by the characters on purpose because communication is a tool to get the control of the relationship in power struggle. Moreover, Pinter shared a precise picture of these failures in communications:

'Failure of communication' ... and this phrase has been fixed to my work quite consistently. I believe the contrary. I think that we communicate only too well, in our silence, in what is unsaid, and that what takes place is a continual evasion, desperate reargued attempts to keep ourselves to ourselves. Communication is too alarming. To enter into someone else's life is too frightening. To disclose to others the poverty within us is too fearsome a possibility. (Pinter, *Plays One* xiii)

Overall, silence and pauses in Pinter's plays have an active role of completing the minor parts of puzzles.

In Pinter's plays, there are some characters who talk unceasingly; on the other hand, some characters are in passive position without any statement or with fewer remarks. The dialogues between these two opposite sides are considered as a failure in communication; nevertheless, similar to what Pinter said above, talking too much is a way to escape the reality with well-dressed crowd of words. On the other hand, silence is power. When somebody is in silence, weaker characters are always in struggle to finish that silent situation. For instance, the talkative side of the one-sided conversation is Rose in *The Room*, Bert does not speak at all until the last scene of the play (109). Because Rose is afraid of losing her personal space and is suppressed by Bert in their relationships, she tries to speak a lot to cover her fears and deal with the power of Bert's silence. In addition, Davies has similar fears to those of Rose in *The Caretaker* which are mainly xenophobia against other nations and losing a space. Likewise, Davies is also of different ethnicity being Welsh (Pinter, *Plays Two* 23), and to cover all his fears and real identity, he speaks too much in all his conversations. Another character of Pinter with same fears, like fear of losing personal space, other people and losing dominance in the relationship, is Edward in *A Slight Ache*. Because Edward is afraid of leaving his personal circle, he invites Matchseller into his house (Pinter, *Plays One* 163). After Matchseller's appearance in the house, because Edward cannot bear the power of Matchseller's silence, he tries not to leave a place for the silence (166-171). In *Landscape* (1967), a couple have different monologues, not because of miscommunication between each other, but because they prefer monologues to survive in this unbearable relationship since especially Beth tries to cope with a husband who has psychopathic tendencies in sexual intercourse (Pinter, *Plays Three* 187). As a conclusion, these silence and extreme talks cannot be defined simply as failures in communication; on the contrary, these characters are in struggles to survive, exist in the universe and cope with the agonising life circumstances.

Along with the silence as a sign of power, there are other types of silence which are suppressed by more dominant characters or due to politics. Stanley, in *The Birthday Party*, begins to utter no words after torturing interrogations of Goldberg and McCann (Pinter, *Plays One* 75), the silence of old woman in *Mountain Language* is a reaction after being prevented by the officers from speaking her native language and seeing her son brutally tortured (Pinter, *Plays Four* 265-267). Furthermore, Aston, in *The Caretaker*, is silenced with a similar method of Lamb in *The Hothouse*. Aston explains “I told them ... when they wanted to know ... what my thoughts were” (Pinter, *Plays Two* 53), “They used to come round with these ... I don’t know what they were ... they looked like big pincers, with wires on, the wires were attached to a little machine. It was electric” (54), “(...) the chief doctor, used to fit pincers, something like earphones, he used to fit them on either side of the man’s skull (54). All these practices are medical torturing which are methods to stop people’s cognitive faculties to prevent them from thinking and talking. The effect of his medical tortures is found in Aston’s statements, “The trouble was ... my thoughts ... had become very slow ... I couldn’t think at all ... I couldn’t ...” (55), “I couldn’t look to the right or the left, I had to look straight in front of me” (55). With this persistent and slow killing of individuals’ speaking and thinking abilities, the authorities manage to suppress Aston. The matter of not looking right and left can be interpreted as ideologies, and authorities do not leave a place for freedom of any ideas, but just make people look in front of themselves and obey what they say. Besides, those three dots show how Aston’s speech is fragmented because of tortures. Consequently, the old woman, Stanley and Aston are silenced due to psychological and physical tortures in interrogations. Since politicians and authorities want to keep their status quo safe, they silence people with the help of various methods and ruin these people’s personal lives. The silence of Matchseller may not be optional, too. Matchseller is not described specifically, but reference to Africa’s being a happy hunting ground for Edward (Pinter,

Plays One 167) shows that the Matchseller is from African countries or close to them. Matchseller does not talk, maybe due to the fact that he does not speak English, or he speaks with not a perfect accent, or from Edward's point of view he is dehumanized since he is not European. In other words, social point of views and political acts affect individuals' performance in language faculties. The last group of characters in Pinter's plays has a different position in being in silence. They have lost their ability to speak, or they have been silenced with different methods. This time characters are exposed to physical loss of speaking organs, such as cutting of tongues. One can assume based on Jimmy's situation in *Party Time* that he is killed, but the reference to mouth as "The dark is in my mouth and I suck it" (Pinter, *Plays Four* 314) can be considered as tearing tongue apart physically to prevent him from speaking and explaining his ideas which jeopardise status quo of authorities. Another example for chopping of the tongue is Victor's tongue in *One for the Road*.

NICOLAS. I can't hear you.

VICTOR. It's my mouth.

NICOLAS. Mouth?

VICTOR. Tongue.

(...)

VICTOR *mutters*.

NICOLAS. What?

VICTOR *mutters*.

NICOLAS. What?

VICTOR. My son. (245-247)

Victor cannot articulate clearly because torturers cut his tongue off which is another physical method of silencing people.

On the other hand, silence sometimes can be optional in situations like resistance to and escaping from oppression of authorities. In Harold Pinter's plays, there are some escaping methods from suppression, such as being silent, monologues which are living in memories that characters create by themselves and voice-overs. In the situation of Matchseller, he may have chosen to be silent to become powerful in his power struggle with Edward. Also, monologues of Beth and Rose are the ways of escaping from unbearable living conditions and violence of their husbands. Therefore, they can survive in the struggle for power. Moreover, voice over dialogues of old woman and her son, and man and young woman in *Mountain Language* provide them with a limited freedom (260-261, 263), "Voice-over dialogue between family members imparts the liberating power of language" (Wentz 3). Additionally, Homi K. Bhabha describes, "The production of meaning requires that these two places be mobilized in the passage through a Third Space, which represents both the general conditions of language and the specific implication of the utterance in a performative and institutional strategy of which it cannot 'in itself' be conscious" (2395). That is why the characters in *Mountain Language* try to escape from these brutal physical and psychological tortures thanks to voice-overs to Third Space where they can have freedom.

In conclusion, silence and pause of Pinter are not only minor details, but also, they are like pieces of puzzles that complete the whole picture. There are two types of silence of Pinter's characters. The first silence is an instrument to struggle in power relationships because it gives power and space for preparation. However, the second one is another type of tool which is used for silencing people who are a threat for status quo. This type of silencing can be conducted both physically and psychologically; therefore, the consequences of this silencing period affect individuals' personal lives deeply, damaging their lives profoundly to protect the power of authorities. Voice-over dialogues are unique in theatrical dimension

which give freedom to oppressed characters. Common people personalize silence to struggle in power fight, the same silence is politicized by authorities to protect status quo of states. In Pinter's plays, the most important thing is not the one said or showed; on the contrary, it is the one unsaid and unseen.



CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Along with his splendid leading roles, Harold Pinter brought many characteristics to the drama, such as the adjective to describe his style, *Pinteresque*, and concepts such as *Pinter silence* which is not created by Pinter in the first place, but he used silence perfectly; that is why it is named after him. Even though a great amount of research and criticism has been conducted on Pinter's drama, there are still many unspoken features. Pinter successfully depicted the era that he lived in, not because he was one of the perfect followers of certain theoretical issues, but because he gave his characters freedom to show real-life events on stage with all positive and negative sides. Pinter was intrigued with upheavals of his time in a realistic way; however, he did not try to fit his characters and plots within a specific location, ethnicity, or ideological manifestos, he simply let them live and struggle just like in the real life. There are some tendencies to divide his plays into three categories as "Comedy of Menace", "Memory Plays" and "Political Plays". Nevertheless, as it was argued above, there are quite many items which are definitely related to politics in Pinter's earlier works. Because Pinter's plays are based on power struggle between and among individuals and between individuals and authoritative system, considering involvement of politics apart from memory and menace can lead to the wrong conceptualisation. Also, since upheavals in political fields have affected individuals' lives deeply, no one can deny the involvement of politics in personal lives. In other words, as Pinter's plays are shaped with personal power struggles and survivals, they are personal, therefore, they are political. To sum up, personal actions in Harold Pinter's plays are politicized, political issues are personalized and integrated into daily lives, as well. Moreover, politics and personal relationships alter inner actively and interactively power struggles.

Because personal is political or vice versa, personalization and politicization are found in Harold Pinter's plays. These binaries can be categorized as politicization and personalization of relationships, social gatherings, space and language. The main theme of Harold Pinter's plays is relationships which are centred around the family concept including husband and wife, mother and son, father and son; friends and professional partners. Power wars between and among people are the principal components of politicization of the relationships because when one is trying to survive in that power struggle, one ends up being political in her or his speeches, actions and memories.

Society requires different roles from people, like being a father at home and a manager at office, so these divisions are micro cultures. People have different roles and norms in macro cultures as well. Like in personal relationships, the political upheavals and approaches of the period influence the social dynamics of gatherings. Since the characters in Pinter's plays struggle for power, they politicize norms and gatherings to control the group or survive in the power struggle. On the other hand, parties and celebrations are means of hiding or coping with the grotesque situations of the time.

The other aspects of Harold Pinter's plays are space and identity. The typical *Pinteresque* setting of Pinter's plays which includes dark and gloomy rooms with some closed doors is not arbitrary; on the contrary, it shows how characters feel because people attach their memories to houses and rooms. That is why Pinter's characters try to protect their personal spaces to keep their memories safe. Along with this, politics appears in power struggles which are to protect or obtain a place, so the characters find themselves fighting for it. Furthermore, while some characters are aware of their defensive actions for a specific house or room, the others are in a struggle to protect their personal spaces unintentionally. In addition to politics of space, some of Pinter's characters undergo different identity shifts, such as changing names because of political and personal reasons.

Identity shifts are experienced to survive in power struggles. Sometimes the characters change their names to hide their ethnicities which cause their suppressions and some characters alter their identities as social roles, like shifting from wife to whore, because they need to survive in violent relationships.

The last but the most important type of politicization in Harold Pinter's plays is language. As it was explained before, Pinter was interested in power struggles between and among individuals, and individuals and system, and language became a powerful weapon in these fights. In Pinter's plays, use of language is not just a communication tool, but it is a manipulative medium to dominate and control other people. State language, practiced by politicians and officers, has an idiosyncratic feature that oppresses and controls public. Besides, there are interrogations and repeated instructions which are used not to get information; instead, their purpose is to torture and suppress people psychologically. Furthermore, there are some physical attempts to silence people, such as medical intervenes into brains and cutting tongues off. In these language tortures, people need a way to escape and survive. Therefore, Pinter gave three dots, pauses, complete silence and voice-over dialogues to struggle. Some characters in his plays do not talk and some characters specifically talk to each other in another dimension. Pinter preferred these devices to fight because the world is getting more political, because of which it is getting crueller and oppressive. People start to be exposed to different types of tortures.

Consequently, Pinter tried to depict the realistic picture of common people's lives, and he showed how states and politicians affect and ruin people's personal lives, as politics occupies every aspect of life. The vague line between politics and personal has been lost with the actions of states and authorities. Pinter successfully managed to bring samples of real life on the stage with distinctive techniques and artistic viewpoints.



WORKS CITED

- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994. Print.
- Bensky, Lawrence M. *Harold Pinter*. Ed. Charles Marowitz and Simon Trussler. London: Methuen, 1967. Print.
- Berne, Eric. *Games People Play*. Grove Press, 1964. Web.
- Bernhard, F. J. "Beyond Realism: The Plays of Harold Pinter." *Modern Drama* 8.2 (1965). Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "The Commitment to Theory." Cain, William E., et al. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 2001. Print.
- Billington, Michael. "Myths in No Man's Land." *The Guardian*, 2 November 1992.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. New Delhi: Peacock Books, 2006. Print.
- Esslin, Martin. *Pinter The Playwright*. London: Methuen, 2000. Print.
- . *The People Wound: The Plays of Harold Pinter*. London: Methuen, 1970. Print.
- Garner, Naomi. "The Politics of Harold Pinter." *Inquiries Journal/Student Pulse* 2012. Web. <<http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/a?id=616>>.
- Gordon, Robert. *Harold Pinter: The Theatre of Power*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012. Print.
- Gussow, Mel. *Conversations with Pinter*. London: Nick Hern Books Limited, 1994.

- Hall, Peter. "Directing the plays of Harold Pinter." Raby, Peter. *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- Knowles, Ronald. *Understanding Harold Pinter*. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1995. Print.
- Merritt, Susan Hollis. *Pinter in Play: Critical Strategies and the Plays of Harold Pinter*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990. Print.
- Millar, Robert McColl. "Nation and Language." Millar, Robert McColl. *Language, Nation and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Morley, Sheridan. "Party Time and Mountain Language." *Herald Tribune* (1991). Print.
- Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language." Donaldson, E. Talbot, et al. *The Norton Anthology English Literature*. Ed. M. H. Abrams. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1993. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "A Night Out." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "A Slight Ache." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- . "Art, Truth & Politics." *Nobel Lecture*. Sweden: The Nobel Foundation, 2005. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Celebration." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Eroding the Language of Freedom." Pinter, Harold. *Various Voices: Sixty Years of Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-2008*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 2013. E-book.

- Pinter, Harold. *Funny and Moving and Frightening: Pinter* Kathleen Halton. Vogue, 1 October 1967. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Introduction." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Introduction." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Three*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1997. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Introduction." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Two*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1977. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Introduction." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1996. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Landscape." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Three*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1997. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Mountain Language." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "No Man's Land." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Three*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1997. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "One for the Road." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Party Time." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Precisely." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Basement." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Three*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1997. Print.

- Pinter, Harold. "The Birthday Party." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Caretaker." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Two*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1977. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Dumb Waiter." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Homecoming." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Three*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1997. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Hothouse." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Lover." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Two*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1977. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The New World Order." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "The Room." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays One*. London: Eyre Methuen Limited; Faber and Faber Limited, 1976. Print.
- Pinter, Harold. "Victoria Station." Pinter, Harold. *Harold Pinter: Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1998. Print.
- Quigley, Austin. "Pinter, politics and postmodernism (1)." Raby, Peter. *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*. Ed. Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.
- . *The Pinter Problem*. Princeton University Press, 1975. Print.
- The Nobel Prize in Literature 2005 - Bio-bibliography*. n.d. Nobel Media AB 2014. Web. 7 May 2018. <https://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/bio-bibl.html>.

Wentz, Matthew. "The Transformative Linguistic Politics of Mountain Language." *Georgia State University Research Symposium*. 2016. 5. Web.

Yerebakan, İbrahim. *Political Dimensions of Harold Pinter's Dramatic Art*. Erzurum: Atatürk University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Publications, 1997. Print.

Notes:

ⁱ Carol Hanish essay "The Personal is Political" in Anthology "Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation" in 1970.

ⁱⁱ For more details please see Gaston Bachelard "Poetics of Space" 212.

ⁱⁱⁱ For more details please see Gaston Bachelard "Poetics of Space" 19.