

**T.C.
CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BÖLÜMÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**CONFLICTS AND BETRAYALS IN A PANOPTIC WORLD AS A
FOUCAULDIAN POWER IN DAVID MAMET'S *GLENGARRY GLEN ROSS*
AND JOE ORTON'S *THE GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT***

Şerif YILMAZ

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mahinur Akşehir

MANİSA

2013

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum *Conflicts and Betrayals in a Panoptic World as a Foucauldian Power in David Mamet's Glengarry Glen Ross and Joe Orton's The Good and Faithful Servant* adlı çalışmanın, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın, tarafımdan yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin bibliyografyada gösterilen eserlerden oluşup, bunlara atıfta bulunmuş olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

25/09/2013

Şerif YILMAZ

TEZ SAVUNMA SINAV TUTANAĞI

Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü 11/10/2013 tarih ve 26/2 sayılı toplantısında oluşturulan jürimiz tarafından Lisans Üstü öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 24. Maddesi gereğince Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Şerif YILMAZ'ın "Conflicts and Betrayals in a Panoptic World as a Foucaultian Concept in David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross* and Joe Orton's *The Good and Faithful Servant*" Konulu tezi incelenmiş ve aday 25/10/2013 tarihinde saat 14.00'de jüri önünde tez savunmasına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini savunmasından sonra 60 dakikalık süre içinde gerek tez konusu, gerekse tezin dayanağı olan anabilim dallarından jüri üyelerine sorulan sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin,

BAŞARILI olduğuna



OY BİRLİĞİ



DÜZELTME yapılmasına

*



OY ÇOKLUĞU



RED edilmesine

**



ile karar verilmiştir.

* Bu halde adaya 3 ay süre verilir.

** Bu halde adayın kaydı silinir.

BAŞKAN

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mahinur AKŞEHİR UYGUR
(Danışman)

ÜYE

Prof. Dr. Dilek DİRENÇ

ÜYE

Doç. Dr. Sibel GÜZEL

Evet Hayır

*** Tez, burs, ödül veya Teşvik prog. (Tüba, Fullbright vb.) aday olabilir



Tez, mutlaka basılmalıdır



Tez, mevcut haliyle basılmalıdır



Tez, gözden geçirildikten sonra basılmalıdır.



Tez, basımı gereksizdir.



DAVID MAMET' İN *GLENGARRY GLEN ROSS* VE JOE ORTON'UN *THE GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT* OYUNLARINDA FOUCAULT'NUN GÜÇ ÖGESİ ÇEVRESİNDE VE PANOPTİK DÜNYADAKİ ÇELİŞKİLER VE İHANETLER

Şerif YILMAZ

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü

Yüksek Lisans

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mahinur Akşehir

Manisa 2013

ÖZET

Panoptikon, 18. yüzyıl düşünürü ve mimarı Jeremy Bentham tarafından, sadece mimari yapısıyla tutsaklar üzerinde güç ve otorite etkisi oluşturmak üzerine kurulmuş bir hapisane tasarımıdır. Bu fikirden etkilenen Foucault, bu konsepti idealaştırmış ve panoptikon fikrinin başka unsurlara da uygulanabileceğini savunarak panoptisizm fikrini ortaya atmıştır. Bu tezin de amacı panoptisizm fikrini edebi yapıtlarda incelemektir. Bu amaçla Amerikan tiyatro ve senaryo yazarı David Mamet'in *Glengarry Glen Ross* adlı eseri ile İngiliz tiyatro yazarı Joe Orton'un *İyi ve Sadık Uşak* adlı eseri incelenmiştir. Her ne kadar bu iki oyun arasında 20 yıllık bir zaman farkı ile büyük bir kültür farkı olsa da, her iki oyunda da panoptisist fikir ile kapitalist toplum yapısının dolaylı olarak bireylerin şirketleri için kişiliklerinden taviz vermeye zorlamasını görmekteyiz. Bu çalışmada yazarların birbirlerinden farklı bakış açılarıyla aynı temayı önermeleri panoptisizm fikri ışığı altında incelenecektir. Bu amaçla Foucault'nun panoptisizm anlayışının Mamet ve Orton'un eserlerindeki yansımaları arasındaki farkları da incelememiz gerekecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Joe Orton, David Mamet, Foucault, Panoptisizm, Güç

**CONFLICTS AND BETRAYALS IN A PANOPTIC WORLD AS A
FOUCAULDIAN POWER IN DAVID MAMET'S *GLENGARRY GLEN ROSS*
AND JOE ORTON'S *THE GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT***

Şerif YILMAZ

Department of English Language and Literature

Master's Degree

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Mahinur Akşehir

Manisa 2013

ABSTRACT

The Panopticon is a design for a prison that aimed to gain control over inmates by its sheer architecture, designed by 18th century architect and thinker Jeremy Bentham. Foucault took this architectural idea and applied it as a social and cultural idea, enabling that the panoptacist structure can be used in other concepts as well. Thus this study has aimed to search for the idea of panopticism in literary texts. American playwright and screenplay writer David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross* and British playwright Joe Orton's *The Good and Faithful Servant* were analysed for this purpose. Although these two plays take place in different cultures and 20 years apart, we still see the same idea of panopticism, representing the capitalistic social system that indirectly forces individuals to appease their personalities in order to comply with the company. This thesis will thus take a closer look at the different perspectives these writers propose to the same issue, due to differences in setting, under a panoptacist light. This will of course require analysing Foucault's idea of panopticism and how his idea and the writers' point of views are different on it.

Keywords: Joe Orton, David Mamet, Foucault, Panopticism, Power

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would never have been able to finish my thesis without the guidance of Assistant Professor B. Ayça Ülker Erkan.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Assistant Professor Mahinur Akşehir, for her excellent guidance, constructive feedback, patience, and providing me with an excellent atmosphere for doing research.

Special thanks to Associate Professor N. Sibel Güzel, the head of English Language and Department at Celal Bayar University.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends. Without their love and patience, this study would not exist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
1. LIFE AND WORKS OF DAVID MAMET	4
1.1. Mamet's Biography	4
1.2. Literary Career of Mamet	7
1.3. Mamet & The Theme of Power Relations	10
2. LIFE & WORKS OF JOE ORTON	13
2.1. Orton's Biography	13
2.2. Literary Career of Orton	16
2.3. Orton & The Theme of Power Relations	19
3. NEW HISTORICISM & PANOPTICISM	23
3.1. Foucault & Panopticism.....	23
3.2. Power Relations & Panopticism	28
3.3. New Historicism	32
4. ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYS IN TERMS OF PANOPTICISM	35
4.1. <i>Glengarry Glen Ross</i>	35
4.1.1. Plot Construction	36
4.1.2. Social, Historical and Economical Context of the Play	40
4.1.3. Character Analysis	43
4.1.4. Analysis of the Play in Terms of Panopticism.....	46
4.2. <i>The Good and Faithful Servant</i>	58
4.2.1. Plot Construction	59
4.2.2. Social, Historical and Economical Context of the Play	63
4.2.3. Character Analysis	65
4.2.4. Analysis of the Play in Terms of Panopticism.....	72
CONCLUSION	77
APPENDIX	80
WORKS CITED	80

INTRODUCTION

One of the most distinguished studies on power of all times undoubtedly belongs to Foucault who has written on the matter in several of his books. Recently, especially with the new trend in political democracy and the capitalist economy, the issue of power has become even more interesting. Numerous works have been written on culture and morality to criticise the capitalistic society and its negative effects and how all these affect the power relations in general. This study will analyse two plays which deal with this issue: *Glengarry Glen Ross* by David Mamet and *The Good and Faithful Servant* by Joe Orton. These works will be analysed with a Foucaultian approach, making the concept of the Panopticon the central discussion of the thesis.

The Panopticon is originally the idea of 18th century thinker Jeremy Bentham, who has aimed to create a structure of discipline and authority based on simple architecture. The Panopticon is a circular structure with its walls acting as cells. In the middle of the structure there is the watch tower which enables the watchman to watch over all the inmates (the structure is depicted in more detail in Section 3). The building is designed in such a way that it will carry out power over the inmates without the necessity of an authority figure. The inmates will only be aware of the authority, and not each other.

Foucault who was fascinated by the sheer simplicity and effectiveness of this design approached the idea not only as an architectural structure but as an abstract concept. As an architectural structure, the Panopticon can be adjusted to be not just a prison but an educative institution, a hospital and the like. As an abstract idea, it can signify the power relation between people or other institutions. The internet, for example, could be seen as an example to the Panopticon: a central structure that can survey everything, and people around it that are hardly aware of each other. Their attention is focused on the central power structure.

Both plays that are going to be analysed show the various representations of the concept of Panopticon: in both of the plays the figurative "Panopticon" is a company and the "inmates" are its employees. In both of the plays there is one person within the company who is not bound to the rules is one employee who can watch over all

the other employees. This person is, again in both plays, a power figure who has the capability to manipulate the power relations between the characters.

However when analysing the plays, we cannot overlook the social, historical or economic differences of the plays. Although their themes are similar, the plays take place in different time periods and in different countries: *The Good and Faithful Servant* by Orton takes place in the United Kingdom in the 1960s, while *Glengarry Glen Ross* takes place in the 1980s Chicago, United States. Though both writers have the background of a working class family, which pushed them to dealing with issues such as the capitalistic society, they have taken different angles of one common theme.

There are still some differences between the two plays on how the writers deal with the given issue. While Mamet chooses to depict the dishonest, consciously swindling culture of capitalistic Americans, Orton touches upon the conservative structure and the hypocrisy that comes with it. Mamet's Chicago is a place full of conmen and predators who would do anything for material success and wealth. This fact is known within the community Mamet depicts, and it is in fact praised. In Orton's community however honest work and a steady, lifelong career is the ideal value. He deals with piety and the institution of marriage. He also has the theme of dishonesty, but it is not praised and it does not serve to the benefit of people. The concept of dishonesty in Orton's text comes from the need to conceal acts that would be judged as immoral by society.

It is because of these similarities and differences that this study has adopted a new historicist point of view in analysing the plays. The economic situation and policies at the times of the plays have a major impact on how society and its values were shaped and how power relations were formed. Also, the fact that these plays provide a criticism for society makes it necessary to take a look at the social structure of these two countries that are being criticised.

Mamet and Orton both are distinguished authors and playwrights. They both have their distinctive styles and idiosyncratic features that make their work stand out. Moreover, both of their plays have significant autobiographical qualities, which made

it necessary to take a closer look at the lives and literary styles of these individual writers.

Thus this study will first make a short introduction with the lives of David Mamet and Joe Orton, and provide insight on their literary careers, the features that distinguish them in the literary world and their view towards literature and how they approach the theme of power relations will be discussed. In the third section of the study a literature review of Panopticism and Foucault's ideas on power, as well as New Historicism will be provided. In the final chapter of the study, the plays *The Good and Faithful Servant* and *Glengarry Glen Ross* will be analysed in accordance with a New Historicist standing and taking the concept of Panopticon as the central trait.

1. LIFE AND WORKS OF DAVID MAMET

David Mamet is an influential playwright, script writer and film and theatre director. His works distinguishably represent the American culture, especially America's culture of conning and deceiving, and he uses his unique tone of voice and language to reflect his idea the best way onto the stage or on the screen. His most prominent feature is his use of language, the broken dialogue and the dynamic relationships between the characters that is created by that. Mamet successfully uses language as a powerful tool to depict feelings and situations. Mamet has also numerous books about acting, theatre and film where he has written down his ideas towards literature and art. His ideas were influenced by intellectuals such as Brecht, Meisner and Boleslavsky.

1.1. Mamet's Biography

David Mamet, who was born in 1947 in Chicago, is an award-winning playwright and director. His parents were educated, his father being a labour lawyer and his mother a teacher. His interest in cinema and theatre started during his childhood years, as he lived only a block-and-a-half away from the Jeffrey movie theatre, which he visited frequently (Nadel 13). In 1963, at the age of 16, he started doing backstage work at the Hull House Theatre where works by Harold Pinter, Brecht and Edward Albee were staged, all of whom influenced Mamet as can be seen later on in his career (Blansfield v).

His family life that was complicated in many ways, which can be argued to have affected his works. His parents divorced in his early years which are argued to be reflected on the men and women relationships in his work, according to Blansfield (v). It is also recorded that Mamet's parents were anything but supportive on neither his talents nor his social life. Mamet and his sister were often harassed and bullied at school for being Jewish, which their mother preferred to ignore (Nadel 14). Similarly, Mamet's father never seemed to recognize his son's talents. At the opening night party of Mamet's successful play *American Buffalo* in 1975, he was reported to act in a castigating way towards his son, the play and the producers. Mamet and his father often had their disagreements, which concluded in several months of silence between them (Nadel 14).

Mamet's father Bernie Mamet was a man with high expectations, who always complained that his children weren't living up to their potential. He put a great emphasis on semantics and language, as Mamet's sister Lynn Mamet reports: "The prevailing attitude was that if you could not express yourself correctly, you were dead meat. My father put an almost pathological emphasis on semantics. ... There was a best word for everything and God help you if you didn't use it." (Nadel 15). His mother Lee Mamet was also very "semantic", a schoolteacher who had a sharp tongue that often uttered sentiments that played with words and their meanings, such as "I love you, but I don't like you". No doubt, this environment created a lot of confusion for the Mamet children (Nadel 15). Nadel's biography depicts the Mamet family repeatedly as a portrait full of disaffection and non-supportive attitude towards the children. David Mamet and his sister Lynn were constantly frustrated by their parent's behaviour, which drew them closer to each other, so that David and his sister have remained close friends and allies until this day.

The strict and non-indulgent way of Bernie Mamet and the confusing way of Lee Mamet created reason for much strife within the family, but it also played a great role in Mamet's upbringing as a prominent playwright. Indeed, a talent for choosing words and transmitting dialogues in a lively and culturally accurate way marks Mamet's works. Mamet was, also, greatly influenced by his father's work. As a labour lawyer Mamet's father raised awareness on bad working conditions and the overall situation of the working class for his son. It is believed that Mamet's sympathy for the working class and underdogs derives from this fact (Nadel 13). In 1991 when his father died, Mamet had reconciled with his father and it is reported that Mamet insisted on closing his father's grave himself, and after his death he often used the honorary Hebrew phrase "Olav'sholem" when talking about his father, which meant "of blessed memory" (Nadel 23).

As for relation to the stage, at the age of 14 Mamet moved to Chicago to live with his father, who was then divorced, and picked up on a career as a child actor. He entered the Yiddish theatre scene that was formed in Chicago back in 1887. Plays staged there, were not only written by Yiddish playwrights, but there was also a large repertoire of classical plays from Shakespeare, Moliere, Chekhov or other writers

translated into Yiddish (Nadel 23). Mamet spent long years in Chicago, attending theatre schools and working at theatres' backstage, learning "the trade". He worked in several different theatres, meeting actors, playwrights, directors and choreographers and watched them work.

In the years 1965-69 Mamet left the big city life in Chicago behind and attended the Goddard College in the modest district of Plainfield, Vermont for a BA in English literature. During his junior year he went to study at the Neighbourhood Theatre in New York to study acting with Sanford Meisner, who was a big influence to Mamet. Besides Meisner, Boleslavsky in New York, who both added revolutionary approaches to theatre, also influenced Mamet. The Meisner approach argued that theatre must be open to interaction between actors, saying, "The text is your greatest enemy" and emphasizing response over reaction (Nadel 37). Boleslavsky's approach on the other hand was very direct and right-to-the-point. He argues that an actor needs to memorize the lines, set himself an objective accordingly and then speak the lines clearly in order to achieve that objective (Nadel 39). Mamet adopted these two approaches immediately, liking their directness and concreteness. He couldn't however continue his second term in New York, and instead took on jobs in theatres and went to see many movies and theatre plays (Nadel 40).

According to Nadel, Mamet marks the working experience in *The Fantasticks* in 1967 as his "first true milestone in the Professional Theatre". One day when the assistant stage manager got ill, Mamet was pressed into the job of running the light board. During the play's climactic moment of a final reprise of "Try to Remember", he accidentally elbowed the master switch, among all sorts of switches and knobs necessary to adjust the lights, and plunged the stage, the house and the light booth in total darkness (Nadel 41). Mamet never forgot this moment and treasured it as an important lesson on how the technical staff must rehearse the movements just as much as the actors do. But it wasn't this lesson that made *The Fantasticks* so important for Mamet's career, it was how he was introduced to the practical matters and the know-how on staging a show every night and it also showed him how the audience could be addressed from the stage and engaged with the play (Nadel 42).

His experiences in New York convinced Mamet that he wasn't cut to become an actor, and so he decided to pursue his theatre career in writing and directing. With his newly gathered insight on theatre, acting and writing Mamet returned to Goddard to pursue his studies. During his studies he wrote the early drafts to several of his plays, *Sexual Perversity in Chicago*, *Duck Variations* and *Reunion*. For his senior thesis he wrote *Camel*, a "Second City-Style Revue" (Blansfield v). In fact, *Camel* was the product of a string-together of random notes and anecdotes from his notebook, as he had failed to write a play that he found satisfactory for several months and had finally decided to turn to his notes as a last resort. However with *Camel* Mamet's career both as a playwright and a director started, and in a very assertive way too since *Camel* included its own commentary and scene analysis to show what he thinks of theatre, acting and directing. His opinions about theatre presented in *Camel* have affected his whole career.

After graduating from Goddard College, Mamet moved back to Chicago where he worked at various jobs such as driving a cab and working in a real estate office; an experience, which he would use in writing his play *Glengarry Glen Ross* (Blansfield xxiv). At some point he was called back to Goddard to teach a term of acting and working with students which turned out to be very inspiring for him. Mamet describes this time of his life as invaluable for his playwright career, as it was a very productive period for him (Nadel 56). Mamet has written also several screenplays throughout his career for films such as *Hannibal* (2001) and *Come Back to Sorrento* (2010). He was the creator, executive producer and frequent writer for the television show *The Unit* (IMDB).

1.2. Literary Career of Mamet

Mamet's literary career is prominent for his direct style achieved by means of language and themes. The way he creates fractured, interrupted dialogues and a profane language provides a challenge for actors on the stage. His plot structures are scaffolded rather unconventionally as well. Mamet feels very strongly about his style, since it was, intellectually speaking, carefully built over the years, brewed and shaped by his plentiful experience of theatre as a theatre and movie enthusiast, actor and backstage worker and his education in two different colleges. After a long period of

personal development in his field he became a playwright and a director and his well-rooted background helped him for a rather fast success.

Nadel summarizes Mamet's ideas on theatre, based on his education and experiences in New York in the following extract:

The idea of a "through line", - the "single overriding action that all the individual actions serve" and that unites "the individual beats" of a scene was paramount. This was Aristotle (character is action) filtered through Stanislavsky and Boleslavsky. Further, the idea of subjugating all aspects of the production – "not just the script, but the acting and the plastic elements – to the through-line of the play" was also crucial. It would help him greatly on stage and in film directing. Acting, he also came to realize, was "about two people who want something different." What we try to do, he believes, is "*achieve our wishes from each other*" and awareness of this becomes the difference between good and bad playwriting. (Nadel 44)

His first play *Camel*, which he wrote for his senior college year, marks the start of his career as a playwright; Mamet was actually interested in becoming a director. In order to complete his senior year he was somewhat forced into writing a play. This is why he not only created his own commentary for *Camel*, but also provided a scene analysis to the play. Further, he decided to stage the play, which marked the beginning of his directing career (Nadel 44). Influenced by Brecht, Pirandello and his experiences in *The Fantasticks*, Mamet dived into directing this play, explaining his thought on directing and why he did not panic in his first directing attempt like this:

[I remembered] the advice of the Francis Parker School and John Dewey and the Neighbourhood Playhouse School of the Theatre and most of all, I remember that Acting is Doing. So I just started doing.

I tried to stage each scene for truth rather than for funniness; the more I worked at it the more appropriate this seemed. ... I found that directing, given a certain background of stage experience, is just common sense combined with an overview of each scene. (Nadel 45)

The idea that acting is doing did not only influence his directing, but also his writing. His childhood under his father's iron fist of literate dictatorship, Mamet knew well how to use words and his perceptive nature of the working class developed into his unique way of dialogue writing. Being a native of Chicago and very much in touch with the American society, Mamet is very much an urban writer. These features of his are turned into a gritty street language, one that requires a dynamic and fluent acting (Blansfield xix). Therefore, we can say that Mamet successfully implemented his ideas on acting and directing into his writing.

Although Mamet's career began as an actor and director before achieving success in 1976 with his three Off-Off-Broadway plays, *The Duck Variations*, *Sexual Perversity in Chicago*, and *American Buffalo*, his first career success was his play *Sexual Perversity in Chicago*, which was inspired by his time he spent in Chicago after graduation (Bigsby 1). Like his other works, *Sexual Perversity in Chicago* featured profane and characteristic language qualities and included urban tones by means of theme and language as it is set in Chicago. The play won an award as the best new Chicago play in 1974. The following year it was produced as a double bill with Mamet's new work *Duck Variations* at the off-off-Broadway St. Clemens Theatre where it also won the Obie Award for best new play of the year (Blansfield xxv).

American Buffalo, which was written after these two plays was also set in Chicago, helping Mamet set his image as a writer and establish his career. It was premiered at the Goodman Theatre's Stage Two in 1975, moving to New York the following year and winning Mamet his second Obie Award in 1977 and the play made its breakthrough to Broadway, earning a New York Drama Critics' Circle Award (Blansfield xxv). With these consecutive successes Mamet had managed to establish a name as a playwright.

In the 1980's Mamet started to move towards Hollywood and screenwriting. Mamet's first work was writing a script for *The Postman Always Rings Twice* (1981) for director Bob Rafelson. This was followed by *The Verdict* (1982) for Sidney Lumet and *The Untouchables* (1987) for Brian De Palma. For Mamet this was an important experience, as it taught him the importance of focusing on the plot rather than

character and dialogue, which became the characteristic features of his later works (Blansfield xxvi).

After his first script writing experiences, Mamet wrote and directed two of his own films *House of Games* (1987) and *Things Change* (1988). *House of Games* got a 4-star rating by Roger Ebert ("House of Games"), his highest score and it also got a thumbs-up by Vincent Canby ("House of..."). However Washington Post gave a fairly terrible review on the film (Howe). *Things Change* grabbed less attention than its predecessor by means of reviews; however it earned its co-stars Mantegna and Ameche Volpi Cups at the Venice Film Festival for their performance (IMDB).

His Hollywood work was relatively commercially oriented and preferred money, so he continued to work in several other movies as well as directing some of his own such as *State and Main* (2000) and *Heist* (2001) (Blansfield xxvi).

Throughout the 1980's and 1990's he continued to write his own plays, some of which were turned into television films or movies. These plays include *Glengarry Glen Ross*, *Homicide*, *The Water Engine*, *A Life in the Theatre*, *Oleanna*, and *American Buffalo* (Blansfield xxviii).

One of the plays that turned into a film was *Glengarry Glen Ross*, which featured a powerful cast including Al Pacino, Jack Lemmon, Ed Harris, Alan Arkin and Kevin Spacey. Different from the play, the movie introduces an anonymous character played by Alec Baldwin. Mamet edited the script to include a speech written specifically for this character about the sales contest, of intimidating nature (Blansfield xxvii).

1.3. Mamet & The Theme of Power Relations

Mamet who has identified himself through his work as an American urban writer most commonly writes the stories of low or middle working class people, con artists or people on the streets. His most common themes feature the failings and flaws of the American dream, deception and language as a survival skill and as a tool of power. Mamet is a deconstructive critic of the American culture and he finds that it is

best described by means of cheating, tricks and conning. Therefore, the theme of power relations is not directly addressed in Mamet's work.

However in *Glengarry Glen Ross* we see a hierarchical order in human relationships and how the characters try to gain an advantage over each other. The dialogues are very dynamic with characters interrupting each other or vainly trying to be in synch with the dominant speaker. In fact Mamet successfully uses language in his works, especially in *Glengarry Glen Ross*, to depict the power relations between the characters. It seems that Mamet adopted his father's view on that expressing one's self is the best way to show one's worth, and therefore his characters always try to gain some credit through speech. This is also closely related to Mamet's connection with con artists who try to cheat and deceive their way through life using language as a tool.

Mamet also had a fascination with knives and guns, a passion that was reflected in some of his works. Owning weapons is of course indubitably an act of power. According to Nadel, guns and knives were a symbol for Mamet for the world of men and completely attributed to masculine identity (Nadel 52). We can see his fascination also in his works. Mamet loved to show the life of the Chicago mob in his work, because he saw criminals as a part of the local culture. In most of his works we see a heavy patriarchal culture where men have to prove their strength to other men. In the movie *The Untouchables* (1987), the character Malone says; "You wanna know how to get Capone? They pull a knife, you pull a gun. He sends one of yours to the hospital; you send one of his to the morgue. *That's* the *Chicago* way!" Here the knife and the gun are clearly a metaphor for power. People with weapons are powerful; people with guns are more powerful than people with knives.

By means of power relations Mamet also has some works on men and women relationships, although some critics accused him of reflecting gender issues somewhat one-sided. Women never seem to have important roles in his works; in fact, they feature hardly any female characters at all. The exception may be his film *House of Games* where the main character is a woman who in the end of the film reclaims control over her life. In fact, she does this by firing a rifle at the con artist Mike three times (Mamet 1987). So we see that the woman's act of reclaiming power is by using

a masculine tool of power. Indeed this point of view offers an interesting alternative to Mamet's usual approach where the con-man, the man who bends the words for his own purposes, is not the powerful figure, but he is overthrown by the woman who carries a weapon. Similarly in *Glengarry Glen Ross*, we see that the only female character in the play, Mrs. Lingk, who is an invisible character, will again overthrow the con-man. Mr. Lingk who has been talked into buying an estate by salesman Roma is bullied by his wife into breaking the contract, and she has such a strong impact on her husband that none of the talking or conning of Roma's works.

Although we can say that Mamet never explicitly means to comment on power relationships, it is a theme that can be found in his works which are dominantly masculine and often about men who need to prove themselves somehow in order to gain acceptance in their patriarchal community. It can be seen, by not reading too hard between the lines, that the issue of how power is perceived and seized takes place in his plays and scripts. Generally speaking, the main feature of power relations is the power of speech and how it is used to secure and maintain a position of power through this skill, since scammer and double-dealers are a part of Mamet's repertoire of favourite characters.

2. LIFE & WORKS OF JOE ORTON

Joe Orton is a British playwright who died at the early age of 34, leaving only a limited number of works behind. During his literary career he has written 10 scripts to be performed on stage, as radio plays or as television movies. He also has written three novels, one of which was co-written with his lifelong partner Kenneth Halliwell. Although he has only written a few plays, he has managed to enter the world of literature as a distinguished and unique playwright.

Orton is distinguished by his direct style and his black humour. Not only his use of language but also his choice of theme and his depiction of his characters are usually aimed towards shocking his audience. Common themes Orton wrote about include sexuality, perversion and murder. He often mocked and criticised authoritarian institutions such as the church or the police and his works often question society, morality and authority. His dark but farcical cynicism has added the term *Ortonesque* into the literary terminology.

2.1. Orton's Biography

Joe Orton's life which met a tragic ending too early was marked with unfortunate events. During his 34-year-life he suffered from diseases that set him back in his education and career and in the end he was brutally murdered by his lifelong partner Kenneth Halliwell (Orton 1).

He was born in 1933 in Leicester, England as a son of a gardener and a working mother in the footwear industry (Leicester City Council). His family always had to struggle to make a living, which made them unaffectionate and isolated from each other. Orton was not a healthy child and suffered very often from asthma attacks, which caused him to be absent at school very often. Unfortunately this resulted in his 11+ failing. He was sent to Clark's College after that, which his family paid for with great hardship, but instead of the liberal education his mother expected him to get, he learned Pitman's shorthand and accounting. But even there he was anything else but successful. His teacher remembers him as a semi-literate boy who would lisp and

hardly put a sentence together (Orton 11). He left school at a very young age, and after that he began working as a junior clerk at the age of 16 (Billington 249).

His interest in theatre began around 1949, joining several theatrical societies such as the Leicester Dramatic Society. There he worked in amateur productions. Shortly after he applied for a scholarship at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art (RADA) and got accepted in 1950. However he could only start his courses in 1951 due to appendicitis first, and then because he received call up papers for National Service (Leicester City Council).

It was in RADA that Orton met Halliwell. They quickly became lovers and moved in together in a flat in West Hampstead. Their life together would be a mischievous one. Halliwell was living off an inheritance and was seven years older than Orton. After their graduation, they worked at different jobs for a while, but in the end they both moved to London to become writers (Leicester City Council). Orton and his partner lived off Halliwell's inheritance and Orton's unemployment benefits. They lived an isolated life together and were very convinced of their literary genius, which is why both of them refused to work for long terms. They worked together on several novels, such as *Lord Cucumber*, *The Mechanical Womb*, *The Last Days of Sodom* and *The Boy Hairdresser*. All of them were rejected by the publishers, which is why in 1957 Orton decided to write on his own and started to work on his novel *Between Us Girls* (Leicester City Council).

In 1959, Orton and Halliwell started to steal books from the Islington library and altered these book jackets. Creating obscene and mocking collages on the dust-jackets of the books, Orton and Halliwell also decorated the walls of their flat with pictures from books. In 1962 both of them got arrested for stealing and defacing 72 library books and removing 1,653 plates from art books. They got a fine of 260 pounds and were sentenced to prison for 6 months (Kidd 2012). However, today the same book covers are being exhibited in The Islington Local History Centre as works of art rather than tools of crime (Islington Council, The Random House Group Ltd, The Orton Estate).

Orton found his time in prison refreshing in some ways. Not only was it his first time separation from Halliwell for the long run, it also showed him “what really lies under the surface of our industrialized society”, as Lahr quoted in the "Introduction" to Orton's *Complete Plays* (Lahr 15). For Halliwell prison was a devastating experience, however Orton found it to be a liberating experience, as he could break free from his lover creatively and after that his literary career started to flourish (Leicester City Council).

In 1966, Orton's mother passed away due to a heart attack. Orton explains the occasion in his diary how the distressful event affected his family. From his diary entries it can be seen how unaffectionate the family members are with each other, although it is evident that Orton was shaken by this incident. His father was devastated and lost his mental stability after his wife's death, not being able to recognize his own children and generally acting lost and confused (Lahr, "Introduction" 22-23).

The cold family relations in the Orton family might explain his attachment to Halliwell. It is often mentioned in his biographies that Halliwell was a mentor and a father figure for him (Leicester City Council). Orton, being an untalented, semi-literate boy with a heavy working-class Leicester accent when he was a teenager, his partner Halliwell played a major role in Orton's development and education. Halliwell taught Orton what to read and how to write, although their attempts of writing together were a failure.

During 1966-1967 Orton had established a good life as a successful, rich and celebrated writer. He and Halliwell went on a holiday in Tangiers, from which Orton wrote in his diary: “We sat talking of how happy we felt. And how it couldn't, surely, last. Or we'd be struck down from afar by disaster because we were, perhaps, too happy” (Lahr, "Introduction"27). Indeed, after their return, on the 9th August 1967 Halliwell and Orton were found dead in their home. Nine hammer blows to the head, executed by Halliwell, had killed Orton. Halliwell lay dead on the floor due to an overdose of 22 Nembutal tablets. His suicide note referred to Orton's diary entry from Tangiers (Leicester City Council). The comments were Halliwell simply couldn't take

to be the sidekick of his successful partner, with no substantial career success of himself.

Their funerals' were held in Enfield; on different days, which were attended by only three relatives and Orton's agent. Orton however was bid farewell by his family, friends, colleagues as well as the cast of *Loot*. He was brought to the coffin with his favourite Beatles song, "A Day in the Life". Upon the suggestion of one of Halliwell's relatives, their ashes were mixed together (Leicester City Council).

2.2. Literary Career of Orton

Orton's literary career, similar to his life, was too short, as his life, and full of hardships. First years as a writer, Orton spent co-writing with his partner Halliwell and every work they wrote was rejected by every single publisher. The first play he ever wrote was called *Fred and Madge* in 1959, at the age of 26, and it featured a couple that was merged in clichés. What was interesting about the play though was that Fred's job was pushing boulders uphill and Madge's was sieving water in a bath. But just like the second play he wrote in 1961, *The Visitors*, it was rejected by the BBC and the Royal Court (Joe Orton Online).

Orton's career started to flourish when he started to write solo and also, ironically, after the time spent in prison. Orton reflects all these experiences on his plays *The Ruffian on the Stair* and *Entertaining Mr. Sloane* in these words: "Being in the nick brought detachment to my writing. I wasn't involved anymore and suddenly it worked" (Orton 16). His first career success, meaning that it was acknowledged as a literary piece and presented to the public, was *The Ruffian on the Stair*, which was broadcasted on the BBC Radio in 1964 (Orton 1).

His play *Entertaining Mr. Sloane* on the other hand was his first major success. It was first produced in London at the New Arts Theatre in 1964 and the later same year it was staged in West End's Wyndham's Theatre (Orton 64). *The Times* wrote about the play that it "made more blood boil than any other British play in the last ten years" and his play *Loot* was called "a Freudian nightmare" by the same source (Orton 1).

His whole career was marked by such remarks and he produced some of the criticism by himself under the false name Edna Welthorpe (Orton 1).

Whereas Mamet is a witty, deconstructive critic, Orton is a complete demolisher. He always took the risk of speaking about “dangerous” topics and in all his life he was judged and torn down because of his apparently non-existent moral values. He was very controversial with his attitude, his criminal past and even with his sexual orientation, which he never found necessary to hide. However when comparing Mamet to Orton we can draw some parallels between their views towards literature and the emphasis they both draw on the power of words and language. In his novel *Head to Toe* Orton explains his views towards playwriting as opposed to writing prose:

To be destructive, words must be irrefutable. Print was less effective than the spoken word because the blast was greater; eyes could ignore, slide past, dangerous verbs and nouns. But if you could lock the enemy into a room somewhere, and fire the sentence at them you could get a lot of seismic disturbance (Orton 8).

As we can see, for Orton, writing was a battle, and his readers or audience was “the enemy”. He found that words could be used to create panic and to “knock the audience dead” (Orton 10). This was how Orton aimed to make his audience laugh and as Lahr beautifully explains in the introduction of his *Complete Plays*, “the word ‘Ortonesque’ worked its way into the critical vocabulary as shorthand for scenes of macabre outrageousness” (Orton 11).

Orton was very much a writer whose writings were inspired by his own life. “My writing reflects the life I’ve lived. If I’d had a different life my writing would be different” he said in one of his interviews (Barnett Orton), much like Mamet who also wrote about places and people he met in his life, as mentioned previously. Whereas Mamet wrote about the artificiality of the American dream, Orton similarly deconstructed the middle-class utopia, and the snobbishness of people who saw themselves as higher for dedicating their life to hard work, although they never achieve more than the average. His sister Leonie said about him:

He hated middle class pompousness, the ‘holier than thou’ attitude. Joe’s recently published early works, such as *Fred and Madge*, show his emergence as a satirist, attacking the lower middle class provincial life and obsession with work as a virtue. (Barnett Orton)

The Good and Faithful Servant, for example, displays exactly these thoughts. According to Leonie Orton, Orton’s sister, it is the most autobiographical work he wrote.

Another aspect of similarity when comparing Mamet and Orton is their belief that theatre is an instrument for showing the truth. Although both are writers of humorous plays, their aim was never to simply amuse the audience. “I tried to stage each scene for truth rather than for funniness” Mamet said once, and this mentality definitely exists in Orton’s work as well (Nadel 45). Orton always wanted to show his audience how society was, especially after his revelation in prison. In his diary entry of the 2nd January 1966, shortly after his mother passed away, he mentions a phone call with Peter Willes who was a Yorkshire Television producer:

I told him about the funeral. And the frenzied way my family behaves. He seemed shocked. But then he thinks my plays are fantasies. He suddenly caught a glimpse of the fact that I write the truth. (Orton 24)

In the diary entry just after that, of the 4th January 1966, we see that Orton also shared some of Mamet’s thought on acting in the form of an anecdote. Acting is about action and interaction. So on the 4th January, Orton took his deceased mother’s false teeth to the theatre where they were working on *Loot*, and gave it to Kenneth Graham who was in the role of Hal, a character whose mother’s dead body keeps reappearing around the house.

I said to Kenneth Graham, “Here, I thought you’d like the originals.” He said “What.” “Teeth,” I said. “Whose?” he said. “My mum’s,” I said. He looked very sick. “You see,” I said, “It’s obvious that you’re not thinking of the events of the play in terms of reality if a thing affects you like that.” Simon Ward [who played Dennis] shook like a jelly when I gave them to him. (24)

It was this kind of audacious behaviour that marked Orton as a peculiar man, but it was his peculiarity that marked him as the literary genius he was. He did not irk away from any theme or topic nor did he find anything too uncomfortable to write about, which is the attitude that was the trademark of his literary works.

2.3. Orton & The Theme of Power Relations

Orton loved to play with a large variety of controversial themes to point out the absurd and distorted way society was formed. His works included obscenity, homosexuality and murder. Orton always aimed to push the moral limits of his audience. His aim was to shock and to slam what he had to say in the face of his audience. Therefore, his themes were affected by his style.

It has been mentioned that Orton's works were greatly influenced by his own life. As is evident with the library theft incident, Orton didn't have much regard for authority or law. He didn't let any entity of power (God, the church, parents or corporations) shape his life. He rejected any suppressive force as can be understood in the way he didn't feel the need to hide his sexual identity, at a time when very few homosexuals dared to do so.

That is why power and authority was a common theme for Orton. Not only in *The Good and Faithful Servant* but also in *Fred and Madge* and *Loot* we see Orton's despise of authority. His play *Fred and Madge* criticises the middle-class arrogance, in a very similar way Mamet criticises the faith in the American dream (Barnett Orton). His later plays, on the other hand, criticise bigger authoritarian institutions like the church, the police or psychiatric institutions.

In *What the Butler Saw* Orton analyses the concept of the decisive authority on whether a person is mad or not. The authority on this in the 20th century are psychiatrists, but of course the history of madness, as Foucault so luminously wrote about, is full of other authorities who decided that people were mad, when in fact modern science revealed that they weren't. So Orton asks the sceptical question of "Who is to know if they are not wrong this time?" The fact remains that society's

classifications of who is mentally stable and who is not; who is normal or out of the line, and therefore who is showing acceptable or unacceptable behaviour is solely based on personal and collective experiences. Thus the “power” to name classes or people –which can be related to the power of language-, is in the hands of society, which is not a single, but a collective entity that consists of individuals. Conclusively, the only thing that can shatter this illusion of authority is, that individuals stop to play along, which is exactly what the characters of the play do. The whole play is a farce where the characters act in impossible abnormal ways, showing in a very *Ortonesque* way that power relations are but an illusion.

Inevitably, the subject that appears in such a play is the theme of power abuse as well. If sanity is a relative concept based on the opinions of the majority, then it is in the hands of the few who lead this majority to put people into places like prisons, schools or mental health clinics, be it as doctors or as patients.

What characterises Orton’s work though is not only the themes and his intellectual approach to these themes, but his literary and dramatic approach. Orton’s plays are designed in such a way that it is quite inevitably the stage is soon filled with shouting, screaming lunatics, as can be seen in *What the Butler Saw*. Similarly in *The Good and Faithful Servant* and in *Loot* we see how satirical and sarcastic phrases that carry the heavy load of communicating the main theme are not shoved into the audience’s face with dramatic gestures. So we see phrases such as “I represent Her Majesty’s Government. Your immediate superiors in madness” (Orton, “What the Butler Saw” 376) and “How dare you involve me in a situation for which no memo has been issued?” (Orton “Loot” 270). That openly mocks authorities, such as the government or the police force subtly woven into the dialogues.

Orton’s play *Loot* is a good example on his attitude towards authorities and how he approaches the theme of power relations. The play is a satire that criticises the church, social codes and values as well as the police force. The main characters are two young men called Hal and Dennis, who have acquired a reputation for their immoral behaviour; promiscuity, homosexuality, gambling and unemployment are some of the main topics these characters are frowned upon for. Contrasting their outrageous behaviour, they are surrounded by a conservative, Catholic community. The members

of this community use every chance to remind these characters of social codes that enforce power and authority over individuals. The father of the family needs to be obeyed, sex should only happen between two spouses of the opposite gender and individuals should work hard for a happy and satisfactory life, and the reason is simply because “it is lawful” or because “God wills it so”. Morality cannot offer a rational or practical answer to why people should behave the way society expects them to behave, which is skilfully presented by the writer through sarcastic dialogues.

The characters Fay and Truscott in the play are representing the authoritarian forces of society, Fay representing the church and Truscott the law. Initially every sentence that comes out of their mouth reminds the audience of their position and of course of their duty towards the society. They are merely tools for power; they represent the authority but are not entities of power themselves. Again we see that institutions bear power and individuals are the ones who carry them out. The members of the society such as Hal or Dennis are the ones who must struggle against these power structures.

Orton once again shows his skill for farce and satire in this play where all the characters contradict themselves or the values they should be representing in a witty and funny way, as we see in this dialogue between Fay and Truscott:

FAY: I'm innocent till I'm proved guilty. This is a free country. The law is impartial.

TRUSCOTT: Who's been filling your head with that rubbish?

FAY: I can't be had for anything. You've no proof.

TRUSCOTT: When I make out my report I shall say you've given me a confession. It could prejudice your case if I have to forge one. (254-255)

Here we see how ruthlessly Truscott can bend reality, and that he has the power to get Fay arrested if he pleases. Once again Orton deals with the subject of power abuse. This is his greatest criticism when it comes to power relations: authority is a means of exploiting the individual based on some rules set by institutions, such as the law and the church.

Although Orton is distinguished by his direct and outrageous style, he has a very subtle way of making a point about certain subjects. Even though he seems to be mocking everything in his farces on the surface, underneath them we can recognize love for individualism and personal freedom. He rejects every type of authority in his plays, because the only person, who should have power over someone, is that one's self. Therefore, we can conclude that according to Orton, institutional power is an illusion that can be fended off through the individual. If it is an institution working with prejudices, it should be every member of the society's responsibility to resist it.

3. NEW HISTORICISM & PANOPTICISM

A New Historicist approach and the concept of Panopticism are used in this study as analytical tools. This section attempts to give an insight of the approaches on which this study is based upon. New Historicist criticism, which bases its criticism on the historical, social and cultural context of the time the literary text was written, is also related to Foucaultian ideals by means of viewing history and culture, as Foucault very often uses literary texts or significant historical events to explain a situation or an idea. Similar to Foucault, New Historicists refuse to view texts on the basis of a singular cause-effect relationship, but try to view these ideas as a whole. Just as in the way Foucault views separate ideas and combines them, such as relating discipline to power, or power to productivity and to use the measurements taken against the plague in the 17th century, the New Historicists aim to analyse literary texts from a broad, yet historical perspective putting co-texts side by side with literary texts. With this in mind, the Panopticon and its ideas on power and discipline related to that will be analysed so as to be used in later sections in the analysis of the literary texts of Mamet and Orton.

3.1. Foucault & Panopticism

Panopticism is a social theory by Foucault, which is based on the idea of the Panopticon. The Panopticon is an architectural design for institutional building proposed by 18th century social theorist and philosopher Jeremy Bentham (Bentham 1995, 29). The architectural structure was designed especially for buildings such as prisons, hospitals, asylums and schools, or in short for "any sort of establishment, in which persons of any description are to be kept under inspection" (Bentham 29).

The idea of the Panopticon is basically very simple: the building is of circular shape and the glazed cells are installed within these walls, as if they are windows. The middle of the building is empty, and some sort of watch tower is placed in the very centre of the building, so that from the tower the officers can see inside every cell. Barton & Barton explain the design like this:

The architecture incorporates a tower central to a circular building that is divided into cells, each cell extending the entire thickness of the building to allow inner and outer windows. The occupants of the cells are thus backlit, isolated from one another by walls, and subject to scrutiny both collectively and individually by an observer in the tower who remains unseen. Toward this end, Bentham envisioned not only venetian blinds on the tower observation ports but also maze-like connections among tower rooms to avoid glints of light or noise that might betray the presence of an observer. (138)

The prisoners therefore will be completely invisible to each other, as they are divided by walls. Visibility is a trap, as Foucault explains. According to Bentham, power must be visible, although unverifiable (Foucault 201). Therefore, the glazed glass will be made in such a fashion that the prisoners cannot see the inspectors, although they can be seen, and thus they will never be quite sure if they are being watched. So doing, Bentham aims to achieve a feeling of omnipresence. "One station in the inspection part affords the most perfect view of every cell." as Bentham explains, and change of place will occur rarely, if ever (qtd. in Evans 195).

The purpose of such a design is clear. Prisoners will be under surveillance at all times, and even if they are not, they will be under the feeling that they are. The officers will have total control and power over the prison. The absoluteness of control is, of course, for the prisoners, frightening, very oppressive and highly disturbing. Bentham successfully promotes his idea:

Morals reformed - health preserved - industry invigorated - instruction diffused - public burthens lightened - Economy seated, as it were, upon a rock - the gordian knot of the Poor-Laws are not cut, but untied - all by a simple idea in Architecture! (29)

Foucault has taken this idea into a new perspective and has elaborated the idea of the Panopticon into a social context. Foucault uses the Panopticon as something further than

a prison, school or similar building, but he discusses it as a structure that does not have to be architectural. The idea of panopticism can be used for the economy, in mass production, or today even for the internet. How does the Panopticon work as a metaphor for something not physical but conceptual and virtual? In his book *Discipline and Punish*, where he discusses the idea of panopticism, Foucault says that "Panopticism is the general principle of a new 'political anatomy' whose object and end are not the relations of sovereignty but the relations of discipline" (208). Foucault takes the idea of the Panopticon outside the institution and analyses its features as a concept.

Foucault sees the idea of discipline as something necessary and fixing. Discipline fixes because, "it arrests or regulates movements; it clears up confusion; it dissipates compact grouping of individuals wandering about the country in unpredictable ways; it establishes calculated distributions" (219). Based on this idea Foucault begins with the problem of the plague in the 17th century. A disease as fatal and epidemic as the plague needs to be quarantined and purified in an orderly fashion. Partitioning space by closing off houses, separating the plagued from the healthy was the only way to solve this terrible problem. According to Foucault it was the plague that made it necessary to invent a new set of techniques, institutions and other kinds of disciplinary mechanism in order to measure, inspect and supervise the plague (195-7). Foucault argues that all modern mechanisms used to brand certain individuals as abnormal (the sick such as lepers and plague victims or the mentally insane) derive from the fear of the plague and the techniques used for the purposes of defeating the disease (198).

According to Foucault, the Panopticon makes the use of power more economic and effective. Foucault does not expect this structure to save society, but to operate according to a purpose, like spreading education, develop the economy or improving public morality. Through the Panopticon disciplines could be distributed throughout society (207-8). Foucault argues that there are two images of disciplinary mechanisms: The *discipline blockade* which is an exceptionally enclosed space on the edge of society, and the *discipline mechanism* which is a functional mechanism that makes power operate more efficiently (209).

Foucault further proposes three different ways the disciplinary society functions: the functional inversion of disciplines, the swarming of disciplinary mechanisms and the state control of discipline. *The functional inversion of the disciplines* is the expectation of the neutralization of dangers by playing a positive role. Inconveniences of large affects are to be prevented, but not by military discipline as it may have been in the 17th or 18th century, but by enforcing respect for regulations and authorities. This is best done through education and it aims the making of useful individuals for the society (210).

The swarming of disciplinary mechanisms relates to the idea that these mechanisms will become de-institutionalized as they increase in numbers and that they will start to circulate openly in the "free" society. Compact disciplines will turn into flexible methods of control (211). *The state-control of the mechanisms of discipline* relates to an institutional mechanism that will enforce social discipline, such as religious groups or the police (212).

So to sum up, Foucault requires for a disciplined society a certain educative force that will enforce disciplinary rules and regulations, which will after a while start to circulate freely in form of social expectations but will also require an institution to watch over. It is a system that he expects, or hopes, to be injected into the society and that should reign freely over society (216). It is this point at which the Panopticon starts to become a conceptual and/or virtual idea. Perhaps this can best be explained through an example.

Mark Dewey, who carried out Foucault's ideas in today's society, investigates the idea of the internet and "modern panopticism". In his blog he asks, "Is it the retrievability of information and traffic in the capabilities of the Internet that serve the modern panopticism?" (Dewey 2007). Dewey explores the idea that the internet has become more "disciplined". According to Foucault, "the primary object of discipline is to fix; [it] is an anti-nomadic technique" (218). But if discipline prevents groups and things to "wander about the country in unpredictable ways" as Foucault says, and the internet enables us this wandering in unpredictable ways, then what is fixed, in the example of the internet? According to Dewey, the unpredictable can be made predictable through

media and bandwidth ownership, and thus the internet can be used as a tool of discipline. This means that the internet, due to its unlimited access to information, can be used for control. It has not only factual information, but also information about individual's private lives and conversations. It is an up-to-date issue that governments are trying to get hold of conversations and messages people send each other over the internet, in order to learn about the people's political ideas, their consuming habits etc. Nothing that can be found on the internet is exclusive; ultimately everything is transparent in the Panopticon.

However one must not forget that the "information" is fixed on the internet. It is always there for everyone to have and it can be accessed orderly and it certainly helps us filter the right information from the wrong. And even if information is removed, it actually is never lost because nothing "really" gets lost in the database. So how do we incorporate the idea of the Panopticon? To answer this, we must identify the watchtower. The fact is that the watchtower exists, even though in this case we "prisoners" don't see it. Every website we enter is under surveillance, sometimes we see it from counters how many people have entered the site and how many people are currently online, but the fact is even if we don't see it, the count is still there. Which sites are visited by whom and when can be identified by professionals at all times.

Is panopticism therefore a means to oppress? Not to oppress, but to enforce discipline, and power, since according to Foucault discipline is a type of power (215). The original architectural structure was built so that the centre can see all, a structure that Foucault has described as "rigorously closed" (207). Yet, it does not need to be oppressive, as we see in the example of the internet, the figurative watchtower functions as the "all-seeing eye" and it is in fact a good way to gather information. Therefore, perhaps we can see the internet as a "disciplinary mechanism" that became de-institutionalized.

Indeed, there have been huge scandals over the years about giving information of individuals to third people, and several rumours are flying around that social networking sites such as Twitter and Facebook are under the surveillance of the government. There have been concrete examples in where dictatorial governments, such as the Turkish

government during the incidents of 2013, have used the information floating in cyber space to enforce discipline over its people. Watching tweets of Turkish citizens has enabled the Turkish government to root out protesters. Can we therefore talk of a society that is under surveillance? That remains to be a topic better left for social theorists. In this study however we will see the psychological effects panopticism has on people, from the point of view of the characters in the plays that are analysed in the following chapters.

3.2. Power Relations & Panopticism

The conventional definition of power is the sole combination of economic and political concerns. However Foucault has gone against the grain and he has delved into other dynamics of power without disregarding economic and political concerns. Foucault's conception of power is not a negative one and he advocates it in the following excerpt:

In defining the effects of power as repression, one adopts a purely juridical conception of power, one identifies power with a law which says no, power is taken above all as carrying the force of prohibition. Now I believe that this is a wholly negative, narrow, skeletal conception of power, one which has been curiously widespread. If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? (*Power* 119)

Power is fundamentally not negative and it is not merely controlled via repression, punishment or prohibition. It has “positive” sides as well and people obey it for this reason. Otherwise it would not be possible to expect people to obey it, knowing that the power is completely negative.

The power concept is not always crystal clear and it is a " [the] ‘bad marriage’ of positive sides such as discipline and order with negative sides such as exploitation and repression" (*Power* 120). Foucault himself announces that the power concept is still enigmatic and problematic:

The question of power remains a total enigma. We now know with reasonable certainty who exploits others, who receives the profits, which people are involved, and we know how these funds are reinvested. But as for power...we know that it is not in the hands of those who govern... No one, strictly speaking, has an official right to power; and yet it is always exerted in a particular direction, with some people on one side and some on the other. It is often difficult to say who holds power in a precise sense, but it is easy to see who lacks power. (*Language* 213)

According to Foucault power is not only a tool which is regulated by a group of people; but it can also be created by structures and buildings. This is the point at which the Panopticon comes into the picture once more: Foucault concretizes his ideas on power and discipline through this architectural building.

As we read the Panopticism chapter in *Discipline and Punish*, we can easily realize that Foucault was absolutely in love with the idea of the Panopticon. According to Foucault, the Panopticon is a representation of the mobilization of power against evil, it is power reduced to its ideal form. It is a "machine" that can be used by anybody. Therefore, power is not based upon the individual as it would be in an authoritarian mechanism. It is a fixed tool -anti-nomadic, in fact- that creates a homogenous effect of power (*Discipline* 202). Foucault saw the Panopticon as a device that opened up numerous possibilities; it could be used as a laboratory or machine to:

carry out experiments, to alter behaviour, to train or correct individual. To experiment with medicines and monitor their effects. To try out different punishments on prisoners, according to their crimes and character, and to seek the most effective ones. To teach different techniques simultaneously to the workers, to decide which is the best. To try out pedagogical experiments - and in particular to take up once again the well-debated problem of secluded education, by using orphans. (203-4)

For Foucault, the Panopticon was fascinating and exciting, however for a society so engaged in debates on human rights and individuality; these ideas may seem somewhat bloodcurdling. What is it about the Panopticon that makes its nature so hair-raising? It's "homogenous", unlimited potential of power over an individual. It offers a single unit to have control over a large number of people and it gives power over people's minds and behaviour through architecture. The ridiculous simplicity of this might be why Bentham and Foucault took the effects this structure may have on people so lightly.

Foucault argues that the Panopticon is a customizable model, calling Bentham's idea of using it for particular institution as "closed upon itself" in a similar way utopias are closed upon themselves: perfect in theory but with flaws when put into practice (205). The Panopticon, Foucault says, is a "cruel, ingenious cage" that has the potential of being used effectively and for the benefit of society (205). It appears that Foucault assumes that these experiments or training programs will be designed in a moral way. However history agrees that governments or other authoritarian institutions do not always behave in a moral way. The power of the Panopticon derives merely by its structure; however the power is still channelled by institutions.

Foucault's argument that the Panopticon will not degenerate into a tool of tyranny is based on the fact that the observer in the Panopticon can be anybody. The system of the Panopticon would not be disrupted by a change in the observant party, therefore anybody from the public could walk in and look how a panoptical school, hospital, factory or prison functions (207). There, however, Foucault makes the assumption that the Panopticon exists only to serve its purpose and that it would be therefore open to the public. However; if the institution exists to exercise power, just for the sake of exercising power (for example, for the purpose of torturing a certain group of people in society) it is very unlikely to be open to public.

According to Foucault, discipline is a type of power and panopticism is a way to achieve it (215). Foucault argues that rights should be guaranteed to a person when engaging in panopticism and that the Age of Enlightenment has invented disciplines as well as liberties (222). Similarly, just as the Middle Ages invented judicial inquisition,

the 18th century invented examination. At this point Foucault makes an interesting argument: if the extreme of ancient regime penalty was the dismemberment of the convict's body, the extreme modern penalty must be indefinite examination (227). Therefore, if the privacy of the body was disrespected during the Middle Ages, the mind can be exposed at these modern ages, perhaps also for the benefit of technological and scientific advancement. Indeed, there is so little left of the nature to discover, so many goals have been achieved in the field of technological advancement that it is only a matter of time and investment made on R&D to improve our technological equipment. The only big mystery that is left to the human kind is its own mind, for which the Panopticon provides a perfect opportunity to explore (as Foucault brought up earlier, so excitedly).

But what is power and how do people assume power over each other, if we are all born as human beings, even though under different circumstances? According to Foucault, power is created through discourse and ultimately resides within the individual, even if they are surveyed or punished. In "The Subject of Power," Foucault explains that "something called Power, with or without a capital letter, which is assumed to exist universally in a concentrated or diffused form, does not exist. Power exists only when it is put into action" (219). It shouldn't be confused with violence though, because although violence can in some cases be part of a power relationship, "In itself the exercise of power is not violence. [it is] always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action" (220). The Panopticon is power, put into action. Although it does not necessarily entail violence, it enforces control over a person.

According to Foucault, power is not a thing but a relation; it is not a negative force but a positive force that is productive. This explains how Foucault can see the Panopticon as a positive and productive force (*Discipline* 194): he believes that the power of the Panoptic machine can be used to enhance individuals in forms of schools and hospitals. Disciplinary institutions are structures of power, and they are based on the purpose of reforming the individual in a disciplinary way as to be functioning individuals within society. With this point of view he ends the chapter "Panopticism" with the question "Is

it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?" (228).

What is interesting about Foucault is that his ideas do not seem to accept the existence of an absolute morality. Perhaps this is why he does not shy away from putting schools and prisons into the same category. After all, who are we to say that schools are good and prisons are bad, if the morally right and wrong can change according to our point of view. Or whether the prisoners do or do not deserve the punishment they are meeting in prison? Foucault seems to look at humans as commodious instruments of the social structure. He does not argue how the Panopticon or the structure of power has been shaped. Instead, he argues how power might affect the individual. We will, however, look into this point of view through the spectacles of Mamet and Orton and their characters.

3.3. New Historicism

New Historicism is a school of criticism that was developed during the 1980s, as a reaction to the New Critics. It is based on Historical Criticism, which insisted that the author's life, his/her social background and the cultural context the work was written in were necessary to understand a literary work. The New Critics have displaced the Historicists, who have been displaced by the New Historicists (Murfin&Ray).

New historicists attempt to analyse the literary text with a consideration of its time, similar to the historicists. However, the point from which they differ from the historicists of the 1930s and '40s is that the critical school was influenced by the poststructuralists and the reader-response theory, as well as the social theories that were new at that time, such as the feminist, cultural and Marxist critics. Different from the historicists, new historicists tend to see history not as linear and as purely objective, and therefore they don't share the view that literary texts have a single or easily identifiable historical context (Murfin&Ray). They look at the literary text from a wider historical perspective, which gives their criticism more of a "socio-historical" element rather than

simply "historical". It does not overlook the social and cultural situation existent at the time the play was written.

Veeser summarizes some points that can be often seen in new historicist criticisms as following:

- That every expressive act is embedded in a network of material practices;
- That every act of unmasking, critique and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it exposes;
- That literary and non-literary "texts" circulate inseparably;
- That no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths, nor expresses inalterable human nature;
- That a critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participate in the economy they describe. (Veeser xi)

Interestingly, many critics argue that New Historicists have made use of the writings and ideas of Foucaultian critics while conducting their criticism. According to Myers, New Historicists use an academically categorized understanding of history, although they publicly disapprove of the notion of periodization, in a similar way Foucault has analysed some philosophical notions. It is Foucault's skill to put together incidents and phenomena that seem unconnected, and exploring a relationship between them based on cultural and historical critical analysis (Murfin&Ray). Even the idea of Panopticism is an example to this, where Foucault has used a structure designed in the 18th century to explain principles of discipline and power in every society.

Myers argues that New Historicists use the Foucaultian notion of episteme under a new and improved label. Similar to Nietzsche, Foucault has refused to see history as a linear and evolutionary process or a continuous strain of cause and effect relations. There is no beginning and ending to history and neither is there a single cause and effect relationship. History is rather moving in the shape of a spider web, encompassing some events and affecting various economic, social, cultural and political factors (Murfin&Ray). These ideas are precisely what moved the New Historicists, who have

rejected to see literature as a single-purposed and superficial thing with a single purpose and cause-effect relationship. History does not provide a model of truth, nor is it a string of facts and events; it is the complex structure of the human mind's evolution. New Historicists will, with a rather Foucaultian perspective, argue that there is no single perspective to the literary text and will attempt to analyse it from its historical and cultural context in an all-encompassing way. Therefore, when analysing the given literary texts from a panoptical point of view, we will not prioritize the writer's biographical information or his personal opinions. The main idea that the literary analysis will be based upon, which is panopticism, will also not be the sole perspective the analysis is based upon. The historical and cultural context in which the texts take place will be also taken into consideration, giving the analysis a more integrated quality.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYS IN TERMS OF PANOPTICISM

This chapter aims to analyse Orton's *The Good and Faithful Servant* and Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross* from a Foucaultian and New Historicist points of view. In both plays we will see the Panopticon metaphor as a means to observe and assert control over characters. Interestingly, both of the Panopticon metaphors are based on companies: in Orton it is a factory, whereas in Mamet's play it is a real estate office and both have used power relations within these companies to criticise a strongly capitalist society and how this materialistic culture has affected people. It is possible to draw parallels through this Foucaultian approach between these two plays, although they take place in different countries and on different time periods.

4.1. *Glengarry Glen Ross*

Glengarry Glen Ross was first premiered in 1983 and carries all of Mamet's characteristics as a play: it is set in Chicago, most of the characters are conmen and deceivers and the relationship between the characters and the whole feeling of the play is communicated by Mamet's unique usage of language, which is profane and also very life-like.

The play features the life around a real estate office and the difficulties its salesmen are experiencing. They are caught up in a very competitive environment, where the sales they make are put on a "board" which helps the company survey the salesmen. At this point we can talk about a strong panoptical metaphor, where the salesmen are placed and being surveyed by the "board" or Williamson, the character who operates the board. The salesmen try to survive this environment by lying and cheating their way to profits. Making profits however in this play is never displayed as something about company profit or personal benefit; it is about survival, because whoever is on the bottom of the board will be fired. In the end the characters are stuck in this system and cannot get out, because they are not aware that the walls of this figurative Panopticon are built by the characters themselves.

4.1.1. Plot Construction

Set in the merciless world of real estate business in America, *Glengarry Glen Ross* is about four Chicago real estate salesmen --Levene, Roma, Moss and Aaronow-- striving to survive a harsh competition. Their bosses organise a competition through which the first two, who sell more houses, will keep on working for the company while the last two will be sacked. The winner of the competition will be awarded a Cadillac, which is a motorized representation of success, and the second will get a set of steak knives.

The first act of the play basically introduces the characters and shows how the relationships between them are. In the first scene we see Levene and Williamson, in the second Moss and Aaronow and in the third Roma and Lingk. In all of these scenes the salesmen (or in the case of scene two, the better salesman) dominate the conversation and try to manipulate the other character into doing something. The parallel is unignorable. The dynamic of these conversations is also very high; the characters talk fast and interrupt each other very often, which present a very energetic play.

The play opens with "a booth at a Chinese restaurant, Williamson and Levene are seated at the booth" (Mamet 1). What time is it? Where is the Chinese restaurant? Who are Williamson and Levene? How old are they? Those questions are unanswerable due to inadequate stage description and characterization. The reader is not aware of the fact that this restaurant is a de facto extension of the real estate office where these two salesmen are working.

The play skilfully presents people trying to survive the ruthless world of real estate business as they are struggling to close deals and to achieve higher sales than their co-workers. Every sale made is being surveyed by the board and the best salesmen are generously rewarded, whereas the weak will be severely punished. Not surprisingly, the desperate and scared characters start to conspire against each other or try to manipulate each other. So in the first scene in the Chinese restaurant features that "veteran" salesman Levene is trying to persuade Williamson, whose job is to gather the leads and

distribute them to salespeople, into giving him the better leads. However his sales have been declining and Williamson refuses to inform him because it is against the company policy. Only the better salesmen can get premium leads, which is a concept criticised loudly and often throughout the play, as can be seen in the next scene.

In the next scene we see Moss and Aaronow having lunch together. Aaronow is worried that he will get fired because he hasn't made many sales lately and Moss complains about the way things are being run, perhaps in an attempt to cheer Aaronow up. Aaronow listens and agrees, trying in vain to complete Moss' sentences. Moss' long speech however turns out to be a manipulative act, as is revealed when he mentions Graff, how he took the leads to strike his own deals and what big of a success he is. He "hypothetically" mentions that if the leads should be stolen from the office, they could be used to make a fortune. Talking "hypothetically", Moss reveals an intricate con and tells that Aaronow should be the one to execute this plan.

Moss intimidates and threatens Aaronow into committing a robbery, presenting a crooked logic by arguing that everybody would suspect Moss, and that he should create himself an alibi while Aaronow steals the documents. Moss pressures Aaronow into committing this crime that very night, and if Aaronow does not agree to it Moss will do it himself, telling the police later that Aaronow was his accomplice. Aaronow is presented a peculiar scenario where in either case he can't win and he does not seem to be able to talk himself out of that situation. By listening to Moss's plan to ransack the office, he has been a co-conspirator.

Aaronow has difficulty in understanding how he got himself into this mess. He is a weak, passive character who did not have anything to say on his own during the whole conversation, which put him into this situation. This scene shows that there is no room for useless and unconvincing people in the real estate business, and symbolically in a capitalist world, and thus it is one of the key scenes in the play. The scene emphasizes Mamet's theme of the power of language as well as conning and deception.

In the third scene of the first act we see Roma and Lingk in a restaurant. Roma makes a long and very vague speech on what life really is about and being the master of your own destiny, to confuse him and manipulates him into buying land.

The first act of the play therefore does several things: First of all it introduces all the major characters and marks their characteristics. The scenes are designed so that we are introduced to two characters in each scene; in each of them we see one passive and one more dominating personality: while Levene, Moss and Roma are dominating and manipulative, Lingk and Aaronow are passive characters. Williamson however is different from all the others, being neither manipulative nor let him get manipulated. These scenes open up many intricate possibilities and create the question "What happens if all dominating characters are put into the same scene?" This question will be answered in the second act of the play. So to sum it up the first act creates an outline of the characters and their relations with each other. It is also significant that Act One takes place in one day, while Act Two takes place the day after.

Secondarily the first act is a slow and skilful build-up to the plot. What seem to be just everyday conversations of a stressful business life will lead into a short but complex chain of events. It shows how the salesmen are panicking, and how they are trying different methods to save their jobs: bribery, theft, blackmailing, fraud and selling people estates. All of these characters who are in planning in Act One will reveal themselves in Act Two.

Act Two starts the next morning in the real estate office that has been robbed the night before. We are introduced to a new character, police detective Baylen, whose only role is to interrogate the salesmen in an adjacent room outside the scene. The characters start to come in, all of them showing different reactions to the robbery.

Roma is the first one to storm in, demanding to know if the contract he made with Lingk was stolen as well, because winning the Cadillac depends on this contract. Williamson tells him that it was not. After Roma, we see Levene coming in, ignorant of the robbery, happy because he just closed a deal. He excitedly starts to tell his story

which only Roma is interested in hearing. Meanwhile the interrogations continue: first Moss comes out, angry at Baylen in the way he's been treated.

After Moss leaves, Lingk comes into the office to cancel his contract, because his wife was mad at him. Roma who already knows what Lingk will ask of him puts Levene into the role of an important and rich customer who needs to be taken to the airport immediately. They play out an act in order to delay discussing the contract until Monday, which is the date the contract will legally be irrevocable. His con however gets disrupted by Williamson who assumes Lingk is a customer who is worried about the robbery and assures him that his contract has been filed last night. Unfortunately this contradicts directly to what Roma said to Lingk before, which makes Lingk realize that Roma is not being honest with him. Lingk leaves the office, threatening to report Roma to the Attorney General.

Naturally Roma gets angry with Williamson, but his fit of rage gets interrupted by Baylen who is asking for Roma to be questioned. Levene however does not leave his fellow colleague alone and picks it up from where Roma left off, cursing and insulting Williamson. In his anger he gives out that Williamson was lying about the contract being filed. Indeed this had been the one night during all his time working for Mitch & Murray's where Williamson left a file on his desk for the night. Realizing that only the robber could have known this, Williamson exposes Levene as the thief.

Levene of course denies the crime at first, but realizing Williamson has cornered him, he tries to negotiate with him, trying once again to bribe him by offering him a certain percentage of his commissions. Williamson rejects it and reports Levene to Baylen.

As a last stroke of humour, Mamet reveals Roma who has seemed to be the nicest of the salesmen as a conman like all the others. After coming out of the interrogation, unaware that Levene is going to be arrested, Roma tells him that they should be partners. But just after Levene goes into the interrogation room Roma reveals that he is planning to share Levene's commissions, designing to scam him. So we see that there is a "morale of the story" kind of ending, the morale being "everybody is corrupted". In the end we see the

plot construction is very carefully planned, with a long and elaborate build up and a fast, dynamic and complex resolution.

4.1.2. Social, Historical and Economical Context of the Play

Glengarry Glen Ross was written and performed for the first time in 1983 and is based on Mamet's experiences working in a real estate office during 1969. It features the American business culture, as can be seen from the opening quote "Always be closing" which is a well-known practical sales maxim in the business world.

The plot, setting and language of the play are all based on this sub-culture of salespeople. At the beginning of the play Mamet puts a note to give some background information on the culture, explaining some key words used in relation to making sales. There are "leads" which define potential customers, "sit downs" or "sits" defining the appointments made with the customers or the "board" which is the sales graph showing which salesman made the most sales (Mamet liii). The focuses of the company as well as the people are very sales-oriented and the author's note is in a way an introduction to the distressing setting of the play.

The 1980's were the first time database marketing was introduced. This new way of marketing is a direct marketing strategy where information on potential customers is stored in a database to be addressed by salespeople later on. The play is based on this new understanding in the marketing world. In the play we see how the characters complain about the board and the way sales have changed. Levene, the salesman who has left his prime years behind a long time ago, complains about the new system of finding leads, constantly insulting Williamson for representing this new way of doing things. According to him, there shouldn't be a new way of doing things, there simply be "the way of doing things".

However all this background information on leads, sits and database marketing is only necessary in order to understand the context better, the whole business environment is a literary tool to represent the American postmodern materialist culture. Mamet did not

simply play on the idea of the "American dream", but something deeper. Mamet successfully shows the type of patriarchal materialism that will make people do anything to acquire "trophies", value objects, in order to prove their manhood. Kane finds that there is a strong parallel between this idea of the play and the Reaganist policies of that time:

The ideology of Roma's imaginary Glengarry Highlands is a credo based upon self-interest, which reverberates with the corporate-think of Reaganomics that prevailed in the mid-1980s when the play premiered. (Kane 203)

The 1980's in the United States was dominated by the presidency of Ronald Reagan, whose economic policies were referred to as "Reaganism" or "Reaganomics". Reagan was aiming to lower government spending and therefore taxes, however during his terms the defence budget was increased by 35%. Through his policies, which were very similar to Margaret Thatcher's policies, the rich got richer while the poor got poorer. Unemployment rates increased up to 7.5% during his term and poverty increased significantly. Although Reagan did not decrease welfare expenses, it was clear that he was no friend of the idea of the social state. During his terms Reagan told the story of welfare fraud, which was known as the "Chicago welfare queen" who allegedly had "80 names, 30 addresses, 12 Social Security cards and collected benefits for four non-existing deceased husbands "(Fialka 7A). Supposedly this welfare queen got a benefit of 150.000 dollars, did not work and drove a Cadillac (for which she is also known as the "Cadillac Queen"). This Welfare Queen became a widely known myth in the American folklore, although the facts on this story that was told by Reagan were not true.

It is in this setting the play is set: a country led by a Republican, conservative government where people started to lose their jobs and fall into poverty. It was important to hang onto those jobs and moreover, the culture demanded from a person to work hard in order to be worthy of living.

Moreover we can say that the American culture is strongly affected by individualism. In this play we see this as a survive-in-the-wild kind of individualism with the bottom line "every man on his own". Therefore, the men are in a constant struggle to show who has the upper hand. The Cadillac, in this case, is a trophy that will prove the man who owns it; he is better and more powerful than the others. The Cadillac is the cultural symbol for success, power and wealth and Mamet used this cultural symbol just as Reagan did. As Kane states:

The first prize is a Cadillac (Symbolic wealth) and the second, a set of steak knives (symbolic food). The remaining salesmen-the losers- face a metaphoric death represented by being fired. The contest encodes sales as acts of competition that are recorded on a sales board, establishing a hierarchy. (196)

Everything in the play is evaluated according to their potential of acquiring wealth or their potential to make another wealthy. For example, the play constantly uses insulting words to reference to certain minorities such as "Polacks" and "deadbeats". This is not due to racism, but it is because these people are too poor to buy estates, and thus they have no benefit to the characters. "Don't ever try to sell an Indian", Moss tells Aaronow, because they won't buy (Mamet 10). For the salesmen there are two types of people: customers and bad people.

As we look to the play we realize that to the characters in *Glengarry Glen Ross*, there is no way wrong if you can earn money. The salesmen can not only their customers, but also each other and basically everyone they can. No one judges the other for being dishonest because it is "just business". Mamet shows a world where wealth is the highest value, where honesty and other values count for fairly little, if not nothing. People who are good salesmen are being respected in this community, no matter how they have acquired that wealth. Jerry Graff is a great example to that. He has stolen some leads and has opened his own business. Moss admires him for that, "He's clean, he's doing business for himself" he says (13). Apparently cleanliness is based on how

much money you make, and if you have a lot of money and you don't have to pay commission to anyone, you are "clean".

It is evident that Mamet strongly criticises this mind-set and how the capitalistic society and business can corrupt people. There is no happy ending in the play. Everyone has played according to the rules they believed were necessary for survival and they lost. The play displays the control mechanism this society generates through its corruption, related to the idea of panopticism. As we will discuss in the following chapters, the panopticism does not require an external force to impose power and discipline over its inmates. The corruption this society generates builds certain figurative "walls" around people that force them to behave in the way society expects them to.

4.1.3. Character Analysis

Looking at the overall theme and plot construction and theme of *Glengarry Glen Ross*, it is not surprising to see that the characters are all male. The main characters are the four real estate salesmen Levene, Roma, Moss and Aaronow. These salesmen not only have to survive this merciless business world and earn their living, but they also have to justify their male-identities within the community they belong to. If a man fails to sell lands, he automatically becomes an outcast in this patriarchal community. Having sold a piece of land, Levene expresses that he gets back his male identity and he directly combines the masculinity with the success in his business: "And now I'm back, and I got my balls back" (Mamet 88).

The characters have an interesting hierarchy amongst themselves. The characters can be divided into different groups: First, there is a group of the four salesmen: Levene, Roma, Moss and Aaronow. These are the characters "out in the battlefield". They go out in the streets and try to talk people into buying property with help of the "leads". The relationship amongst these characters is solely based on the success rate of the individual: a salesman is only respected as much as he sells. They are also rivals, but a certain work ethics force them to be respectful towards each other. They are a peculiar mixture of friend and foe. But everyone else who doesn't belong to this group is an

alien to them and doesn't understand how things work in the business. Levene demonstrates this in his long speech to Williamson, in the first scene when he is trying to persuade Williamson to do him a favour, by using sentences like "that's 'talk', my friend, that's 'talk'. Our job is to sell" and "A man acquires a reputation. On the street" (3; 7). Here we see that according to Levene, going out on the street to find customers and talking them into buying property is the most reputable thing a man can do. Throughout the play we see that the salesmen are looking down on Williamson because of that.

The second group of characters, who are both influential in the play, powerful amongst the characters but are also very interesting because they are invisible, are the business managers. These characters influence the characters and events directly, but they never appear in the play. Mitch and Murray who own the real estate business are one of them, and the other is Graff, ex-salesmen who has made himself independent after a streak of successful sales. They have crucial roles in the play, although they are not represented by actors.

Mitch & Murray and Graff are two opposing external forces. In a way we can say that while one side is God, the other side is the Devil, however which is which is not entirely clear. Mitch & Murray are the slave-dealers with their whips at hand, driving the salesmen to sell, threatening them with dismissal if they fail to do so. Graff on the other hand shows the salesmen, especially Moss, the gateway to a different path. However none of these characters have ever directly spoken to the characters about these qualities. These things are simply "known" by the characters; somehow it has been announced prior.

The third group of characters are the customers. These are non-significant characters that have assisting roles in the play. They are simply necessary, because the play is about salesmen. However a "good customer" does not seem to exist. Either there are "deadbeats" or "Polacks", or they are Indians who are not interested in purchase at all. These characters are not seen in the play, but customers who don't buy are often mentioned as to represent the hardships in the real estate business. The only customer

who appears in the play is Lingk, who is being conned by Roma to buy an estate but who changes his mind after talking to his wife.

Although Lingk has a key role in the plot by helping Williamson figuring out who the thief in the office was, his character is weak, passive and insignificant. He is just another "John", whom Roma meets in a bar and shares a few drinks with. In one night he decides to buy a property, the next night after talking to his wife (or rather after being talked-to by his wife) he decides that he doesn't want to buy the property. He has no power or control over any events.

The last group of characters can be characterized as the "honest office workers" or perhaps as the "spoilsports". This group only contains Williamson and Baylen, the police officer who comes to investigate the theft and who is considerably less significant than Williamson. However they share one very important quality: they are just doing their job and this is why they are both despised by the salesmen.

Baylen is a character we rarely see on stage. He is investigating the robbery and interrogates the salesmen one by one in a separate room off-stage, away from the main action. Still, he is a character who raises tension, because during the dialogues he occasionally calls up someone's name, and the salesmen leaving the room generally complains about how the police is "behaving" but really, they are only complaining that the investigator has been asking routine questions. So once again we see the salesmen characters' contempt towards people from other professions, doing their jobs.

Figures of authority are generally frowned upon by the characters in the play: Mitch and Murray get their fair share of curses, while Williamson is treated terribly as the only authority in the office when Mitch or Murray is not present. Baylen is also disliked, although we know almost nothing about his personality. Even Lingk's wife who is assuming power on her husband is presented as a menace. Graff, on the other hand, who has surpassed authority, is being praised throughout the play.

4.1.4. Analysis of the Play in Terms of Panopticism

The Panoptic prison system can be applied to the business world in *Glengarry Glenn Ross* in the sense of power relations and "disciplinary power" that is "exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility" (Foucault, *Discipline* 207).

Foucault's Panopticon concept of power relations and disciplinary power has direct reflections on the sales contest in the play. All four characters are stuck into a prison-like business world where they all have to sell more than each other, and their success is under surveillance by the "board" in the company. The board is located in the "office", which basically is a representation of the watchtower at the centre of the Panopticon.

However, in the end no matter how many lands the characters will sell, two of them will get sacked. This dilemma causes a "frontier ethic" among these four salesmen. The frontier ethic they have created is a notion that a salesman cannot be successful only through hard work and rhetoric. He must rely on his fellow salesmen. They are destined to be a part of a professional rivalry. They are all "hands" to do this job. They have to sell more than each other, but it does not give them right to ignore other fellow salesmen. Therefore, they have to help each other in every possible circumstance. Levene, for instance, helps his rival Rome when he is in need of help to influence a remorseful customer Lingk:

ROMA. You're a client. I just sold you five waterfront Glengarry Farms. I rub my head, throw me the cue "Kenilworth."

LEVENE. What is it?

ROMA. Kenilw... . . . (Mamet 63)

The frontier ethic has not unconsciously been created by these salesmen; it is a product of two invisible guards, company owners Mitch and Murray, and the visible ones, which are the salesmen. Carrying it to a panoptical base, we can argue that "the gazed" that is in separate cells in the outer ring and "the gazer" that is in the inner watching-

tower have created the frontier ethic. Roma and Levene are helping each other out, although they are rivals, not because they like each other but simply because they don't have another choice.

The positions of the gazed and the gazer can be taken as negative and positive sides of the power respectively. The gazed, four salesmen, is visible in the design of prison architecture and it is against the gazer. The gazed perceives the gazer as a negative side of the power. However, the gazer, Mitch and Murray, is not negative in terms of disciplinary power relations. They are not even visible in the play, but their domination over the salesmen is visible as they have organized a sales contest to force them to be more productive for the firm. They have to encourage salesmen to sell more lands so as to stabilize their market share and to cut down costs. The sales contest has its punishment and reward simultaneously. The former two will be awarded with Cadillac and a set of steak knives, whereas the punishment will be a discharge from the job for the latter two. The sales contest also stabilizes the surveillance among the salesmen. Foucault articulates this power dilemma in his article "The Eye of Power" as follows:

One doesn't have here a power which is wholly in the hands of one person who can exercise it alone and totally over the others. It's a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised....Power is no longer substantially identified with an individual who possesses or exercises it by right of birth; it becomes machinery that no one owns. (156)

In this disciplinary power relationship, four salesmen accept the rules of the game and they are aware of the fact that they will be either awarded or punished. This system cuts their communication from each other. In other words, they are alienated to each other because of a lack of communication. They are all small cogs in "machine"; they do the requirements of the job. In this sense they are similar to the prisoners in the Panopticon. They are seemingly together, but in fact they are all in separate cells in the prison and are watched by unseen owners. This miscommunication between the salesmen is the core of the play. Their sentences are never fully finished as the listener always

interferes. The dialogue between Williamson and Levene reflects this miscommunication:

WILLIAMSON. Murray...

LEVENE. ... you talk to Murray...

WILLIAMSON. I have. And my job is to marshal those leads...

LEVENE. Marshal the leads... marshal the leads? What the fuck, what bus did you get off of, we are here to fucking sell... (Mamet 5)

The four salesmen talk exhaustively to conceal their insecurity, while acting their roles in their stressful lives. Roma acts like a spokesman of all real estate salesmen in his confession: "The true reserve that I have is the strength that I have of acting each day without fear" (36). Dialogues of the characters portray a harsh view of the declining real estate business in America. The guaranteed way to be successful in this business is to be successful already. Hard work and success bring better-quality success within this business world, but the values of business ethic and equal opportunity are overlooked by money holders, such as Murray and Mitch. Levene's plead to Williamson is a result of these unequal opportunities:

WILLIAMSON. Will you please wait a second. Shelly. Please. Murray told me: the hot leads...

LEVENE. ...ah, fuck this...

WILLIAMSON. The...Shelly? (pause) The hot leads are assigned according to the board. During the contest. Period. Anyone who beats fifty per...

LEVENE. That's fucked. That's fucked. You don't look at the fucking percentage. You look at the gross. (7)

The four salesmen do not choose to escape from the system except Jerry Graff. Turning the illusionary business world into a revolutionary one, Jerry Graff, who is an ex-salesman working with these four salesmen, runs his own business now. He rebels against the panoptical system of Murray and Mitch. He opens his own real estate office

courageously and he is no more in a cell watched by the owners. He himself is the owner now.

He is a great inspiration for other salesmen, but they merely "speak" of his revolt. The four salesmen do not act to rise up against the system that encapsulates them except Moss. He takes Graff as a Muse who inspires him to be brave enough to ransack the office. He appraises what Graff has undergone and attempts to pass his inspiration onto Aaronow:

MOSS. Look at Jerry Graff. He's clean, he's doing business for himself, he's got his, that list of his with the nurses...see? You see? That's thinking. Why take ten percent? A ten percent comm...why are we giving the rest away? What are we giving ninety per...for nothing. For some jerk sit in the office tell you "Get out there and close." "Go win the Cadillac." Graff. He goes out and buys. He pays top dollar for the... you see?

AARONOW. Yes.

MOSS. That's thinking. Now, he's got the leads, he goes in business for himself. He's...that's what I... that's thinking! "Who? Who's got a steady job, a couple bucks nobody's touched, who?"

AARONOW. Nurses.

MOSS. So Graff buys a fucking list of nurses, one grand--if he paid two I'll eat my hat--four, five thousand nurses, and he's going wild... (19 -20)

Graff's escape from the Panopticon is also a great example of depicting the miscommunication among the salesmen. They do not gather to rebel against the panoptacist system of Mitch and Murray. They merely come together and they become "seemingly" a team of sincere people who just go out of the cells of the prison when there are monetary advantages. Different from slaves or prisoners in the Panopticon, Graff or the other salesmen have the option of quitting their job. This condition helps the reader to understand how power is a "total enigma". This reflection of surveillance is a product of both the ruler and the ruled, but it is not oppressive in the lights of Foucault's power conception:

Power comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between rulers and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix – no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depths of the social body. One must suppose rather that the manifold relationships of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups, and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole. (*History* 94)

The phrase “power comes from the below” reflects the idea that those salesmen are powerful enough to rule over the owners. So although the salesmen are "below" the owners, they still have power. For instance, Moss and Levene ransack the office to steal "hot leads" and harm Mitch and Murray greatly. They have done something out of the Panopticon's view. Therefore, it is not always possible to say that all the power is in the hands of the owners. It is a manifold between the ruler and the ruled ones.

Foucault's analysis of power directs the reader to conclude that there is an "above" and a "below" in the real estate sales business. The "above" consists of the owners, Mitch and Murray, whereas the "below" consists of the hierarchy of the four salesmen. Four salesmen are watched and controlled by Williamson, a guard in the Panopticon, reminding the salesmen of Mitch and Murray who know everything that happens in the office. Those salesmen are aware of the fact that they have been exploited by the owners and this assumption creates a gap between the "producer" and the "product". This exploitation is the main cause of the ransacking of the office, since the premium leads that Levene and Moss need are given to Roma, which enables Roma to sell more lands and to have the first place on the board. These salesmen are not always the ones that have been exploited on by Mitch and Murray, they also exploit each other. In this sense, they can be both "exploited" and "exploiter" simultaneously. Everyone in this business world has power to use abuse or misuse power. They sometimes use it only to defend themselves and sometimes to offend others. The interactions between the characters is always based on assuming power over each other, and the pressure of making sales

causes the characters to constantly plot against each other. The dialogue between Aaronow and Moss is the best example for this, when Moss makes Aaronow part of a conspiracy. Aaronow is always pushed around by others and he is constantly interrupted by them while talking, because he cannot assume power. He cannot beat them with his own speech and therefore, he is weak.

That competitive atmosphere turns this business world into a warlike life in which everybody has to harm another just to survive this world. Their armour is "language to influence". Their speech performances directly affect their place in this battle field. Tools of speech are not only an act or a means of communication and interaction among these real estate salesmen, but it is also a manifestation of power. Salesmen are rhetoricians whose main talent is to have powerful speech ability. Besides, they are supposed to be all actors who love to play with words in order to make a living. Roma is the best example of the power of speech in the real estate business. Roma tries to confuse Link with unnecessary talk so as not to give his money back:

LINGK. But we have to before Monday. To get our money ba...

ROMA. Three business days. They mean three business days.

LINGK. Wednesday, Thursday, Friday.

ROMA. I don't understand.

LINGK. That's what they are. Three business... I wait till Monday, my time limit runs out.

ROMA. You don't count Saturday.

LINGK. I'm not. (Mamet 41)

The speech above demonstrates that talking ability is an example of the space those salesmen occupy in power relations. They are not dominated by others while talking. They all become "dominators" through their communicative powers. Their reliance on speech can be seen by the usage of "power phrases" such as: "I want to tell you", "all I am saying". They want to be listened to and they have a desire to "dominate" through the best thing that they are able to do: to talk. Speech gives them power and freedom.

A salesman who is "in his game" is not bound by the pressures or worries of the "real world", he can talk, lie and cheat himself over mountains in order to get that deal closed and the only socially accepted rule there is that nobody touches the player, nobody harms him or tries to destroy his game. If necessary they play along, they are always aware that the talker is in charge, the figure of power. For example, in the scene where Lingk, the customer to whom Roma has sold a property, comes back to the office to dissolve the agreement, Roma asks Levene to pretend to be a customer. Levene plays along, acting out as a prestigious customer working at American Express, who has bought several properties from that firm, in order to make Roma look reliable. Roma assures Lingk his check isn't cashed in and that he can terminate the deal, however while assuring him that to earn his trust he is trying to postpone the date of returning the check to Lingk, so as to close the deal. Once the check is cashed, the deal is closed and the customer cannot terminate the contract. At this point Williamson comes out of the office to tell the customer the check has been cashed. Lingk leaves the office, frustrated and scared of his wife, and Roma turns to him angrily because he interrupted his con. However his rage is interrupted by the police and Roma enters the inner room, leaving it to his co-worker Levene to pick up the raging. Levene is angry with Williamson because he is an office worker and he doesn't understand how things work "outside" the office. Williamson is not in their league, even though he has power over them because he is gathering and distributing the leads, he is in Levene's point of view below them, because he doesn't make a living through the art of speech (57-59).

Language professor, J. L. Austin argues that to say is as significant as to do in his article "How to Do Things with Words":

It seemed expedient therefore to go back to fundamentals and consider how many senses there may be in which to say something is to do something, or in saying something we do something, or even by saying something we do something. (108)

Austin's idea about "saying something and doing something" is utilized in every action or life style of those four salesmen. They do something by saying something even by

listening to something. For instance, a dialogue between Moss and Aaronow exemplify how a character can be an accomplice by only listening to a conspiracy. Moss' speaking about the criminal act is as significant as to do it and Aaronow is made an accomplice by only listening to Moss' plans. In other words, Aaronow has been turned into a criminal, when there even isn't a criminal act.

MOSS. they take me, then. They're going to ask me who were my accomplices.

AARONOW. Me?

MOSS. Absolutely.

AARONOW. That's ridiculous.

MOSS. Well, to the law, you're an accessory. Before the fact.

AARONOW. I didn't ask to be.

MOSS. Then tough luck, George, because you are.

AARONOW. Why? Why, because you only told me about it?

MOSS. That's right. (Mamet 32)

The dialogue is significant by means of choice of words and the manner of how these words are used. It shows how words can take you up or down in the world that has been created by the playwright. Moss here clearly states his power on Aaronow with a skilful use of language and rhetoric.

Mamet's skill in using language becomes evident in this play where all characters draw their power from rhetoric. All the characters use different form of figures of speech to achieve what they want. In the dialogue between Aaronow and Moss we see how Moss first makes a speech to Aaronow about how terrible the system of the real estate business is, showing him sympathy and giving him the feeling that they are both on the same side. Aaronow only tries to finish his sentences, as if the sentences reflected his own idea. Then before Aaronow knows it, he realizes Moss is revealing him his plan. Let us look at the part of the dialogue where Moss turns the conversation around:

MOSS. You don't axe your sales force.

AARONOW. No.
MOSS. You...
AARONOW. You...
MOSS. You build it! Men come...
AARONOW. Men come work for you...
MOSS. ...you're absolutely right. (Mamet 15)

Moss is injecting his own ideas to Aaronow, realizing Aaronow is repeating him. By saying "you are right" he is actually giving the right to himself. Aaronow does not speak a full sentence that is entirely his product throughout the dialogue.

The choice of words and how the words construct speech in this dialogue, and in other dialogues throughout the play, are essential to the powers of manipulation and the rhetorical skills of the characters. Austin explains the characteristic of constructing word blocks in his Speech-Act Theory, stating that there are three characteristics of statements that begin with the constructing of word blocks. These word blocks culminate in certain effects on the reader.

[...] Locutionary act, which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to 'meaning' in the tradition sense. Illocutionary acts such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking &c., i.e. utterances which have a certain (conventional) force. Perlocutionary acts: what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading. (Austin 108)

Those three features of statements are employed by characters in the play, but the Perlocutionary acts are utilized intentionally much more than the other two. The perlocutionary act creates the base of the playwright's striking word plays. For instance, Williamson's dull and dispassionate talks draw a daunt character image in the reader's mind. He represents the bureaucratic classes of the time through his talks. He speaks as much as needed, no more no less. He deters the salesmen around him by his dull talk

and those salesmen talk to him just as much as they need to do. The salesmen are dependent on Williamson because they need to take leads from him, which gives them the feeling that they need to have certain control over him.

The first scene of the play where Levene and Williamson try to convince each other is a great example of the Perlocutionary act in that this talk includes persuasiveness, deterrence and mislead, respectively. Levene at first tries to persuade Williamson to get hot leads to hold the first place on the board, but Williamson deters this conversation by saying "I'm...wait a second. I'm hired to watch the leads. I'm given...hold on, I'm given a policy. My job is to do that. What I'm told" (Mamet 6). Foucault's power conception echoes here as well. The power arises where there is conflict. Levene tries to be the dominating one in this conversation, but Williamson resists it. The resistance creates a 'powerful' power. As power is 'a total enigma', it is hard to choose who is powerful and stronger than the other. Levene seems to be the one who dominates the talk, but in the end Williamson does not give in to Levene and imposes his own terms on him, indicating that he has power to rule over.

Williamson symbolizes the watchman of the Panopticon that is Mitch & Murray's real estate office. As we see all the salesmen in the office are being closely monitored and are bound to the rules of the board. In the way Foucault anticipated, it is a completely transparent system that can be run by anyone. In this case Williamson is that "anyone". This is why he is always separate from the other characters; he is a part of the office but not part of the competition and the power play. He does not have to struggle for power, therefore his power is absolute. He is the "watching eye" of Mitch and Murray.

Another power relation that needs to be discussed arises between Lingk, a client, and Roma. Roma has already sold him "a piece of land", but now he wants to get his money back as his wife does not allow Lingk to buy the land. A powerful woman's voice in a masculine world of real estate business is echoed through Lingk:

LINGK. I don't have the power. (pause) I said it.

ROMA. What power?

LINGK. The power to negotiate.

ROMA. Tonegotiate what? (pause) To negotiate what?

LINGK. This.

ROMA. What, "this"? Pause.

LINGK. The deal.

ROMA. The "deal," forget the deal. Forget the deal, you've got something on your mind, Jim, what is it?

LINGK. (rising) I can't talk to you, you met my wife, I... Pause.

ROMA. What? (pause) What? (pause) What, Jim: I tell you what, let's get out of here...let's go get a drink.

LINGK. She told me not to talk to you. (Mamet 77-78)

It is not Lingk who tries to get his money back, but it is his wife who forces Lingk to go and get the money right away. This powerful woman dominates over both Roma and Lingk. Power relations are again dominant. Some critics accuse David Mamet of not giving a woman's voice in his drama, but this small short conversation shows that there are powerful women as well. It is therefore interesting that this invisible character is the only female character in this play which is dominated by patriarchal power relationships. This could be Mamet's statement on gender relations: the patriarchal system is such a complexly woven system that no men fail it, but a dominating woman can fail it. Perhaps Mamet aimed the audience to question the gender power concept with this dominating woman figure.

Mrs. Lingk's position echoes the position of Mitch and Murray in this sense, because the owners of the real estate office are not seen either. Therefore, power is not a stable and crystal clear concept in Mamet's business world. Power concept always arises when there is a conflict and struggle between the characters. Foucault states that there are three types of struggle in his essay "The Subject and Power":

Generally, it can be said that there are three types of struggles: either against forms of domination (ethnic, social, and religious); against forms of exploitation which separate individuals from what they produce; or against

that which ties the individual to himself and submits him to others in this way. (421)

In the play we can say that all characters -except Williamson- struggle against forms of domination, which is basically the competition that Mitch & Murray created. More specifically though, they are struggling against separate individuals. Mrs. Lingk struggles against the exploitative Roma while Roma struggles against Mrs. Lingk, who has made Mr. Lingk submit to her.

Roma's submissiveness to himself and to others occurs at the very end of the play. The office has been ransacked and the salesmen are all disappointed, but Roma yells "I'll be at restaurant" where he finds his 'victims' to sell lands. His struggle is to obey the rules of the game and he is a representative of Foucault's definition of struggle that points an "individual [submits] to himself and submits him to others in this way" (421).

Consequently, this business world of Roma is not a world of men. The power relations among individuals in the play are not stable and power is not an object to be held by an individual or institution. The power is not enough for the characters to get their male identities or authorities. They all feel the insecurity of the real estate business sales that has been powered by capitalists such as Mitch and Murray. Therefore, we see that the play successfully represents the capitalistic social structure that is growing in people, and how people adapt to this as the means of obtaining power changes. Money is the currency for power, and these salesmen can acquire this only through the effective use of language. The characters submit to this system, because of their fear of failure. They are under surveillance in the Panopticon, and this pressure forces them to comply with the rules of this society.

The most interesting aspect of the Panopticon is that, as we repeatedly emphasize, that it does not require any crowd control technique like indoctrination or brainwashing to make an individual obey to a certain set of rules. It is the mere structure that both mentally and physically forces people to act in a certain way. This is the point where the Panopticon becomes more than a building and becomes the idea of panopticism, which

exactly what we see in this play. The salesmen are not prisoners, but because it is simply a fact of the society they live in that a man needs to earn money in order to survive, and because jobs are hard to come by, they are forced by the circumstances to work there and to comply with their rules. If they do not make enough sales, they will be kicked, and so they hold on tight to the only skill they have, which is bending language in such a way that it will serve their purpose. By complying to this system, in fact by finding a way to cope with it -which is to cheat and lie to customers and colleagues- they turn themselves into prisoners, making it impossible for them to leave the Panopticon.

4.2. The Good and Faithful Servant

The Good and Faithful Servant is one of Orton's plays that gathered less public attention and that is, according to a number of critics, sadly underrated (Charney 139). It does not have Orton's typical violent and sexually shocking behaviour, but it rather attempts to show insight on how individualism and passion are sucked out of people by corporations. While Orton's sister has called *The Good and Faithful Servant* his most personal play, Charney calls it his most Marxist work (Barnett Orton; Charney 139).

Goodman of *The New York Times* has called the play "a mild Joe Orton work", sounding in his review disappointed by the lack of "an Ortonesque spin" that would have "startled us into unsettled laughter" (Goodman). Indeed Orton has aimed to sow the seeds of discomfort in his audience with this play, not expecting laughter but perhaps a chuckle or a quizzical smile. Nonetheless this makes the play no less witty, for even though Goodman found that "takeoffs on corporate conformity have become conformist" we can still see the sexual connotations that characterize Orton. The play's aim was to criticise the hypocrisy of lower-class morality and to show the control mechanism of the capitalistic society on the working class and thus far has proven itself accomplished.

4.2.1. Plot Construction

Most of the characters in the play are connected with each other through an unfortunate chain of events. In the first scene we see that Edith, a chairwoman of the factory, is the long lost love of Buchanan. As it appears they have worked in the same company for 50 years and never saw each other because they have been using different entrances.

As it turns out, Buchanan and Edith's short affair has produced twins, who died during the war leaving behind one grandson to Buchanan and Edith, although it is not clear, who the father is. This revelation causes for the old couple to decide to marry immediately, to right the wrong they made in their younger years. But the promiscuousness seems to be in the blood, since Edith's grandson Raymond has also impregnated a young woman named Debbie, who also happens to work in the same company as Buchanan and Edith.

Throughout the play, the sad life stories of the characters are sprinkled over the play. Edith's life story is the first we learn, and along with hers we learn how her and Buchanan's sons died. Their grandson Raymond and Debbie, ironically, live through the same thing. The cyclical construction of the plot is apparent, since the same story is played through three generations. Even Raymond's mother is part of it:

EDITH. [about Raymond's mother] She took her own life, poor dear. When the boys were killed. She couldn't face the idea of living on, so she gassed herself. She was illegitimate as well. That was the bond between them.

BUCHANAN. Is there no respect for marriage in this district?

EDITH. Very little you will find. (165)

The message behind that is plain: there is something immoral and promiscuous about the human nature that morality is trying to suppress, but no matter how the matter is approached, the human nature will always prevail. Orton who was infamous for his lack of morality shows here his firm belief in the vainness of moral values.

On the subject of morality Orton does not back to slam the hypocrisy of the concept into our faces. When Edith tells Buchanan of their sons he asks:

BUCHANAN. Their morals must surely have been below average?

EDITH. It was the conditions. You couldn't blame them. We were so frightened in those days. You lived through it same as I did. They panicked, I expect. (156)

Buchanan is eager to label the sons as "immoral" and move on with it, although he did the same mistakes. Even after a whole generation has come and passed away over Buchanan's affair, he still wants to make it right by marrying Edith. After all she's been through this would of course mean very little to Edith, and so she asks "isn't it too late?", but for Buchanan this is a matter of clearing his honour. In contrast to Buchanan's conservative approach, we see that Edith is understanding and tolerant when she comments "It was the conditions" on her twin's affair (156). Unlike Buchanan, she is being fair, showing that it is useless to bicker over it.

The point in the play where Edith and Buchanan decide to tell Raymond about their affair in the past and that they will get married is especially significant for the theme of morality. After all this theme is what shapes the main plotline.

EDITH. Mr Buchanan is your grandfather. The man who appeared with me on my wedding photograph had nothing to do with you. Not even indirectly. I was very silly, and Mr Buchanan behaved badly. We would've got married, only we lost touch with one another. We were too young to know what we were doing. (Pause.) Don't blame us too much, Raymond. Try to imagine what it's like to be young.

BUCHANAN. I'm going to marry her. Do the right thing.

RAY [shrugs.]

RAY. Well, understandably I'm shocked by your revelations. The country's moral values far from changing seem to remain unnaturally constant. (166)

We see in the scene while Edith is very ashamed and Buchanan is very concerned about retaining his honourable appearance, Ray doesn't take the news too hard and simply shrugs and makes a pertinent comment about the subject: the country's moral values are not changing, the approach to it however is. Orton here makes his point that people used to behave in the same awful way back in the older days as well, they just were bothered more by it that they felt the need to conceal it with lies and deceit. Almost to prove his point, we learn that Debbie is also pregnant, and that the father is Raymond.

Buchanan and Edith who move in together after their marriage are now living together with Raymond who is unemployed. Buchanan who is outraged by his carelessness urges him to find a job. Further the company, represented by Mrs. Vealfoy, is involved because of his relationship with Debbie. Mrs. Vealfoy is pressuring Debbie to talk to Raymond to persuade him for marrying her and later on offers Raymond a job in the factory, reassuring that he's planning to marry Debbie.

While Mrs. Vealfoy is closely monitoring the young couple's life, Buchanan tries to enjoy his new marriage and retirement. But things are not going great. His retirement gifts, an electric toaster and an electric clock, break. In the first annual meeting after his retirement Buchanan painfully has to face the fact that no one remembers him even after his 50 years of service at the main entrance. Frustrated and realizing that he wasted his life, Buchanan smashes his retirement gifts with a hammer, and dies.

The play does everything to build up to this moment. Starting from the first scene we see how Buchanan is excited about becoming retired, not because his working days are done but because he has had an honourable career of 50 years of service. He is excited about his photograph appearing in the magazine. Although he didn't ask the company to pay him some sort of homage, he enjoys gestures such as the magazine or the gifts. As none of them turn out to be the way he expected he becomes frustrated and he is also very troubled by Raymond's situation. Each of the scenes adds a little more frustration to Buchanan's life.

The plot of the play is spread across 19 short scenes, which makes the play's construction more like a screenplay rather than a play fit for theatre. Not only the plot but also the setting makes this play very adaptable to the screen. Some of these scenes are very short and without a dialogue, which adds to the depressing and frustrating mood of the play. The plot construction is designed to reflect Buchanan's mood in order to increase tension.

The opening scene of the play features a long corridor with closed doors on both sides. The sounds of typewriters and ringing telephones can be heard. At the very end of the corridor we see Edith scrubbing the floor. The scenery gives feelings of monotony, loneliness and detachment. The other scenery communicates a similar feeling. The mood of the play implies that the scenes are usually set in shades of grey. Other scenes are Mrs. Vealfoy's room, which has a desk, and a door to see her guests out; the firm's canteen, which is also not described in any characteristic way; the firm's clothing store, the firm's recreational centre and the bedrooms and living room of Buchanan's family house.

Of the 19 scenes, there are two very short scenes constructed without any dialogue but with only gestures. These give the play a grave and somewhat artistic feeling, and definitely take away the cheerful feeling. The first one of these short scenes is Scene Five, where Buchanan gives back his uniform after his retirement. This scene marks the official retirement of Buchanan and thus is a very important ritual for the character. In the scene Buchanan is inside a curtained cubicle and hands his uniform coat from behind the curtain to the attendant. The attendant, who is wearing a brown, uncharacteristic overall, puts Buchanan clothes on a dummy. The symbolism there is obvious; Buchanan was only viewed as a pawn of the factory and is now passing its position on to the next "dummy". The dummy is rolled away slowly with a dustsheet over it, waiting for its next victim (164).

The firm's clothing store is also an interesting setting. Buchanan is hidden behind curtains and goes out of the curtain as a transformed person. Orton describes him as

“smaller, shrunken and insignificant” (164). The scenery can be small, muffled, and full of curtained cubicles. Again, the colours must be white or in the shades of grey.

The second short scene is Scene Seventeen, another climactic moment of the play. This scene is perhaps only a few seconds long, and takes place in Edith’s living room. Buchanan simply stands beside the table with the clock and the toaster on it, his retirement gifts, and smashes them with a hammer. So while the first scene was his initiation to his “real life” separated from the company, the second scene represents a sad realization, an epiphany of the fact that his life was, tragically, wasted.

Needless to say, the play does not have a happy ending. It does not end with Buchanan’s death, but with a company celebration where Mrs. Vealfoy announces Buchanan’s death shortly, giving the message that even death cannot separate the connection between the individual and the corporation.

4.2.2. Social, Historical and Economical Context of the Play

As mentioned before *The Good and Faithful Servant* was highly based on Orton’s personal experiences with the low working class since both his mother and father worked and struggled to make a living all their lives. Orton himself tried to work in several different jobs, but he never stayed long in a “conventional job” and turned to the theatre instead. He always despised the false morality and the devotion to an institution, which is why in many of his other plays he criticises institutions such as the church, the police and the government.

The play opens with two quotes that serve as road-setters for the readers or actors. The first quote is from the Matthew 25:21, “Well done, thou good and faithful servant,” and it ironically shows where the title of the play comes from (Orton 151). The second quote attempts to open up the concept presented in Matthew; it is a definition by the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*: “Faith, n. Reliance, trust, in; belief founded on authority” (151). This is like a warning sign for the reader and shows the unreliability of the

concept of faith, and not only as a religious concept. Orton, therefore, states that this play is a criticism of the blind trust people put into corporations.

Orton lived in a society that was haunted by political hopelessness. The idea that irregularities could be solved through objective and practical politics was, according to Orton, an illusion from the 1950's (Biggsby 161). The British society had become lethargic, which Orton tried to picture with his slightly grotesque characters.

The play is sown with little scenes and characters from Orton's life, and according to Adrian Page if there are direct parallels between his life and his work, his thoughts on life will be reanimated in his characters (Page 142). For example, Orton's mother had caught tuberculosis and lost part of her lungs and also lost her eyesight after long years of working with a sewing machine. His father lost three fingers while serving as a gardener (Lahr 44).

Orton is providing his audience with bitter criticism of the working conditions of that time. After WWII, England was devastated and most of the people were still trying to recover from that. Finding a steady job was important and people were expected to hold on to these jobs to have a steady income, to provide for their family. Family values were important, married women were still expected to stay at home. In many areas it was still difficult for minorities to find a job or an apartment to rent as you could still see signs like "No Irish or Black need to apply" (BBC News). It is not hard to imagine that a marginal, controversial personality like Orton experienced difficulties. That also explains the sarcastic tone that Orton employs towards the values of that time.

After the war the economy was also declining. The British governments failed to adopt a policy that could help the economy recover. Britain had low social capabilities, their workforce was under-skilled and cities and banks were coming short, which means that there were no or little investment opportunities and that the educational system was a failure. Moreover, the British defence expenditures were kept higher than most of the countries in the world after the war. This made it even more difficult for Britain to recover (Woodward). In this fruitless social and political environment, work was one

thing people were holding on to. Art and culture were coming short, and for many people work became their entire life, which is exactly the fact Orton satirizes in his play.

4.2.3. Character Analysis

The main character of the play, Buchanan, is a doorman in a very big factory and is retiring at the end of the play after 50 years of service. He is described as “an old man, wearing a commissionaire’s uniform” (Orton 153). This character is based on Orton’s father who has worked as a gardener for the city for long years. Both Buchanan and Orton’s father have lost some limbs during their years of service – Buchanan an arm and Orton’s father three fingers (Charney 140).

All the characters in the play - with the exception of the young, mischievous son - are devoted to their company and are somewhat petty. All, with the exception of Mrs. Vealfoy, have an extremely sad, unfortunate story, which gives the play an almost absurd twist. The degree of devotion of the characters to their work is almost inhuman. Only at the beginning of the play we hear Edith talking about her 50 years of service, with “breaks, of course. For pregnancy and the occasional death of a near relative” (153). It is almost absurd how she mentions her maternity breaks and bereavement leaves, as if it is totally irregular to give a break from work at all and holiday is not an option, which is, of course, exactly what Orton was aiming for. His characters find even thinking about skipping work or slacking sinful, even though their work holds nothing for them, as we see throughout the play.

Edith, who we meet at the first scene of the play, is a woman who has been beaten up by life and is left with nothing but her job and her mischievous and good-for-nothing grandson. The man whom she briefly loved in her youth, who turns out to be Buchanan, has abandoned her and left her pregnant to twins. Her father turned her out and she raised her sons in poverty and all alone. Later they served in Italy as soldiers, and died of a poisoned well. Fortunately the authorities classified the deaths as war wounds. Both

of them left an illegal son from a girl working at a pub, although nobody knows which of the twins the true father was.

Perhaps the most distinguished character trait of Edith is her bitterness. Having had a very unfortunate, miserable life, Edith has only one reason to live, her grandson.

BUCHANAN. Is your grandson alive?

EDITH. Yes. I look after him. When he's settled I shall die.

BUCHANAN. What of?

EDITH. Does it matter? (156)

Edith is a mixture of the archetypal mother who lives for her child and the chronically depressed widow. Her statement "I look after him" shows how she adopted the mission of taking care of her grandson, although, as we see later on in the play, her grandson is an adult who should be capable of taking good care of him. But her mission of taking care of him will only end when he's married, in other words, when she has passed over the flag to someone else. Orton here seems to make a statement about gender roles, where the man is dependent on the woman to be "taken care of". We see the same issue in Scene Nine, which takes place in Buchanan's bedroom. On the table we see an artificial arm, a pair of glasses and a hearing aid, as Edith enters the room to equip Buchanan with these objects:

EDITH. Another day! What has it in store? Sunshine or showers?

She helps BUCHANAN sit up and gives him his glasses.

Now you can see the world.

She gives him his hearing aid.

Now you can hear. (171)

As it appears on this scene, Buchanan needs Edith to get up, see and hear. He seems to be an incapable man, which is interesting because he must have coped with life somehow after his first wife deceased. The neediness of Buchanan is therefore not a real one; perhaps it signifies his need of attention.

Her resigned tone shows her bitterness. When she says she will die after her grandson is married, Buchanan awkwardly asks "What of?" The question is sheer absurd, but Edith's answer shows that she just doesn't care.

Buchanan, however, presumptuous as he is, takes this as a sign of depth:

BUCHANAN. You have philosophy then? (EDITH nods, begins to scrub the floor.) Are you resigned to anything in particular?

EDITH. No. Life in general. Isn't that enough? (156)

The pun here with the word 'life' is witty, and once again shows us Edith's bitter view towards life. But although she is bitter, she cares about people. She is a woman who does not live for herself but for others. When questioned by Mrs. Vealfoy she admits:

EDITH. ... It's only for show. It's a waste getting married when you're my age. I'm only doing it for his sake. He's very much on his dignity about it. He's been like that all his life so he tells me. (180)

As we see Edith is getting married only for Buchanan's sake. We don't know whether she does this out of love or of a sense of duty. However we also see a very important aspect of Buchanan's character.

Buchanan is a typical working class man who values a respectable and successful career and a good reputation. Although he has done something immoral in his past, he is almost obsessed with setting his reputation right, though it wouldn't mean anything. Buchanan takes pride in his 50 years of service and it is important to him that his photograph would appear in the company's magazine.

In her conversation with Mrs. Vealfoy Edith reveals that Buchanan is depressed and that he is staying in bed all day. Mrs. Vealfoy is terrified by the thought and wants Buchanan to engage in hobbies and activities. So in Scene Sixteen, when Buchanan finds himself

in a company reunion, Mrs. Vealfoy introduces him to a supposedly old colleague of Buchanan. However it turns out that they have never talked to each other before:

BUCHANAN. You remember me then?

OLD MAN. I retired a bit before you.

BUCHANAN. Did you see my photo in the magazine?

OLD MAN. No.

BUCHANAN. I was a long-service employee. A credit to canteen food they said I was. (Pause) That's their words. I had dinner there since it opened. Can't be much wrong with the food, can there? (184)

As we see Buchanan has a big concern about being remembered and having been important to the company, as it is the first thing he asks when he meets this old man. As the conversation continues however, the old man realizes Buchanan is not his old friend George Hyams, but a George Buchanan. He does not know Buchanan, which upsets Buchanan greatly. Incredulous, he asks him if he's sure, but the old man walks away. Buchanan gets more and more disappointed and self-aware that his life did not matter at all.

BUCHANAN. But I worked here. I was on the main entrance. Are you sure you don't remember me?

OLD MAN. I'm sorry.

He shrugs BUCHANAN off and moves to the group around MRS VEALFOY.

BUCHANAN. Nobody knows me. They've never seen me before. (189)

It is this moment that leads to the climax on Scene Seventeen, where Buchanan smashes his table clock and the toaster and in the next scene he passes away.

Another major character in the play is of course Mrs. Vealfoy, who seems to be the woman who runs the office, although it is not entirely clear what her job definition is. She seems to operate as a human resources specialist; she decides whom to hire, whom

to retire, on public events organized by the company and also with whom the employees (or even potential employees) should get married. She attempts to control everyone in the firm and everything related to the personnel, even their personal lives. She finds the thought that Buchanan is depressed and despairing completely unbearable and she does everything she can to cheer Buchanan up. However her mechanical and compassionless personality makes this impossible and she only ends up frustrating Buchanan more.

In fact, we do not know anything about Mrs.Vealfoy. She is a woman who smiles and laughs a lot in all wrong occasions and seems to be insincere in everything she is doing. She is completely impersonal and lacks empathy as we can see from the first scene she appears in the play. In Scene Two we see Buchanan talking to Mrs.Vealfoy in her office about his retirement. Mrs.Vealfoy checks if everything is in order, that all debts are paid and that all possessions belonging to the firm are returned. During this conversation she points out to Buchanan's missing arm:

MRS VEALFOY. ... You lost a limb in the service of the firm? (She consults a file on her desk.) You conceal your disabilities well.

BUCHANAN. I had therapy treatment in the medical wing of the firm's Benevolent Home.

MRS VEALFOY. And the pension paid to you by the firm for the loss of your arm plus the cash was legally binding. We are in no way responsible for your other limbs. If they deteriorate in any way the firm cannot be held responsible. You understand this?

BUCHANAN. Yes. (158)

As we can see Mrs.Vealfoy's tone of voice is indifferent towards Buchanan's loss, and she does not bother giving him a single word of sympathy. Instead, she is worried that Buchanan might sue the company for the losses of other limbs. Even the fact that she calls Buchanan's condition a "disability" has a bitter taste to it, considering that it was the firm who "disabled" him.

Orton gives information about Mrs. Vealfoy's personality by revealing her priorities when she faces the situation. Whereas her priority is the interest of the firm when Buchanan's limbs are involved, her attention slides to her hat and the mirror when Buchanan asks whether they are going to take any photographs of him for the magazine. Mrs. Vealfoy obviously does not care. Her attention focuses on Buchanan again though, when he mentions his grandson. She looks at him sharply and starts questioning him. The possibility that Buchanan might have given false information on his private life to the firm infuriates her.

Starting with Scene Four, Mrs. Vealfoy is presented with the case of Debbie. Debbie is pregnant from Ray, whom she hardly knows, and despairs because her parents would take the news ill. Mrs. Vealfoy treats her with sympathy and compassion, and takes the matter into her own hands. From that moment on she works hard on getting Debbie and Raymond married, talking to Debbie quite often and talking to Raymond as well. She appears to be very friendly towards Debbie, smiling a lot, but this is mainly because things are going the way she plans for them. When she learns that Buchanan is unhappy with his retirement, her smile immediately turns into a sharp tone of voice. But of course, her friendly face is just a mask too, as is revealed in her conversation with Raymond.

She starts the conversation with a lot of smiles, laughs and questions him all to which Ray answers simply with "yes" or "no". Mrs. Vealfoy thinks this is an excellent sign, saying that they are getting on very well, although her frequent laughs may as well be the sign of nervousity.

MRS VEALFOY. ... (She laughs and then, suddenly, serious) Do you love Debbie?

RAY. Yes.

MRS VEALFOY. And do you agree that what you have done is wrong?

RAY attempts to speak. MRS VEALFOY holds up her hand, smiles.

I'm not passing judgement. I merely want to ask if you agree with me. Do you think it wrong? (Smiles.) You don't have to say 'Yes' if you disagree with me. (Pause.) Do you think what you've done is wrong?

RAY. No.

MRS VEALFOY. I see. (She smiles with no trace of disapproval.) And why don't you think it's wrong?

RAY. If two people love each other why shouldn't they make love? (181-182)

As we can see Mrs. Vealfoy smiles steadily throughout a conversation that is definitely not going the way she was planning to. Although from former experience with the character we know she must be displeased, she shows no sign of it because she is fixated on manipulating Ray to marry Debbie and to work for the firm. We also see her insistent and manipulative personality, in the way she is trying to pressure Ray into admitting he has done something wrong, although she seems to guess that this is not how he feels.

Raymond on the other hand is a young and independent character. Although he shares the characteristics of his family, which can be summed up as promiscuousness and opinionativeness, he is also different from them by being a non-conformist. Although he is a hedonist and a slacker, he is not stupid. He immediately recognizes Mrs. Vealfoy for what she is and does not cooperate with her manipulative talk. He simply rejects her by answering "no" to her question.

However, although Ray is a young non-conformist who does not seem to be easily fooled, he still finds himself filling out a form for a job application in the company. Mrs. Vealfoy makes the good argument that having a wife and a child will create the need for a weekly wage for Raymond, and that he should start to consider a career.

The power relation between Ray and Mrs. Vealfoy as well as the manipulative aspect of Mrs. Vealfoy's character will be discussed in detail in the Panoptic Analysis section of the study.

4.2.4. Analysis of the Play in Terms of Panopticism

Surveillance is one of the major themes of the play. It is constantly rubbed in the face of the audience that the company, from hiring until death, is watching every step of the employees. Different characters of different ages offer an example to this, as some are just getting hired, some are retiring and some are dying. And perhaps some of the people have just been conceived yet, since the cyclical construction of the plot indicates that Raymond might as well continue the family tradition by sending his child to work for the company.

Compared to Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross* we can say that the Panoptic image is much more visible in this play, as the audience is introduced to a company building with several entrances, a structure so big that although people have worked there for 50 years they haven't seen each other, simply because they used different entrances or were working in different sections. Also, the aspects of the Panopticon are far more visible in this play. Although in both plays the Panopticon is a company, in *The Good and Faithful Servant* the structure is more important and emphasized. In *Glengarry Glen Ross* the characters could move in and out of the structure as they pleased –in fact they only visited the office if they had to-. In Orton's play we get the feeling that the characters never quite leave the company, perhaps because Mrs. Vealfoy works so hard to keep the bonds very close.

First of all, the Panopticon provides that the prisoners will be invisible to each other, but visible to the watchmen. This situation forms the main issue of the play; that Buchanan is not recognized by anybody in the firm and that none of the workers in the firm have seen each other. All of the workers have different sections and entrances, which resembles cells in the Panopticon metaphor, which keeps them away from each other.

In *The Good and Faithful Servant*, unlike in *Glengarry Glen Ross*, there are no bosses. Mrs. Vealfoy mentions certain divisions such as Buchanan's "section", the firm's clothing store, recreational centre and the Records department, but it is not clear who

runs the place. This adds to the imagery of the prison, because a prison is not “run” by anybody, only the watchers.

In the second place, the image of the watchmen is far more distinct. Williamson from *Glengarry Glen Ross* was representing the bosses and marshalled the leads; however he did it all according to the Board, which made the Board the “true” watcher. In *The Good and Faithful Servant* however, Mrs. Vealfoy has no other purpose than watching and controlling the employees. During the play she has one-to-one conversations with all of the main characters: first with Buchanan about his retirement, then with Debbie on her pregnancy, with Ray about his marriage and career plans and finally, with Edith about her marriage and her husband. She is involved in all of the characters’ private lives, and nothing escapes from her. She has ultimate control over the characters, and ultimate transparency, as is expected from the Panopticon.

Paternek explains that the Panopticon operates based on the idea that each inmate is assigned a virtuous role that they need to play (108). Panopticism has also an educative aspect to it by means that the inmates are made aware of their actions and the responsibilities that come with it. This idea can clearly be seen in *The Good and Faithful Servant*, as the title of the play suggests. The characters of the play are not servants; they are employees in a company. However Orton decided to reduce them to servants of the company.

In the play every character is aware of their responsibilities. These responsibilities are given to them by Mrs. Vealfoy, in a way, although these are responsibilities the society would expect them to have, such as providing financial support for your children and your family. To understand this idea better we must remember that Orton has always defined himself as a man with no morals; therefore, he is free from all norms of the society. So from his point of view, finding a job to earn money, to provide for some food and shelter for your children is not necessarily something one must do, it is only something society expects them to do. For a man with no morale, living your life for someone else is unnatural behaviour. In the play Mrs. Vealfoy is a metaphor for the society that imposes this kind of unnatural behaviour upon the characters. Therefore,

Mrs. Vealfoy is the guardian of the prison, and the assigner of roles in accordance with Panopticism.

The Panopticon image in the play also outlines the power relations between the characters in the play. Similar to many of Orton's plays, such as *Loot*, *The Good and Faithful Servant* also features a "juvenile delinquent", a young and irresponsible character who is being pressured by older people to find a job, to get married or just generally to live a "decent" and socially acceptable life. In *The Good and Faithful Servant*, Ray is that character who represents the decline of all authority. As was discussed in Orton's approach to power relations, Ray would be the character that is not affected by the "illusion of power" created by institutions and enforced by individuals who represent these institutions, but represents the power of the individual, who has rejected to live according to society's imposed rules for all his life. However in this play, Ray loses his power struggle. Like his parents and grandparents he finds a job, marries due to the pressure created by an illegitimate child and continues the family tradition. Moreover, he is pushed into this by the corporate structure, the Panopticon, represented by Mrs. Vealfoy.

Orton's sister Leonie had commented that *The Good and Faithful Servant* is probably his most autobiographical work, and looking at it from the point of view of power relations, it is probably also his most pessimistic work (Barnett Orton). Given that many of his works have an adolescent male character with an immoral reputation; it is not hard to conclude that Orton often creates characters that are in one way or another like him. These faint "reflections" of his character are always his most powerful tools in making a point. Indeed, in *The Good and Faithful Servant* as well, Ray is the only character that appears to be able to look at the moral and capitalistic values in an interrogatory way. He is the only character that stands out by means of values and personality. Although he is a rascal like his fathers and grandfather, he is not ashamed of it and does not deny his nature. However unlike Orton's other young characters, he gets tamed by "the system" and eventually starts working for the same enormous, soul-eating company in the way his grandparents did. For someone like Orton who could

never keep a "normal" job and who despised the conservative middle-class values this must probably be a personal hell.

Let us take a closer look at why Ray ends up in an "Ortonesque hell" unlike the other "fictional Orton". The must inevitably be that it is the power of the Panopticon. According to Foucault, the enigmatic side of power concept is that it is difficult to trace its origin (*Language* 213). However what makes the Panopticon so interesting and effective is that it is a structure that imposes power and discipline, without needing anybody to hold power. The architectural design, the feeling of surveillance and the sheer awareness of its disciplinary structure makes the Panopticon powerful. Anybody could be the watchman, it doesn't really matter since nobody can see if someone is sitting in the watchtower or not.

Bearing the Panoptical structure of the company in the play in mind, it is not surprising to see that Ray turns himself in to the company. When Mrs. Vealfoy asks him if he wants to marry Debbie, he already has decided, and although it is Buchanan who tells him to find a job, Ray does not resist. It does not take any great effort to "discipline" this young man; he simply takes his place in one of the cells of the Panopticon.

Orton himself never got "disciplined" but spent his life earning a living by being a writer. After his first plays became successful he never needed to find a "decent job", but still this play shows that he was affected by society's expectations. That he never had to comply with these expectations explains why the heroes of his plays always oppose social and moral values. The power is always within the individual, except in *The Good and Faithful Servant*.

The parallels between the Panopticon and the company in *The Good and Faithful Servant* are skilfully presenting Foucault's ideas on discipline and power. Although Orton's and Foucault's beliefs on power do not coincide with each other, we see that Foucault's idea prevails. The Panopticon is a powerful structure because it imposes discipline on the inmates, and thus the individual feels the need to comply with the structure's power. So we can deduce that power comes from the individual, just as Orton

believed. However in Foucault's design, discipline and power is a positive force, whereas Orton who criticises and satirizes power structures whenever he can, thinks it obviously as a negative force.

CONCLUSION

To conclude this panoptical analysis on Mamet and Orton's works presents a very contemporary point of view towards power: both of these writers deal with the effects of a capitalistic society and community on individuals. Foucault took the idea of the Panopticon and made it more than an architectural structure by conceptualising it. The Panopticon imagery is not only an explicit building that can be seen in the plays, it is also a metaphor for the capitalistic system. It represents how individuals are encircled by the system and how they are trapped in this system that requires them to be materialistic and conformist. However this emotional "prison" is not the making of one person or one central authority, it is built with the cooperation of the society, which is also undertaking the role of the watchman.

The Panopticon as a direct parallel is easy to spot when looking at *The Good and Faithful Servant* and *Glengarry Glen Ross*: both of these plays take place mainly in a company. Especially in *The Good and Faithful Servant*, the company resembles a prison in many ways. It is a place, the attendants of which visits regularly and hardly leave and the personnel have to wear certain aprons that are somewhat similar to prison uniforms. In both plays we see that all the "inmates" of the companies are closely watched by the "watchman" figure, Williamson and Mrs. Vealfoy. Another feature of the Panopticon that can be seen in the plays is that the characters are oblivious to each other's imprisonment. In *Glengarry Glen Ross* for instance, everybody has some idea about how the other salesman is doing, but in the end no one knows who had the means and the motive to do the robbery. Therefore, it is not surprising that Williamson, the watcher, figures out who the thief is.

Besides the more obvious physical similarities, we might want to take a closer look to how the plays have psychological and emotional parallels with the Panopticon. It makes us remember how the Panopticon issues power over its inmates: as was repeatedly addressed, the beauty of the Panopticon, according to Foucault, lies in its intelligent design. It is the structure that is powerful, because it has been built in such a way that the inmates will feel isolated, alone and 24 hours under surveillance. It does not play on

emotions such as sympathy or comradeship, which can be emotions that can lead to ganging up and causing conflict in a prison. The attention of the inmates is turned pointedly towards the centre, which is why the design was also thought to be fit for schools. At the centre of attention we see the watch tower that can or cannot be occupied by the watchman.

To draw a parallel between the psychological impact of the Panopticon and the characters in the play, we might want to take a look at the social and economic context of the settings of the play. Although the plays are set in different countries as well as 20 years apart from each other, they both deal with similar issues: how working for a profit oriented institution can corrupt the individual. Orton and Mamet draw different conclusions; they both try to explain how dedicating a life to earning money will change that person. According to Orton, the individual will almost involuntarily become the puppet of the company, also expecting their children to live their life. Buchanan becomes a “vegetable”, a person who has gone to work all his life, has not pursued neither hobbies nor creative or recreational activities. In the end he dies friendless and sad. On the other hand Mamet represents a culture where it is not enough to have a job to earn money; you also need to keep your job by constantly fighting for it. As a result, people in the company have become dishonest and opportunistic. The system has corrupted them in such a way that they use every opening they find to exploit and steal from their co-workers.

Both of these different reactions towards this money-oriented system share similarities with the idea of panopticism. Once the characters have entered the building, they find that they don't even try to go out, even though it is obviously a prison and even though there isn't anyone who is actually holding them back. They are surveyed by the watchman however, who whips the characters up to act according to the rules of this prison. Orton's prison expects its inmates to sacrifice all their time, while Mamet's prison expects them to sacrifice their energy and honour. In both cases the watcher characters are the ones who promote this sort of behaviour. Mrs. Vealfoy does everything to make her employees stay in the company and even tries to employ their children. Williamson doesn't even have to make a great effort to keep the salesmen

working. The Cadillac prize does it for him. Looking at it from a more humorous point of view we could even say that it is not Williamson but the Cadillac who is the watchman.

But when we take a closer look at the plays it becomes clear that it is wrong to simply label the characters Williamson and Mrs. Vealfoy as “the watchman”, because as Foucault indicates, anyone walking into the prison could be the watchman. Bentham argued that “power must be visible, yet unverifiable”. The visible watchmen are a visualisation of power. The watchman itself is in fact not a person but a concept, just as the Panopticon is. It is society and the social and economic conditions that shape the prison and it is the individual that gives it power. That’s why Mrs. Vealfoy’s surveillance differs from Williamson’s and surveillance employed today through the internet gives a different shape to prison-like lives.

APPENDIX

Complete works of David Mamet

Plays:

Lakeboat (1970)
The Duck Variations (1972)
Lone Canoe (1972)
Sexual Perversity in Chicago (1974)
Squirrels (1974)
American Buffalo (1975)
Reunion (1976)
The Water Engine (1976)
A Life in the Theatre (1977)
*The Revenge of the Space Pandas, or
Binky Rudich and the Two-Speed Clock*
(1978)
Mr. Happiness (1978)
The Woods (1979)
The Blue Hour (1979)
Lakeboat (revision) (1980)
Edmond (1982)
The Frog Prince (1983)
Glengarry Glen Ross (1983)
The Shawl (1985)
*Goldberg Street: Short Plays and
Monologues* (1985)
The Poet & The Rent (1986)
Speed-the-Plow (1988)
Bobby Gould In Hell (1989)
Oleanna (1992)

The Cryptogram (1994)
The Old Neighbourhood (1997)
Boston Marriage (1999)
Faustus (2004)
Romance (2005)
The Voysey Inheritance (adaptation)
(2005)
Keep Your Pantheon (2007)
November (2007)
The Vikings and Darwin (2008)
Race (2009)
School (2009)
The Anarchist (2012)

Films:

The Postman Always Rings Twice
(1981)
The Verdict (1982)
About Last Night... (1986)
House of Games (director) (1987)
The Untouchables (1987)
Black Widow (actor only) (1987)
Things Change (director) (1988)
We're No Angels (1989)
Homicide (director) (1991)
Hoffa (producer) (1992)
Glengarry Glen Ross (1992)

Oleanna (director) (1994)
Vanya on 42nd Street (1994)
American Buffalo (1996)
Wag the Dog (1997)
The Spanish Prisoner (director) (1997)
The Edge (1997)
Ronin (1998)
The Winslow Boy (director) (1999)
Lakeboat (2000)
State and Main (director) (2001)
Hannibal (2001)
Heist (director) (2001)
Spartan (director) (2004)
Edmond (2005)
A Waitress in Yellowstone (2008)
Redbelt (director) (2008)
The Prince of Providence (2009)
Come Back to Sorrento (2010)
Phil Spector (2013)

Books:

Writing in Restaurants (1987)
On Directing Film (1991)

The Cabin: Reminiscence and Diversions (1992)
The Village (1994)
Make-Believe Town: Essays and Remembrances (1996)
The Old Religion (1997)
Three Uses of the Knife (1998)
True and False: Heresy and Common Sense for the Actor (1999)
The Chinaman (poems) (1999)
Jafsie and John Henry: Essays (1999)
Wilson: A Consideration of the Sources (2000)
South of the Northeast Kingdom (2002)
The Wicked Son: Anti-Semitism, Self-hatred and the Jews (2006)
Bambi vs. Godzilla: On the Nature, Purpose, and Practice of the Movie Business (2007)
Theatre (2010)
The Trials of Roderick Spode (The Human Ant) (2010)
The Secret Knowledge: On the Dismantling of American Culture (2011)

Complete works of Joe Orton

Plays:

Fred and Madge (written 1959, published 2001)

The Visitors (written 1961, published 2001)

The Ruffian on the Stair (first performance 1964) Radio play

Entertaining Mr. Sloane (first performance 1964)

Loot (first performance 1965)

The Erpingham Camp (first performance 1966)

The Good and Faithful Servant (first performance 1967)

Funeral Games (first performance 1968)

What the Butler Saw (first performance 1969)

Up Against It (screenplay)

Novels

Head to Toe (published 1971)

Between Us Girls (published 2001)

Lord Cucumber and The Boy Hairdresser (co-written with Halliwell) (published 1999)

Works Cited

- Austin, J.L., *How to Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Ed. J.O. Urmson. London: Oxford University Press, 1962. Print.
- Barnett Orton, Leonie. "Joe Orton and Me." *Joe Orton Online*. Web. 12 Jul 2013.
- Barton, Ben F.; Barton, Marthalee S. "Modes of Power in Technical and Professional Visuals". *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 7 (1). 1993. 138–62. Print.
- Bentham, Jeremy. *The Panopticon Writings*. Ed. Miran Bozovic. London: Verso, 1995. 29-95. Print.
- Bigsby, C. W. E. *Joe Orton*. London: Methuen, 1997. Print.
- Billington, Michael. *Stage and Screen Lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- Blansfield, Karen C. "Commentary and Notes." *Glengarry Glen Ross*. David Mamet. London: Methuen, 2004. Print.
- Canby, Vincent. "House of Games (1987) Mamet Make A Debut With 'House Of Games'" *The New York Times*. 11 Oct 1987. Web. 13 Jul 2013.
- Charney, Maurice. "Joe Orton's Laodicean Tragedy: *The Good and Faithful Servant*" *Connotations*. Vol.18. 1-3 2008/2009. Print.
- "David Mamet." IMDB. Web. 13 Jul 2013.
- Dewey, Mark. "Foucault: Panopticism." *Cultural Studies*. Web. 15 Jul 2013.
- Ebert, Roger. "House of Games" 16 Oct 1987. Web. 13 Jul 2013.
- Evans, Robin. *The Fabrication of Virtue: English Prison Architecture, 1750–1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. Print.
- Fialka, John. "Reagan's Stories Don't Always Check Out." *Eugene-Register Guard*. Web. 9 Feb 1976.
- Foucault, Michel. "Language, Counter-Memory, Practice." *Intellectuals and Power*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980. Print.

- Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2nd edition. Ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. "Art after Modernism: Rethinking Representation". *The Subject and Power*. New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1984. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: An Introduction*. Vol.1. New York: Vintage Books, 1990. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.
- Goodman, Walter. "Stage: 'Faithful Servant,' A Mild Joe Orton Work." *New York Times*. Web. 13 Jul. 2013.
- Howe, Desson. "House of Games" *Washington Post*. Web. 13 Jul 2013.
- Joe Orton Online. "The Plays." Joe Orton Online. Web. 12 Jul 2013.
- Kidd, James. "Joe Orton: The life and crimes of a great playwright." *Independent* 25 Jan 2012. Web. 12 Jul. 2013.
- Lahr, John. *Prick Up Your Ears*. London: Penguin, 1978. Print.
- Lahr, John. "Introduction." *Orton: Complete Plays*. Joe Orton. London: Methuen, 1998. 7-28. Print.
- "Life and Work." Joe Orton Online. Web. 12 Jul 2013.
- Mamet, David. *Glengarry Glen Ross*. London: Methuen Drama, 2004. Print.
- Murfin, Ross and Supriya M. Ray. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*. New York: Bedford, 1998. Web. 13 Apr. 2013.
- Myers, D. G. "The New Historicism in Literary Study". A Commonplace Blog. Web. 27 April 2013.
- Nadel, Ira. *David Mamet: A Life in the Theatre*. Hampshire: Palgrave & Macmillan, 2008. Print.
- Orton, Joe. *Complete Plays*. London: Methuen Drama, 1998. Print.
- Page, Adrian. *An Age of Surfaces Joe Orton's Drama and Postmodernism, The Death of the Playwright?* Basingstoke: Lumiere Corporation Press Ltd, 1992. Print.
- Paternek, Margaret A. "Norms and Normalization: Michel Foucault's Overextended Panoptic Machine." *Human Studies*, 10-1, Foucault Memorial Issue (1987), 97-121. Print.

“The David Mamet. *Huffington Post*. Web. 12 Jul 2013.

“The Orton Estate, Gallery.” Joe Orton Online. Web. 12 Jul 2013.

“Things Change.” IMDB. Web. 13 Jul 2013.

Thornton, Michael. "Why I blame myself for the murder of Sixties playwright Joe Orton, by theatre critic and friend Michael Thornton." *Daily Mail*. Web. 16 Jul 2013.

Veesser, Harold Aram (Ed.). *The New Historicism*. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Woodward, Nicholas. "Britain's Post-war Economic Decline." *New Perspective*, 1-2, Dec 1995.

"Your 1960s: Life" *BBC News*. Web. 31 May 2007.