Pinter's One for the Road, Party Time, Celebration and Power's Invisibility
—From Shakespearian Disguise to Postmodern Subject—

Makoto Hosokawa

About Pinter's later plays Varun Begley argues that they "explore . . . convergences of horror and civility," and points out "the proximity of civility and barbarism" in plays such as One for the Road (1984) and Party Time (1991). Though he doesn't refer to his last full-length play Celebration (1999), it would be added to such plays, too. Begley has discovered such convergences in Alain Resnais's Holocaust documentary Night and Fog (1955). He describes the film as follows:

> [It] begins with the exterior of a comfortable villa, home to a Nazi commandant. The narrator reports that the residence was located near one of the concentration camps. Subsequently three snapshots depict the wives of various commandants. One poses in the parlour, smiling, with a group of well-dressed visitors. Another sits beside her husband, a contented dog in her lap. The banality of these images is somehow intolerable. They evoke real but macabre domestic dramas performed in the shadows of the camps. (162)

The problem of the nearness of civility and barbarism or villainy is pregnant with a variety of themes ideologically, politically and literarily when Pinter's three plays are investigated. This problem has a close relationship to the theme of the modes of power in Western history. It is necessarily linked with the theme of the way a ruler really is. The consideration retroacts as early as the Shakespearian age through the Enlightenment. The theme of disguise comes to be involved when we consider rulers in Shakespeare. And the examination of the modes of disguise in power leads us to reflect on the problem of the self or the subject around power.

When we put in temporal order One for the Road, clearly a political drama, and Party Time, and Celebration, seemingly bourgeoisie dramas, or civil ones, and look at them from these viewpoints, each of the latter two plays seems to be a work developed or transformed

from the previous play in relation to power, disguise, the self or subject. The most conspicuous feature in them is that the proximity of civility and barbarism recognized explicitly in One for the Road becomes less visible in Party Time, and least visible in Celebration; in other words, power becomes more and more invisible while civility comes to be foregrounded more and more. At the same time, the visible connection of an individual to power tends to be blurred and to disappear in the latter two plays, whereas power converges on one individual in One for the Road.

The theme of the proximity of civility and wickedness in power is a very old one. Machiavelli, the Renaissance philosopher, says that "a prince may not have all the admirable qualities, but it is very necessary that he should seem to have them" (48). Here he teaches Renaissance rulers the power of disguise. Though Shakespeare often represents a ruler's disguise, as in Henry V (1568-9), Measure for Measure (1604-5), the tradition seems to be reflected a bit in One for the Road. This paper reviews these problems or power's modes, disguise in power, and the self or subject in relation to power in Pinter's later three plays, considering some historical background such as thought and theatre, and Pinter's features and life.

1

Since the mid-1980s Pinter's work "has become openly, ostensibly political as opposed to his earlier, more metaphorical exploration of power games" (Aragay 246). One for the Road is the first full-length one of such political plays. In the play Nicolas, a high-level bureaucrat, questions a political dissident Victor, his wife Gila and his son Nicky in some detention facility. Though the setting is unspecific as is usual in Pinter, the description of his interrogations is realistic. Nicolas's questioning of Victor at the outset starts with polite frankness:

> Hello! Good morning. How are you? Let's not beat about the bush. Anything but that. D'accord ? You're a civilized man, So am I. Sit down. (223)

He treats Nicolas as an intellectual ("You're a man of the highest intelligence"), and shows his civility to such a highbrow, saying, "So [a civilized man] am I, or "I am [a religious man]" (224). But his subsequent civil phraseology such as "There is only one obligation. To be honest" (230) is opposed to his later ominous and sexual locutions which are "reminders of the ineluctable suffering that rhetorical civility disguises" (Begley 176). He says to Nicolas that he loves the death of others ("Do you love the death of others as much as I do?" 229). "Does she fuck?" he asks him about his wife, and says, "Your wife and I had a very

nice chat . . . . She's probably menstruating" (231). It is clear that these uncivil words refer to killing and rape. Though his speeches don't describe torture directly but focus on its periphery digressively during the play, they imply that violence is done to political dissidents in the detention facility offstage, and that he is closely concerned in it. We can suspect from Nicolas's speeches that he himself adopts the Shakespearian ruler's disguise at the same time as power here hides or disguises cruelty or barbarism.

There are two archetypes in Shakespearian disguise. They are "the disguise of the serpent and the disguise of the Incarnation" (Bradbrook 161). As for rulers, the former is reflected in Machiavellian rulers in whom appearance and reality are different in their sly and evil use of power, hiding cruelty behind civility. The latter is reflected in "the disguised rulers (God's vicegerents), who wander among their subjects, . . . in the end distributing rewards and punishments in a judgment scene" (162). Incidentally, according to Bradbrook, disguise is defined "as the substitution, overlaying or metamorphosis of dramatic identity, whereby one character sustains two roles" (160). It doesn't necessarily need to change clothes ("There is no direct disguise in Angelo, Claudius, Iago . . . , but an assumed personality" 161).

Nicolas mentions both types of disguise as to his identity in a dialogue with Victor.

> You probably think I'm part of a predictable, formal, long-established pattern; i.e. I chat away, friendly, insouciant, I open the batting, as it were, in a light-hearted, even carefree manner, while another waits in the wings, silent, introspective, coiled like a puma. No, no. It's not quite like that. I run the place. God speaks through me . . . . Everyman respects me here. (224-25)

Here he surmises that Victor suspects Nicolas to be assuming the disguise of the serpent by which he plays the role of a civil and "friendly" man while playing that of a savage one like a "puma." But he denies such Machiavellian disguise in him, and suggests that he assumes the heavenly disguise by which he takes on the role of God's vicegerent and runs the facility justly. Though he says as a heavenly disguiser, "Everyone else knows the voice of God speaks through me" (227), he soon discloses that he is not a supreme ruler, but a middle-manager of power. There is "the man who runs this country" (230) above him, and who said, "Nic, if you ever come across anyone whom . . . is getting on my tits, tell them . . . honesty is the best policy" (231), euphemistically ordering him to torture the hostile if they resist. Nicolas is much moved when this unidentified ruler makes a patriotic speech to the public.

> NICOLAS. I have never been more moved, in the whole of my life, as when . . . the

> man who runs this country announced to the country: We are all patriots, we are as one, we all share a common heritage . . . . I feel a link . . . . I share a commonwealth of interest. I am not alone. (232)

According to Marc Silverstein, here "Nicolas's articulated sense of shared identity enacts . . . the kind of abdication of 'self' that it describes . . . . his voice dissolves into the monolithic Voice of state power" (428). Far from being either a Machiavellian disguised ruler, or God's vicegerent in disguise, he "becomes a 'mouthpiece' for a Power that always exceeds him." (429). To say from the viewpoint of the motif of disguise in drama, his disguise corresponds to Lloyd Davis's idea of one. Davis argues that "The motif of disguise suggests that personal identity is not conceived as essentially or originally present" (4). His definition of disguise, a manipulation of at least two identities, points out the fictitiousness or fracture of the self or subject in both modernist and postmodernist senses. Furthermore Nicolas is not only an ostensible performer of serpent or God, but also a "metteur en scène" (Begley 176). About his performance and producing, Varun Begley says all of his speeches and behaviours "conspire to render the interrogation as spectacle," (177) and argues that his psychic condition resembles "hysterical psychosis, which is marked by the patient's tendency to perform" (177), seeing him, one of "Pinter's modernist thugs" (164), as a "post-Freudian subject" (172). Aside from Nicolas's pathology, his self is not certainly essential, but he is merely an instrument of power. Of course, he is responsible for torture offstage, who let his soldiers rape Gila ("Have they been raping you?" 243), and ordered them to kill Nicolas's son Nicky ("Your son? Oh, don't worry about him. He was a little prick" 247), but he is only subject to the supreme authorities physically invisible onstage.

2

Power's invisibility began in the Enlightenment era. It is featured by Jeremy Bentham's invention, the Panopticon in whose "peripheric ring, one [prisoner] is totally seen, without ever seeing; in the central tower, one [warder] sees everything without ever being seen" (Foucault 202). It denotes that power becomes invisible, in other words, hidden or disguised. We can see the change of modes of power historically here. The mode of power changes, in the eighteenth century, from power on display to disciplinary power which has continued till today. Foucault says

> Traditionally, power was what was seen, what was shown, and what was manifested and, paradoxically, found the principle of its force in the movement by which it deployed that force . . . . Disciplinary power, on the other hand, exercised through its in-

> visibility; . . . In it the 'subjects' were presented as 'objects' to the observation of a power that was manifested only by its gaze. (187-88)

The former power appears on the coronation, the royal entry and the public executions in Shakespearian era. Shakespeare represents such power in the distribution of justice and mercy by a disguised ruler, the Duke Vincentio who disguises himself as a monk in Measure for Measure. The latter disciplinary power could also be seen in Shakespeare's Prospero ahead of the Panopticon. Prospero in The Tempest (1611-2) is a ruler disguised as a "sorcerer" (3.2.41) with a "magic garment" (1.2.24) on. He exercises his power without being seen by anybody, using as his agent a literally invisible airy spirit Ariel ("Prospero and Ariel, invisible" 4. 1. 193. 1). How disciplinary his power is witnessed in Prospero's training Caliban, who is an "Abhorred slave / which any print of goodness will not take, / Being capable of all ill" (1. 2. 353-55). Prospero, who has failed to train him says, "A devil, a born devil, on whose nature / Nurture can never stick; on whom my pains, / Humanely taken, ..." (4. 1. 188-90). But Caliban who "wouldst gabble like / A thing most brutish" (1. 2. 358-89) gets angry with such power of his for forcing him to learn his language ("the red plague rid you/ For learning me your language" 1. 2. 366-67). Complaining that "This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak'st from me" (1. 2. 333-34), Caliban reveals that such a seeming civil power hides violence.

The same situation is seen in Pinter's Mountain Language (1988) where "mountain people" who speak the forbidden "mountain language" (255) are disciplined so that they speak "the language of the capital" (258). Though power is visible on the stage in this play, showing the elderly woman's "thumb is going to come off" (253) by the attack of a torturer's dog, this modern power, it can be said, belongs to a type of invisible power in which only civility is visible, hiding barbarity or violence. It would be Party Time that represents such power most typically.

3

In Party Time, the violence of power is hidden behind civility. It exists offstage. On the stage a group of bourgeois gather at the flat of Gavin, who holds a cocktail party. One of their topics is a new club of "Real class" (281) available only for the members in which "you play a game of tennis, you have a beautiful swim, they've got a bar . . . ." (283). Gavin is encouraged to join the exercise club as "The cannelloni is brilliant", and "They even do chopped liver" (286) there. In another corner, Charlotte listens to Liz's anger and envy to her lover's love affairs with a young girl. Old people, Gavin and Melissa, talk about small animals ("squirrels"295) and birds (" hawks," "eagles"296) in the country pastorally and

nostalgically. With "Spasmodic party music" (281) the partiers get caught up in small talk cheerfully and socially. Liz praises this civil party, deeply impressed.

> I think this is such a gorgeous party . . . . I think it's such fun . . . . Oh God I don't know, elegance, style, grace, taste, don't these words, these concepts, mean anything any more? I'm not alone, am I, in thinking them incredibly important? (299)

Though civility seems to cover all the stage, the shadow of fear is caught in Dusty's repeated questions about the whereabouts of his brother Jimmy who hasn't come to the party yet: "Does anyone know what's happened to my brother?" (296). Melissa, who came late, says,

> The town's dead. There's nobody on the street, there's not a soul in sight, apart from some . . . soldiers. My driver had to stop at a . . . you know . . . what do you call it? . . . a roadblock. (286)

As if to respond to her question, when Fred asks to Douglas, "How's it going tonight?", Douglas says, "Like clockwork . . . we want peace and we're going to get it" (292). Their conversation suggests that some military action is occurring in the streets during the party, and Gavin admits the "round-up" in his closing speech of the party, saying "we've had a bit of a round-up this evening. This round-up is coming to an end" (313). From their words, we can suspect that Gavin, Fred and Douglas are personally related to state power. There are no direct words from them in the drama which identify them as power's agents. But when we hear the host of this party Gavin say,

> In fact normal service will be resumed shortly. . . . That's all we ask, that the service this country provides will run on normal, secure and legitimate paths and that the ordinary citizen be allowed to pursue his labours and his leisure in peace. (313)

Here we are reminded of the nearness of civility and barbarity in power. A peaceful party host Gavin seems to disguise himself as an ordinary citizen here. Charles Grimes argues that "Politesse, culture, distinction, refinement . . . and other practices of 'everyday life' disguise an ugly, otherwise naked will to power . . . ." (103). Power's barbarity lurks invisibly in civility expressed in "elegance," "grace" which Liz mentions about the partygoers' dresses, and the resumed "normal service" which Gavin assures.

And at the end we encounter the victim Jimmy who appears on the stage, from offstage, whom "Martin Regal sees as dead" (Grime 125). He "comes out of the light and stands in the

doorway," on the stage while "Everyone is still, in silhouette" (313). The paradoxical contrast of light to both sides illuminates the cruelty hidden in civility. Jimmy says enigmatically before the curtain falls:

> . . . a door bangs, I hear voices, then it stops. Everything stops. . . . It shuts. It all shuts. . . . I see nothing at any time any more. I sit sucking the dark. . . . The dark is in my mouth and I suck it. It's the only thing I have. . . . I suck it. (314)

From his words we realize that he was arrested in the round-up, put in prison and killed, which the repeated words "the dark" imply strongly. "The dark" he sucks makes us recollect the Enlightenment whose aim was to 'en-lighten' people. As seen above, the new power born in the period is a disciplinary one whose "chief function" is "to 'train'" (Foucault 170). And it is "exercised through its invisibility" (187). As "the progressive aspect of the Enlightenment finally betrayed itself with the technology of atrocity" (Knowles 59) in the twentieth century, a barbarous aspect was latent invisibly in power in the Enlightenment.

Power's opposite phases does the play, at the end, reveal by inserting a fantastic appearance of the dead Jimmy into a realistic rendering of the party so far, like the Brechtian effect of alienation. Pinter exposes civil power's latent cruelty in this play with such modernist double awareness. On that point, power's barbarity is finally somewhat visible on the stage. But is there anyone in this play who impresses nakedly the supreme authority of power like Nicolas in One for the Road? Gavin? No. He is only "connected to the authoritarian apparatus" (Baker-White 64). Seen from the point that his relation to power is described vaguely and obliquely, he has no intention to disguise power's authority. On the contrary, power is diffused into some subjects rather than is concentrated in one person. None of the characters is an autonomous subject who exercises state power. Mark Silverstein argues

> Pinter . . . conceptualizes the subject's relation to power in more Foucaultian terms: the subject remains an effect that emerges from the operations of a Power that remains irreducible to the dimensions of that subject. (438)

According to him, in Pinter "the subject of (and to) power is 'expendable'" because power "can produce other candidates to fill its subject positions" (439). If so, Gavin as well as Fred and Douglas is no more than power's instrument. Fred implies hesitatingly in his dialogues with Charlotte that he is an exchangeable tool of power:

> CHARLOTTE. I think there's something going on in the street.
> FRED. Leave the street to us.

CHARLOTTE. Who's us?
FRED. Oh, just us… (307)

His ambiguous and vague reply implies that he is one of "us" or power's instruments.

The problem of the self or subject in the play is condensed into a question by power's victim, Jimmy: "What am I?" (314). He says in his monologue at first, "I had a name. It was Jimmy," and then "When everything is quiet I hear my heart" (313). His meaning here is that his identity was Jimmy in quiet and peaceful days. He continues,

> When the terrible noises come I don't hear anything. Don't hear don't breathe am blind.
> Then everything is quiet. I hear a heartbeat. It is probably not my heartbeat. It is probably someone else's heartbeat. (314)

What he tries to convey here is that Jimmy was dead in power's round-up ("the terrible noises"), and he has changed into another victim (he hears "someone else's heartbeat"). In other words, it indicates that power's victims are also exchangeable. He becomes representative of victims in general at the end. Thus as he has lost the self or the subject, he is asking who he is.

All of the characters in the play have no self or the subject, as well. This is impressed strongly by the way people's conversations are scattered incoherently in the shadow of the round-up offstage. The world of this play is, as it were, a postmodern one. Though Charles Grimes argues that power in the play is "Western capitalist power" (102) and that of "the fascist regime" (103), power here seems to be a more modern power in "the global system of consumer capitalism" (Gordon 190), in which the subject is fictitious and fragmented.

4

Gordon recognizes the power in global consumer capitalism more conspicuously in Celebration. This play, unlike Party Time, unrolls only the phases of civility, and doesn't present even a recognizably suggestive hint of invisible barbarism both onstage and offstage. The stage shows us a picture of stylish restaurant in which two middle -aged bourgeois couples are celebrating the wedding anniversary of Lambert and Julie, and at the other table a young banker Russell and his wife Suki are dining. Though the play unfolds incoherently with wandering conversations of civility at the two tables, like those in the cocktail party in Party Time, their talk is represented more satirically and vulgarly. The level of their sophistication is manifested symbolically to the point that they don't know what they have seen

before dinner, a play or a ballet or an opera.

> RICHARD. Very very well. Been to a play?
> MATT. No. The ballet. (455)

> SONIA. Been to the theatre?
> SKI. The opera. (463)

Moreover a rich snob Lambert is ignorant of what kind of dish Osso Bucco is despite his own ordering: "Osso what?" (440) Osso Bucco is to him only a sexual reminder of "arsehole."

> LAMBERT. Well I knew Osso was Italian but I know bugger all about Bucco.
> MATT. I didn't know arsehole was Italian. (441)

Their conversations are full of gibes, piss-taking, sexual affairs, and monetary concerns. Russell calls his wife Suki "a whore" (449) while Prue piss-takes Richard, maitre d', saying "she [Julie] could make a better sauce than yours if she pissed into it" (458). When they find Lambert at table one and Suki at table two were acquaintances before, Russell replies that they met and had sex "Behind a filing cabinet" to Prue's question "I wonder where these two met" (493). Lambert is proud of his richness ("Do you know how much money I made last year?" 451), and shows how nouveau riche he is by giving a few fifty-pound notes as a tip to Sonia, Richard's assistant, saying indecently "Stick them in your suspenders" (503). The servile Richard and Sonia try to ingratiate themselves with their best customers. When Lambert makes fun of Richard, saying, "You could tickle his arse with a feather," Richard replies fawningly, "Well, I'm so glad. . . ." (459), while Sonia "giggles" longingly to Lambert's dangling "the notes in front of her cleavage" (503). About these gross situations and materialism in the restaurant, Robert Gordon says

> The play exposes the way postmodern culture not only fragments but flattens hierarchies of value so that the difference between one pleasure and another is merely a matter of price. (191)

It is certainly true that in this play civility is depicted from the viewpoint of the post- modern situation where "the postmodern body . . . is now exposed to a perceptual barrage of immediacy from which all sheltering layers and intervening mediations have been removed" (Jameson 412-13). As Gordon says, the restaurant is "a kind of temple" whose function is

"appeasing its diners by offering them sensory pleasures and the comfort of exclusive privilege as gratification designed to dull their naked fear and aggression" (191).

Thus civility seems to cover all the play even if its vulgarity is satirized. But the barbarism of power is hidden behind civility in this play, too. Gordon agrees:

> Beneath the stylish surface of the restaurant, the world these characters actually inhabit operates according to the principle of repression by brute force. (191)

But unlike the round-up offstage in Party Time, no evidence of barbarity by power is perceived even offstage. Power is completely invisible in Celebration. It is indirectly, metaphorically and analogically that Power's disguise is implied.

The first instance of the implication is Lambert and Matt's mention of their occupation. Lambert says, "we're consultants. . . . Strategy consultants," "it means we don't carry guns," which Matt affirms: "We're peaceful strategy consultants" (496). The suspicion that there is disguise in such peaceful roles of theirs would be inferred metaphorically by the casual complaint of Lambert's wife Julie to his sudden aggressive proposal of a toast, "Raise your fucking glass and shut up!"

> JULIE. But darling, that's naked aggression. He doesn't normally go in for naked aggression. He usually disguises it under honeyed words. (478)

The two opposite inclinations in him which she points out are a metaphor of his two identities of a civil, honeyed and rich man and a military, aggressive agent of power. But such disguised identities aren't essential, but fictitious. We may as well say that such a disunified self is rather a psychopath. The banker Russell, who doesn't have any relation to power at all, confesses that he is a "psychopath," a "totally disordered personality" (475). He says he feels peaceful in this restaurant despite his hidden symptom of violence:

> . . . .when I'm sitting in this restaurant I suddenly find I have no psychopathic tendencies at all. I don't feel like killing everyone in sight, I don't feel like putting a bomb under everyone's arse. I feel something quite different, I have a sense of equilibrium, of harmony, I love my fellow diners. . . . Normally I feel . . . absolutely malice and hatred towards everyone within spitting distance---but here I feel love. (475)

Robert M. Lindner argues that the psychopath is "the embryonic Storm-Trooper" (4). The potential for soldiership in a psychopath and the similarity between two opposite feelings (love and malice) in Russell and the same two opposite phases in Lambert's self analogi-

cally convince us of Lambert's role as an invisible military tool of power. I don't say Lambert uses disguise by which one sustains two roles. His self is a postmodern one, which is, as it were, "the schizoid, disheveled subject" (Eagleton 16). In his case, he has become a violent instrument of power without noticing it himself, unlike Gavin in Party Time, who is conscious that he is related to power.

5

Though Celebration also doesn't connect an individual and power directly in depicting the nearness of civility and barbarism as to power, the way it suggests power's invisibility and power's hidden barbarity are implied more clearly in the waiter's interjections than in the diners' implications. Grime argues,

> Celebration's posh restaurant setting may seem far removed from the torture sites of One for the Road and Mountain Language. But the Waiter's penultimate speech links the world of the diners to the brutal realities of worldwide torture. (133)

The eccentric young Waiter, who interjects his absurd remembrance of his grandfather into the diners' conversations three times, says unrealistically in his penultimate monologue, "He loved the society of his fellows, W.B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, Igor Stravinsky, Picasso, Ezra Pound, Bertholt Brecht, Frank Kafka . . . ." (502), and ends his interjection in a grave tone:

> He knew these people where they were isolated, where they were alone, where they fought against savage and pitiless odds, where they suffered vast wounds to their bodies, their bellies, their legs, their trunks, their eyes, their throats, their breasts, their balls . . . . (502)

It is very obvious that he obliquely refers to the people or resistants who fought against brutal power and were tortured with their bodies dismembered. In the other two monologues of his which he calls "interjections" (466), he says again that his grandfather was an acquaintance of many celebrities in modern art, film and politics of the first half of the twentieth century such as "D.H.Lawrence, Joseph Conrad, Ford Madox Ford . . . Virginia Woolf" (467)," "Clark Gable" (485), and "the Archduke . . . Bentio Mussolini . . . Wiston Churchill" (501). The era which he remembers in his reference to his grandfather is mainly the early twentieth century when the new modernity of revolutionary science and modernism replaced the old modernity of Newtonian materialism and realism. His grandfather, he says, ". . . stood four square in the centre of the intellectual and literary life of the tens, twenties

and thirties" (468), and "My grandfather was everything men aspired to be in those days" (502). The Waiter respects and is very proud of him because "He was like Jesus Christ" to the point that "He'd even give a cripple . . . a helping hand . . . show him in the right direction" (502). What the Waiter tries to invoke in his recollection of his grandfather is the tradition of the Enlightenment. In his grandfather's days, there remain yet the positive values such as humanism of the Enlightenment whereas its repressed concomitant becomes rampant. Eugene Lunn says, "barbarism resurfaces in the twentieth century through the return of a "nature" which had been thwarted and brutalized by a technocratic civilization" (239). And barbarism is at an extremity in the Nazi regime. "Auschwitz was the Enlightenment's truth" (Herf 234). The era he remembers is a violent one of World I and II represented by "the Archduke" and "Mussolini," too.

At the end of his monologue the Waiter, we may suppose, refers to the barbarity and the victimization in this era, and implies strongly that they remain invisible in the present age, "the moment of the multinational network, or what Mandel calls "late capitalism" (Jameson, 412). His nostalgically implausible remembrance of his grandfather's age problematizes power in the present postmodern age of consumer culture, which the restaurant symbolizes. Power there, on the one hand, merges into civil surface of everyday life, and eradicates traditional or intrinsic values in the previous era whereas it succeeds the invisibility or disguise of power from Bentham's Panopticon. On the other hand, power doesn't connect with a particular individual, but enters any individual or "does . . . display itself . . . through the creation of the subject positions . . . in which we install ourselves" (Silverstein 438), so that it makes him or her an expendable tool of power. In a culture which such power occupies, there is "the 'death' of the subject itself—the end of the autonomous bourgeois monad or ego or individual" (Jameson 15). The subject is characterized by "fragmented and schizophrenic decentering and dispersion" (Jameson 413). Fredric Jameson, who compares two subjects both in modernism and in postmodernism, argues that "the alienation of the subject is displaced by the latter's fragmentation." (14). The era which the Waiter mentions in his grandfather's fictional memory is also the age of three A's ("the Absurd, anxiety, and alienation" [Baumer 414]).

The Waiter's final interjection, which he cannot complete, tells us this zeitgeist of three A's.

> WAITER. When I was a boy my grandfather used to take me to the edge of the cliffs and we'd look out to sea. He bought me a telescope. . . . I used to look through this telescope and sometimes I'd see a boat. The boat would grow bigger through the telescopic lens.
> . . . . . .

> My grandfather introduced me to the mystery of life and I'm still in the middle of it. I can't find the door to get out. My grandfather got out of it. He got right out of it. He left it behind him and he didn't look back.
> .....
> And I'd like to make one further interjection.
>
> He stands still.
> Slow fade. (508)

In the first four lines, the Waiter shows the world of new modernity, Heisenberg's 'Uncertainty principle', by the image of the "telescope" which becomes a symbol of the world's indeterminacy, not absoluteness, from its image of enlarging the world. The world of three A's started from such new view of science in the early twentieth century. People who live in such a world have lost the meaning of life and felt alone or alienated, losing the absolute. The Waiter's grandfather "knew these people where they were isolated, where they were alone," and tried to help them like "Christ" (502).

The Waiter is one of them, too. He has got lost in "the mystery of life," and cannot "find the door to get out "(508), so that he is wounded. To such a man, the diners who are the tools of power interrupt his last interjection and leave the restaurant, with him left behind alone, threatening obliquely to have him sacked.

> RUSSELL. You going to stay until it changes hands?
> WAITER. Are you suggesting that I'm about to get the boot? (468)

Charles Grimes says about the situation of the Waiter that "he is . . . sharply excluded from the world controlled by the diners" (131), and that "his final silence poignantly illustrates his ultimate dispossession" (132). Although Lambert gives a fifty-pound note as a tip to him, this ostensible civility of kindness hides barbarity. Begley argues that "The brutality of this [postmodern] culture lies less in what it depicts than in what it conceals" (185).

Pinter shows double awareness in this play, too, which Gordon calls a "blend of realism and abstraction" (193). He depicts both the people in the restaurant and the way civility pervades in the play by the mode of realism, but by interjecting the Waiter's implausible and fantastic remembrance of his grandfather, he makes the realistic rendering of civility fictitious or suspicious by Brecht's effect of alienation, and betrays the barbarity hidden in civility and the void beneath a joyfully noisy postmodern culture, showing an individual or the self as a schizoid subject and a disposable tool of power.

The Waiter plays the role of victim of such culture and power at the same time as he as-

sumes that of the whistle-blower of that status quo. Thus he, as an absurdist, like the modernist writers referred to in his monologues, feels "the mystery of life" in the void, alienated and excluded from the shallow world of consumer culture with power invisible. We can see the absurdist Pinter reflected in the Waiter.

It is well known that Pinter was influenced by absurdist writers Beckett and Kafka, whose names are in the Waiter's interjections. He is, "like these two writers, preoccupied with man at the limit of his being" (Esslin, Theatre 261). According to Esslin, Pinter said that "he was dealing with his characters 'at the extreme edge of their living, where they are living pretty much alone'" (Esslin, Theatre 262). While Pinter reflects an absurdist phase in this lost Waiter, he mirrors another phase of his, a political activist in his later years, in the Waiter as an indirect critic of the status quo.

In 1987 Pinter participated in a protest to the American Embassy on the reason that the US supported militarily and financially Contra terrorist groups, under the pretext of the protection of democracy, who attempted to overthrow the Sandinista government in Nicaragua. In 1998 he wrote a letter to the Prime Minister Tony Blair in which he said, "The US . . . has given and still gives total support to the Turkish government's campaign of genocide against the Kurdish people" ("Open Letter" 256). In a string of these protest activities Pinter expressed his "outrage at the hypocrisy of Western governments—claiming moral superiority, while sanctioning the most extreme cruelties. . . ." (Billington 305). By his political actions, he questions civil democratic regimes' hiding of barbarity.

> . . . it's not simply that the United States, in my view, has created the most appalling state of affairs all over the world for many years, it's also that what we call our democracies have subscribed to these repressive, cynical and indifferent acts of murder. We sell arms to all the relevant countries, do we not? Not just the United States, but also Great Britain, France, Germany and Spain are very active in this field. And they still pat themselves on the back and call themselves a democracy. ("Writing" 247)

Thus Pinter, in his last full-length play, depicts power's disguise in a contemporary postmodern society under consumer capitalism, like "post-Thatcherite Britain, a society dominated by greed and dumbed-down educational and intellectual standards" (Esslin, "Harold" 29), in which the self or the subject, fragmented, decentered and schizopherenic, is a tool of power while power permeates civility in everyday life and democracy invisibly with its barbarity hidden. Pinter was irritated at such an irresponsible and deceitful society in his later life.

> Mrs Thatcher, I remind you, said immortally: 'There is no such thing as society.' . . . She meant by it that we have no obligation or responsibility to anyone else other than

> ourselves. This has encouraged the most appalling greed and corruption in my society. ("Writing" 250)
>
> . . . the majority of politicians . . . are interested not in truth but in power and in the maintenance of that power. To maintain that power it is essential that people remain in ignorance, that they live in ignorance of the truth, even the truth of their own lives. What surrounds us therefore is a vast tapestry of lies, upon which we feed. ("Art" 288)

The later three plays reflect Pinter's views of the self, the world and power in his later years very ingeniously but insistently. The epitome is represented metaphorically very well in the Waiter's penultimate speech in Celebration, as Charles Grimes says, "Pinter is playing a double game in this passage. . . . he . . . imagistically merges the suffering, marginalized artist with the suffering, marginalized victim of political violence" (133).

Works Cited

Aragay, Mireia. "Pinter, politics and postmodernism." The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter. Ed. Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 246-59.

Baker-White, Robert. "Violence and Festivity in Harold Pinter's The Birthday Party, One for the Road, and Party Time." The Pinter Review Annual Essays 1994: 61-75.

Baumer, Franklin L. Modern European Thought: Continuity and Change in Ideas, 1600-1950. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1977.

Begley, Varum. Harold Pinter and the Twilight of Modernism. Toronto: U of Toronto Press, 2005.

Billington, Michael. Harold Pinter. 1996. London: Faber and Faber, 2007.

Bradbrook, M. C. "Shakespeare and the Use of Disguise in Elizabethan Drama." Essays in Criticism 2 (1952): 159-68.

Davis, Lloyd. Guise and Disguise: Rhetoric and Characterization in the English Renaissance. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Eagleton, Terry. The Illusions of Postmodernism. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Esslin, Martin. "Harold Pinter: from Moonlight to Celebration." The Pinter Review Annual Essays 1999-2000 (2001): 23-30.

_____. The Theatre of the Absurd. 1961. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Trans. Alan Sheridan. 1975. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Grimes, Charles. Harold Pinter's Politics: A Silence beyond Echo. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005.

Gordon, Robert. Harold Pinter: The Theatre of Power. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press,

2012.

Herf, Jeffrey. Reactionary Modernism: technology, Culture, and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Jameson, Fredric. Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Knowles, Ronald. Understanding Harold Pinter. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

Lindner, Robert M. Rebel Without a Cause: The Story of a Crriminal Psychopath. 1971. New York: Other Press, 2003.

Lunn, Eugene. Marxism and Modernism: An Historical Study of Lukacs, Brecht, Benjamine and Adorno. 1982. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Prince. Ed. & Trans. Robert M. Adams. 1977. New York: W. W. Norton, 1992.

Pinter, Harold. "Art, Truth and Politics: The Nobel Lecture." Harold Pinter Various Voices: Sixty Years of Poetry, Politics 1948-2008. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.

_____. Celebration. Harold Pinter Plays Four. 1996. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

_____. Mountain Language. Harold Pinter Plays Four. 1996. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

_____. One for the Road. Harold Pinter Plays Four. 1996. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

_____. "An Open Letter to the Prime Minister: Guardian, 17 February 1998." Harold Pinter Various Voices: Sixty Years of Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-2008. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.

_____. Party Time. Harold Pinter Plays Four. 1996. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

_____. "Writing, Politics and Ashes to Ashes." Harold Pinter Various Voices: Sixty Years of Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-2008. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.

Shakespeare, William. The Tempest. Ed. Frank Kermode. London: Methuen, 1969.

Silverstein, Marc. "One for the Road, Mountain Language and the Impasse of Politics." Modern Drama 34 (1991): 422-40.