(NON-)SPECTACLES OF DISCIPLINE: INSTITUTIONS IN THE PLAYS OF STOPPARD, WESKER, PINTER, AND NESİN

ESRA MİSEM SÖNMEZ

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2020

(NON-)SPECTACLES OF DISCIPLINE: INSTITUTIONS IN THE PLAYS OF STOPPARD, WESKER, PINTER, AND NESİN

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Literature

by

Esra Misem Sönmez

Boğaziçi University

2020

(Non-)Spectacles of Discipline: Institutions

in the Plays of Stoppard, Wesker, Pinter, and Nesin

The thesis of Esra Misem Sönmez

has been approved by:

Prof. Aslı Tekinay _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Emine Fişek _____

Assist. Prof. Ayşem Seval _____
(External Member)

May 2020

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Esra Misem Sönmez, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date .....16.06.2020.....

ABSTRACT

(Non-)Spectacles of Discipline: Institutions

in the Plays of Stoppard, Wesker, Pinter, and Nesin

"We are neither in the amphitheater nor on the stage, but in the panoptic machine," Foucault observes. Yet the stage remains steadily interested in the panoptic machine. Hubs of institutional power continue to concern playwrights, as discipline and surveillance are turned into spectacles on stage. This thesis studies *Every Good Boy Deserves Favou*r by Tom Stoppard, *Chips with Everything* by Arnold Wesker, *The Hothouse* by Harold Pinter and *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* by Aziz Nesin—all plays that are centered around institutions of power and discipline, such as prisons, hospitals, schools and military complexes. In other words, these plays take place in, and are concerned with, institutions in their most Foucauldian incarnations. In this, they have to engage with a considerable question: How does one put the panoptic machine onto the stage, if the peculiar power of the machine lies in its invisibility, in its unspectacular nature, in the subtlety of its operation? In these four plays, we can mark common thematic concerns and dramatic strategies as they grapple with these questions. Thematically, language, visibility and sentiment constitute particularly productive venues of analysis in this examination. Formally, certain structural and tonal choices in the plays' staging, including utilizations of music and humor, respond to the peculiarly unspectacular and subtle formulation of institutional power. This thesis studies representations of institutions in these works, to find how their dramatic strategies respond to the many contradictions of institutional power, in order to understand the representative limits and possibilities of theater.

ÖZET

Disiplinin Gösteriş(sizlik)leri: Stoppard, Wesker, Pinter ve Nesin'in Oyunlarında Devlet Kurumları

"Artık ne amfitiyatroda ne de sahnede, fakat panoptik makinedeyiz." diye gözlemler Foucault. Ancak sahne, panoptik makineye ilgi duymaya devam eder. Disiplin ve gözlem sahnede gösteri haline getirilirken, kurumsal gücün merkezleri oyun yazarlarını çekmeye devam etmektedir. Bu tez, hapishaneler, hastaneler, okullar ve askeriye gibi hepsi güç ve disipline dayalı devlet kurumlarını merkeze alan, Tom Stoppard'ın *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, Arnold Wesker'ın *Chips with Everything*, Harold Pinter'ın *The Hothouse* ve Aziz Nesin'in *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* oyunlarını çalışmaktadır. Başka bir deyişle, bu oyunlar en Foucaultcu tecellileriyle devlet kurumlarında geçmekte ve bu kurumlarla ilgilenmektedir. Bu açıdan bu oyunların kayda değer bir soruyla meşgul olmaları gerekecektir: Eğer makinenin hususi gücü tam da gücünün görünmezliğinde, işlemlerinin gösterişsizliğinde yatıyorsa, panoptik makine nasıl sahnelenebilir? Bu soruyla mücadele eden bu dört oyunda bazı ortak tematik ögeler ve dramatik stratejiler gözlemlenebilir. Bu tez tematik açıdan bu dört oyunu dil, görünürlük ve duygusallık bazında inceleyecektir. Form açısındansa, bu oyunların sahnelenmelerinde müzik ve mizahın ağırlığı da dahil olmak üzere verdiği kararlar, kurumların gücünün hususi olarak gösterişsiz ve ince yapılanmasına cevap niteliğindedir. Bu tez, bu dört oyundaki kurum ve enstitülerin temsilini çalışmakta, böylece kurumlar konusunda tiyatronun temsili olasılık ve sınırlarını anlamayı hedeflemektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to sincerely thank my thesis advisor Prof. Aslı Tekinay for her continuous guidance, patience and support during the planning and writing of this thesis. She was always accessible and beyond accommodating whenever I had questions or concerns and always made time for me. I am thankful for not only the astute and swift feedback and invaluable academic guidance that she provided, but also more than grateful for the encouragement and motivation that she has graciously offered throughout this process.

I am also deeply thankful to the members of my committee, Prof. Emine Fişek and Prof. Ayşem Seval, who took the time amidst their busy schedules and in the midst of this chaotic uncertainty surrounding us all to offer their insight and commentary. I am incredibly lucky to have benefited from their expertise and guidance, and truly appreciate the opportunity. I also could not overstate the influence that Prof. Fişek's work has had in shaping my academic interests and any progress that I might have managed as an aspiring scholar.

Finally, I have benefited from the financial support of BUVAK's Selcuk Altun fund during the writing of this thesis, and I am incredibly humbled to have received it. I would also like to say that I am very much thankful to my peers and friends at the department for their endless support and commiseration during this process, who have been invaluable sources of light and sanity during uncertain times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ……... 1

CHAPTER 2: TRIANGULATING INSTITUTIONAL POWER IN STOPPARD'S *EVERY GOOD BOY DESERVES FAVOUR* ……. 25

CHAPTER 3: THE RULES OF SMILES IN WESKER'S *CHIPS WITH EVERYTHING* ……... 49

CHAPTER 4: INSTITUTIONAL AND THEATRICAL FRICTIONS OF PINTER'S *THE HOTHOUSE* ……. 75

CHAPTER 5: ON THE TURKISH STAGE: "BLACK-BOUND" SEMANTICS OF *YAŞAR NE YAŞAR NE YAŞAMAZ* ……...….... 101

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION ……... 125

REFERENCES ……... 132

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"We are neither in the amphitheater nor on the stage, but in the panoptic machine,[1]" Foucault observes (1995, p. 217). Yet the stage remains steadily interested in the panoptic machine. Many spectacles are made out of discipline and surveillance, and hubs of institutional power continue to concern playwrights. *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* by Tom Stoppard, *Chips with Everything* by Arnold Wesker, *Hothouse* by Harold Pinter and *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* by Aziz Nesin are plays that are centered around institutions of power and discipline, such as prisons, hospitals, schools and military complexes. To put it in different terms, these plays take place in, and are concerned with, institutions in their most Foucauldian incarnations. In this, they have to engage with a considerable question: How does one put the panoptic machine onto the stage, if the peculiar power of the machine lies in its invisibility, in how unspectacular it is, in the subtlety of its operation? How can surveillance and spectacle be negotiated and reconciled on stage? In the aforementioned plays, we can mark some common dramatic strategies as they grapple with these questions. This thesis aims to study representations of institutions in these plays from the second half of the twentieth century, to find out how the dramatic strategies that they employ respond to the many contradictions of institutional power, in order to understand the representative limits and possibilities of theater.

All these plays have markedly institutional settings. Stoppard's 1972 *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* chiefly takes place in a psychiatric institution that also

[1] A prototype for a prison designed by Jeremy Bentham in the eighteenth century, studied by Foucault as a quintessential example for operations of modern discipline, in *Discipline and Punish*.

doubles as a prison for political dissidents. It is, in turn, complemented by a secondary institution, a schoolroom environment attended by the son of a dissident. 1962 *Chips with Everything* by Wesker is concerned with the army, where fresh recruits first meet its institutional power, but where the capitalistic institutions and socioeconomical dynamics of the outside world still remain an important influence. *Hothouse* by Harold Pinter, first written in 1958, though not performed until 1980, concerns an institution that is harder to pin down even at first glance, but hints at anything from a psychiatric or medical facility to a more sinister possible concentration camp. In *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* by Aziz Nesin, the eponymous Yaşar goes through a plethora of institutions, the play extends from his school days to his mandatory military service, and it follows him as he gets briefly institutionalized in hospitals and psychiatric facilities, and later imprisoned for much longer.

Stoppard, Wesker, Pinter and Nesin have perhaps particular reasons to be concerned with institutions, beyond any natural curiosity that the stage may have about the panoptic machine that supplanted it. For all these playwrights, the influence of World War II looms in a past not so distant, at a time when the full scope of institutional power and its potential malevolence was experienced in an unprecedented way. Wesker and Pinter were both British Jews, and they both had to be evacuated and relocated during the Blitz. Stoppard was a refugee from the World War II, where he fled his birthplace of Czechoslovakia before the Nazi occupation. He would later find out he also had Jewish ancestry, with all four of his grandparents being victims in Auschwitz. There were also other, more personal brushes with institutions. Stoppard had been educated in disciplined, strict boarding schools, which he apparently hated profoundly. Wesker would go on to serve in the Royal Air

Force. Nesin similarly had a military career which coincided with World War II, over the course of which he had been injured in an explosive accident. He would also later be imprisoned a number of times, his intermittent sentences approximately adding up to a total incarceration of about five years. Pinter would actually meet Nesin in 1985, during a visit to Turkey that he had undertaken in the name of PEN International, to investigate the treatment of writers such as Nesin. During his later humanitarian activity, Pinter would take more of an interest in international misuses of institutional power in this respect. The same can also be said of Stoppard, who dedicated *Every Good Boy* to two Soviet dissidents who had been incarcerated in so-called psychiatric institutions.

As the treatment of institutions in the aforementioned plays constitute the core of this study, before going further, it might be necessary to clarify what exactly an institution is, beyond just being a prison, a hospital, a school, or a military complex and so forth. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault embarks on an archeology of institutions, starting with the penal (Foucault, 1995). *Discipline and Punish* investigates the main mechanisms in the practice of power and control, the ways in which power has historically been formulated and exercised. Undoubtedly power has always been wielded in some form or another, and this is not the revelation *Discipline and Punish* provides. Rather, what Foucault remarks on is an ideological change in the operations of power, a rising tendency that increasingly became dominant in the ways in which power was practiced and wielded. *Discipline and Punish* sketches out how powerful, state-controlled hierarchies change in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as the locus of power shifts away from spectacle and ceremony. Power no longer realizes its chief operations in grand public demonstrations; in the nineteenth century, character of power changes, it becomes

subtle, minute and invisible. It is “not a triumphant power” according to Foucault (1995), but “a modest, suspicious power, which functions as a calculated, but permanent economy” (p. 170). This mode of political power finds its chief practice in institutions. Schools, prisons, military complexes and so forth become chief apparatuses of this different mode of political power, in that the power they practice isn’t public in character.

Discipline and punishment, in this new incarnation, markedly differ from earlier, spectacular forms of punishment or other demonstrations of power. Hence, power is located “neither in the amphitheater nor on the stage,” where it had been loud and visible, but “in the panoptic machine” (Foucault, 1995, p. 217). Public tortures, confessions, condemnations, which had all been effective because their power was visible and grand, are replaced with more banal, less visible, less concentrated exercises of power. One such exercise of power used to be the various forms of public punishment, which Foucault traces in detail, and such punishments had entire rituals and ceremonies built around them—power was exercised in the form of a spectacle. However, in the nineteenth century, “punishment had gradually ceased to be a spectacle. And whatever theatrical elements it still retained were now downgraded” (Foucault, 1995, p. 9). Power is no longer located in the ceremonies and rituals; public condemnations, confessions, punishment and penance decline over the course of the century. Operations of power continue to retreat from the public arena, in this vein, until “punishment,” the actual exercise of power, becomes “the most hidden part of the penal process” (Foucault, 1995, p. 9). For Foucault (1995), this marks not only a retreat of power and control from the public eye but a profound change in the character of sociopolitical power. Punishment, and the power inherent in that act, “leaves the domain of more or less everyday perception and enters that of

abstract consciousness; its effectiveness is seen as resulting from its inevitability, not from its visible intensity" (Foucault, 1995, p. 9). Hence visibility isn't simply an aspect that is neglected. Inevitability of the punishment, of control, is reliant on this invisibility. This new mode of power is effective precisely because the power that is exercised remains abstract, out of the public eye and everyday life.

Punishment is no longer an everyday spectacle in the public eye; yet this new mode of power and control suffuses into the fabric of everyday routines and habits. It does so in the form of discipline: "A type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology" (Foucault, 1995, p. 215). Discipline, as a form of control, as a method through which power is exercised, isn't grand and unreliable—it is streamlined and particular. Foucault (1995) points to timetables, inscribing value and obligation to all moments of life rather than one specific moment of punishment, instead of the cautionary exemplars made from publicly punished criminals, as one modernized, disciplinary tool. Discipline is now concerned not with the grand, but regulates instead the most minute of gestures, generates many guidelines detailing correct procedure and behavior, and exists in the precision of details. As such, control stretches out to more areas in life. As this form of institutional discipline expands, disciplinary practices settle into the practice of power and control, in schools, hospitals, prisons, military organizations and so forth. "Discipline' may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus;" but these institutions are now identified and perhaps even characterized by their utilization of modern discipline (Foucault, 1995, p. 215).

Hence, though institutions can be of many kinds and discipline may be adapted to many existing purposes, institutions are more about discipline in their

character than any one particular aim of that discipline. According to Foucault (1995), discipline, “may be taken over either by ‘specialized’ institutions,” “or by institutions that use it as an essential instrument for a particular end,” “or by pre-existing authorities that find in it a means of reinforcing or reorganizing their internal mechanisms of power;” “or by apparatuses that have made discipline their principle of internal functioning,” “or finally by state apparatuses whose major, if not exclusive, function is to assure that discipline reigns over society as a whole” (p. 216). In any case, however, these institutions are defined primarily through their use of discipline more than any other proclaimed purpose, of rehabilitation or teaching and so forth, and any other professed objective becomes almost incidental to the institutions’ practice of discipline. Despite the differences in their mission statements, according to Foucault, most institutions replicate a single dynamic that centers around discipline, and discipline almost becomes its own primary purpose, as other aims become almost secondary in nature.

On a similar note, a common trend in the representation of institutions in these plays, is a tendency to play with the stated missions of each institution. Institutions in these plays have a certain ambiguity in common as to what type they actually are, and different types of institutions, if their mission statements of teaching, correction, etcetera are taken at face value, still find themselves characterized more through their use of discipline than any secondary goal. There is a gradual but undeniable conflation of institutions in the plays, and additional, proclaimed objectives are muddled, even almost entirely eliminated: Particular aims of the discipline seem secondary, additional objectives beyond the discipline are interchangeable, as all institutions in the plays eventually resemble each other. There is not much of difference between schools, hospitals, mental institutions and military

complexes as they are represented in these plays. In all their portrayal, the role of institutional specialization is minimized. In *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* by Stoppard, the difference between specialties is already faint, as Alexander's institution is a mental institution and a prison in one. In Pinter's *Hothouse,* the particular aim of the institution is similarly elusive from the start, and the ambiguity of its role is only further heightened. Yaşar visits a plethora of state institutions, from hospitals and schools to prisons, in Nesin's *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz*, all of which seem almost interchangeable and are plagued with the same grand incompetence. Therefore, in each instance, we are left perhaps with a quintessential pilot case for an institution; the plays' portrayals lean more toward an institution without the trappings that might overshadow the true nature of institutional, disciplinary operation. The institutions in these plays serve as almost more of a synthesis, as these playwrights remain more interested in the "discipline [that] reigns over society as a whole" than other, additional aims of its application (Foucault, 1995, p. 216).

Chips with Everything by Arnold Wesker has perhaps the most clearly defined and easily recognizable institution of all the plays, in that its military complex clearly remains as such. Secondary purpose of its institution isn't entirely in question, its markers for specialization are more substantial compared to the ambiguity of institutions in the other plays. However, Wesker's military complex isn't as sharply demarcated from the rest of society, as it might at first appear. Even as an institution that seems to have an autonomous existence, the military institution of *Chips with Everything* ends up replicating outside dynamics of class and capital, and therefore, isn't far removed from the other institutional operations of society, serving as an extension and supplement of the "discipline [that reigns] over society as a whole" (Foucault, 1995, p. 216). There is perhaps more of an affinity between

the military and the factory, however, when it comes to a particular disciplinary concern—Foucault locates the same question at the heart of both the infantry and the labor force, in how to create a collection that is "superior to the sum of elementary forces that composed it" (Foucault, 1995, p. 163). Existence of a capitalist society is related to the existence of institutions in general, the modern incarnations of discipline coinciding greatly with the emergence of the factories. The peculiar relationship of part to the collective, in this respect, remains an important facet of disciplinary operations, however, and can be observed as a concern in all the plays, even if the part and the greater sum aren't strictly capitalistic in conception, as is the case in *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*.

In investigating the institutional operations in these plays, I will also draw on Hannah Arendt's (2006) *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, a meditation on the trial of Adolf Eichmann for his crimes during World War II. While studying the trial, Arendt offers a glimpse into the institutional workings and hierarchies of the Third Reich, which biographically would be an influence for these four playwrights, though to varying extents. Beyond the playwrights themselves, the particular and extreme incarnation of institutional discipline as it was practiced in concentration camps, can potentially factor in into the rising consciousness around institutional operations. *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, furthermore, more concretely ties in with the previously mentioned disciplinary question of those "elementary forces that [compose]" an institution and the greater sum it creates (Foucault, 1995, p. 163). Arendt certainly remarks on the industrialization that is at the center of the Third Reich's operations. Eichmann recounts his twist on the earlier logistical question of mass deportation, which he resolves through a factory a line that processes the Jewish people, "like an automatic factory, like a flour mill connected with some bakery," as Arendt quotes (2006, p.

46). According to Arendt (2006), “the most important conveyor belt in the whole operation” is in fact Eichmann (p. 153). Eichmann’s defense strategy for the trial infamously hinges on the idea of the “elementary forces that [compose]” an institution being significantly smaller than the whole to paraphrase Foucault (1995, p. 163). His defense positioned Eichmann as “a small cog” in the institutional machinery of the regime, and over the course of the trial, attempted to characterize his role in the Third Reich as that of a much less significant civil servant (Arendt, 2006, p. 57).

In her meditation, Arendt easily locates internal contradictions in Eichmann’s small-cog defense, where Eichmann doesn’t altogether prove capable of accepting such an insignificance for his part. Arendt (2006) notes a corrupt and strange work discipline that still lingers in Eichmann, as a result of which he isn’t completely able to denounce an “inner rapport with [his] work,” and fully commit to his small-cog defense, despite the weight of the trial and the threat of a death sentence (p. 57). Contradictions and peculiarities characterize institutional power, in the cases of more than Eichmann’s, because an inability to accept the slightest concession to its potency results in a veritable crisis on the part of the institution, when facing even the smallest threat. Though he is talking of a more specific institutional practice in the development of institutional racism, in the context of criminalized habitation without permit in a state, Étienne Balibar (2009) coins a phrase for such contradictory moments. According to Balibar (2009), “Impotence of the omnipotent” occurs when states and institutions exert enormous power in areas where they are the least powerful and most ineffective, hoping to “reconstitute in the imaginary a sovereignty that is in fact mythical” (p. 63). Greatest exercises of institutional power coincide with its greatest insecurities, paradoxically in denial of any lapse in its

power, but in instances where the exercise of power can only be necessitated due to a previous lack. The plays in this thesis are interested in such exercises of power as they are concentrated around institutional vulnerabilities, with their institutions represented on the verges of disciplinary crises. For the purposes of this thesis, we can perhaps categorize the nexus for such paradoxical lack and concentration of power mainly as language, visibility and sentiment, as all the plays remark on dynamics built around these elements.

Language marks one location of struggle, as a space where institutions can exert power as well as one, paradoxically, where their vulnerabilities can perhaps be the most evident. An official state discourse is present in all the plays in some form, to which the institutions of the plays subscribe, and which is propagated by those institutions. The plays have a vested interest in how fiction and fact are configured by their institutions through these state discourses, which operate heavily on linguistic and rhetorical levels. *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, *Chips with Everything*, *Hothouse* and *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* all commonly display a consciousness of how institutions utilize rhetoric: Control is often designed around language, with one-upmanship and domination being similarly imagined in linguistic terms. Institutions exercise their power through semantic operations, and the rivalries and conflict within the institution, as well, are similarly imagined in linguistic terms. Power struggle between the officials of an institution often play out in a linguistic landscape, in these plays, in the form of linguistic duels.

In *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Arendt (2006) notes in Eichmann an almost pathological inability to speak, that is perhaps emblematic of linguistically solidified institutional positions. Arendt observes that Eichmann's testimony is exclusively in sayings; he talks only in clichés and commonplaces, in what Arendt (2006)

sardonically deems is his "heroic fight with the German language, which invariably defeats him" (p. 48). Arendt (2006), while agreeing with the court that Eichmann's testimony is "empty talk," doesn't attribute the problem to an intentional mendacity on Eichmann's part (p. 105). This inability to speak, according to Arendt, is more symptomatic, "closely connected with an inability to *think*" (p. 49). Arendt (2006), in the book, coins her controversial phrase "banality of evil" in relation to Eichmann (p. 253). Referring to the discrepancy between Eichmann's seemingly mediocre and boring persona, and in contrast, the magnitude of the evil that he has caused, "banality of evil" is as provocative as it is cogent (Arendt, 2006, 253). More specifically, however, the term first comes up in Arendt's writing in a context around language, and this evil banality emerges first linguistically.

"Banality," considering its secondary meaning relating to clichéd phrases, also corresponds to an institutional reliance and insistence on certain semantic operations (Arendt, 2006, 253). Arendt diagnoses Eichmann with banality, in the final moments of his life, as a result of his reliance on two incompatible clichés, as the two semantic operations he resorts to can't entirely run concurrently. Eichmann is invested in the position that he is an independent freethinker, therefore he is a non-Christian who doesn't believe in the afterlife, but he can't resist replicating a discourse of comradery and patriotism right before his execution. On the heels of his renouncement of life after death, Eichmann concludes that they "shall all meet again" (Arendt, 2006, 252). This moment of ideological and linguistic contradiction, for Arendt, serves as a summary for "the banality of evil" (Arendt, 2006, 253). Insistence on catchphrases and the blind, almost counterproductive adherence to the previously established positions are part of institution's semantic operations, with language driven to its breaking point in the process—similar linguistic impasses are

depicted in the plays that are examined in this thesis. In this respect, power that is institutionally wielded is only closely associated with a vulnerability once again; language is established as a nexus of power in institutional operations only as a result of its blind spots and the threat to its power.

It might be fruitful, at this point, to handle what Foucault (1995) terms "power-knowledge relations" as a specific subset of such institutional semantic operations (p. 27). Foucault talks of how power and disciplinary practices create a body of knowledge, and a part of the institutional discourse is in positioning the institutional subjects as the objects of such knowledge. According to Foucault (1995), power relations and fields of knowledge are complementary and even mutually dependent. There isn't "any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations," or vice versa (Foucault, 1995, p. 27). In *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Arendt (2006) points out to one such semantic operation, where the practices of the Third Reich are positioned as a manufactory of knowledge. Eichmann's defense is pleased of its own "'objective' attitude" and so-called unemotional realism (Arendt, 2006, p. 69). Arendt draws attention to one instance where knowledge and an exercise of power coexist under a seeming display of objectivity. Concentration camps and the use of gas is classified as a "medical matter" by the defense, and the creation of knowledge, in this respect, is without a doubt, a continuation of Third Reich's institutional power, with Jewish people positioned exclusively as its objects (Arendt, 2006, p. 69).

All the plays are certainly invested in how knowledge is created about the subjects of institutions, and then linguistically framed over the course of institutional practices, with the aim of their continuation. On the one hand, the plays' representation certainly agrees with Foucault in that institutions are shown as

creating objects of knowledge from their subjects. Subsuming subjects into fields of knowledge is a part of disciplinary institutional practices. In some ways, the plays share Foucault's suspicion of a proclaimed objectivity; the plays are certainly not too optimistic about medical or psychological fields of knowledge. Such psychologizing as a continuation of disciplinary power is present in all four of the works. On the other hand, the plays often mark points where institutions' linguistic operations and their languages of scientific or medical certainty drive language to points of crisis. The stability and sustainability of such languages based on the creation of power-knowledge are often questioned in these four works.

If we focus on what institutions can operate on for now, however, we can see that these plays are also markedly concerned with visibility, and how visibility is managed within institutional settings. As already mentioned, visibility is already a key feature of the newest incarnation of discipline that Foucault defines, and in this respect, visibility is almost on par with language in importance when it comes to institutional operations. In addition to the general invisibility of institutional practices, the now non-public iteration of punishment and so forth, there appears to be an optics of power, as there is a semantics of it. As one can be semantically made an into object, institutions in the plays often attempt to render their subjects invisible, as part of the same disciplinary project. Visibility and its careful denial are fundamentally intertwined with the abstraction and dissemination of discipline. In *Eichmann in Jerusalem,* Arendt (2006) briefly touches on "the paradox of Auschwitz" which perhaps takes the invisible, Foucauldian mode of punishment that carefully doesn't affirm morality to its extreme, in that its discipline denies any meaning, much less profundity (p. 214). Auschwitz as an institution appears to have optimized the inevitability of a punishment by paradoxically eliminating it

altogether—"those [inmates] caught committing a criminal offense were treated better than the others," as Arendt (2006) quotes from a witness (p. 214). In line with the innovations that come with punishment, the invisibility, the denial of moral justification and meaning are taken to such a point that discipline no longer has even a purported cause. Foucault (1995) similarly point to the meticulous denial of meaning in punishment under modern disciplinary institutions: "The carceral 'naturalizes' the legal power to punish, as it 'legalizes' the technical power to discipline," which "[attenuates] the effects of revolt that they may both arouse" (p. 303). In this respect, both operations move to diminish the significance of the punishment, denying any sense of meaning to its subjects.

Continuing on the optics of power, we can see that the four plays are also concerned with the visibility of persons, and not just the visibility of the punishment. Recognition of legal personhood arises as a common theme, as the works play with visibility both conceptually and on the stage. Under the occasionally literal invisibility of characters lies a denial of the characters, either as fully realized human beings, or legal persons and citizens. Yaşar in *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz*, both Alexander and Ivanov in *Every Good Boy*, the inmates of *The Hothouse* and the new recruits in *Chips with Everything* aren't consistently visible as persons, and they suffer from a legal invisibility in one form or another. Their existence isn't always fully recognized by their institutions, who in turns allocate and deny visibility strategically. Personal visibility in the eyes of the law, on the one hand, is closely connected with citizenship. In *Eichmann in Jerusalem,* Arendt notes the legal invisibility of the inmates of the Jewish concentration camps. Inmates were first denaturalized as citizens by their respective states, which resulted in a legal non-existence and that invisibility under the law was doubtlessly a part of the Third

Reich's institutional discipline: "no longer citizens", but "members of the German state" (Arendt, 2006, p. 39). After the war, however, though it would be blatantly unfair to equate the two institutions, we have Eichmann poetically enough put in a similar position of legal invisibility: He is likewise not claimed by any state as a citizen, and therefore, he can be prosecuted in Israel.

Even beyond visibility in the eyes of a nation state, as in citizenship, the role of moral capability in how human rights have historically been configured has legal personhood ultimately dependent on a form of visibility. Human rights as they pertain to social and political activity have historically been contingent on "moral autonomy" (Hunt, 2008, p. 27). To have the most basic human rights, a person must be able to make "independent moral judgments," and their capability of such distinction must be seen and recognized (Hunt, 2008, p. 27). In *Inventing Human Rights*, Lynn Hunt (2008) counts the "children and the insane" among the groups that are seen to be incapable of proper moral judgments, and who have no way of remedying this perceived lack of moral autonomy (p. 28). Denial of moral autonomy, therefore, can serve as a pretext for the authorities to withhold certain rights, and subject individuals to institutions. Full personhood requires a recognition of autonomy, and its visibility in the eyes of an authority. Concerned with the "children and the insane," (at least some) schools and psychiatric institutions must therefore be doubly concerned with visibility (Hunt, 2008, p. 28): In addition to the Foucauldian invisibility of modern discipline, their operation is fundamentally dependent on the invisibility of their subjects' moral autonomy. In this respect, these institutions have a vested interest in which individuals and which operations are accorded visibility.

Another problematic arena for institutional power, where its concentration and potential vulnerability are felt most heavily, is in sentiment. Foucault (1995), in

his work, pays particular attention to the gentility of discipline in its modern incarnations, remarking on "the gentle way in punishment" (p. 104). This gentility is integral to Foucauldian discipline's differentiation from the preceding forms of spectacular, violent punishment, and it is in the heart of institutional operations. These novel forms of discipline aren't just effective despite their gentility, but effective precisely because of it. Modern institutions operate through "the force of sensibility and passion," evoke and utilize shame, grief and pride in turns (Foucault, 1995, p. 106). Birth of discipline as Foucault (1995) conceptualizes it, coincides with the so-called 'sentimentalist' movements in the eighteenth century, steered by "moralists" such as Servon, Mably and Vermeil, all of whom Foucault quotes often (p. 112). Victorian advocates for prison reform are instrumental in the creation of prison systems as we know them, and they popularize a certain discourse around rehabilitation and re-education, instead of the earlier forms of public, violent punishment. They employ a particular vocabulary which relies heavily on sentiment and mobilizes sensitivities: Servon, as quoted by Foucault (1995), appeals to "the *love* of law and country, the respect and trust of the magistrature," imagines a criminal who is "*dismayed* at the public *joy*, *fearful* at the sight of so many enemies" (emphasis mine, p. 113).

While Foucault (1995) certainly remarks on the role of sentiment in the establishment of modern institutions, it might be helpful to bring in Sara Ahmed for a more in-depth examination of such sentiments. In *Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Sara Ahmed (2014) first outlines a general theory about emotions and their workings, particularly the way emotionality relates to politics. Ahmed (2014) then more closely inspects some politically felt emotions, such as love, joy, fear etcetera, one-by-one, in a number of emblematic texts. Rather than thinking of emotions in an either

outside-in (moving from a collective to an individual) or an inside-out (moving from an individual to the collective) transference, Ahmed (2014) works from an understanding that emotions are "social and cultural practices" (p. 9). According to Ahmed (2014), emotions affect both individual and collective bodies, drawing attention to the surfaces of these bodies. They "materialise the surfaces and boundaries that are lived as worlds" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 191). Ahmed draws attention to emotions' work on boundaries between bodies, to how they make boundaries conspicuous.

Emotions may be felt on and through boundaries, but still, how can they be felt at all? How do emotions circulate and reach those boundaries? Ahmed (2014) thinks of how emotions move in terms of a "stickiness" (p. 74), which is perhaps conceptually not very far from Foucauldian power-knowledge dynamics. For Ahmed (2014), objects that prove emotionally fraught eventually become "sticky" through repetition, sticking to some emotion (p. 46). Ahmed underlines a historicity in emotional transference, stresses the processes through which objects become emotionally sticky. Her position is that objects don't evoke or transfer emotions because of an inherent quality in themselves, but that they are associated with sentiments that eventually stick: "Emotions accumulate over time, as a form of affective value" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 11). Stickiness arises from invisible social and political histories—"objects only seem to have such [emotional] value, by an erasure of these histories, as histories of production and labor" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 11). In this respect, Ahmed's work as an archeology of sentiment which examines the creation of our emotional attachments, echoes Foucault's archeology of discipline in *Discipline and Punish*. Ahmed inspects objects whose stickiness to a certain emotion is taken

for granted and looks at how the object's emotional value was accumulated in a historical and cultural context.

Before moving further into the particulars of different emotions, Ahmed's inspection of emotion, as an operation of/on both individual and collective bodies, will perhaps be especially enlightening for the purposes of this thesis. The tension between an individual and a collective, negotiations of agency and culpability in a meeting of the two, are common concerns of Ahmed, Arendt and Foucault. For Foucault (1995), this tension between the two takes the form of a depersonalization of power, as new methods of discipline take over from the old: Distinct individuals who carry power and authority such as sovereigns are replaced with less spectacular, much-less-defined collective bodies. Arendt (2006) meditates on Eichmann's trial and a key question in that trial is inescapably the exact role and responsibility of Eichmann, within the collective body and agency of the Third Reich. Eichmann's "small-cog" defense (Arendt, 2006, p. 57), in this respect, would perhaps fall under "depersonalizing of justice," where "harmful action [is] justified through concealment of its effects" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 198). However, there is more to such a dynamic between an institution and its individuals than that of Eichmann. Boundaries between individuals and the collective bodies of their institution are felt in different ways, in the plays that are studied in this thesis: Potential defectors, reluctant revolutionaries, what seems like unwitting collaborators are common figures in these works. Institutions' appeals to love or to a sense of community are affective strategies, and the emotional operations of institutions are no less crucial, perhaps, than those around language or visibility. Ahmed (2014) looks at "how we become invested in social norms," and even "how emotions can attach us to the very conditions of our subordination" (p. 12). Similarly, we can approach the way the

institutions in these plays are connected to their emotionality, and in turn, how that emotionality influences the bonds and boundaries between individuals and institutions.

The four plays all feature appeals to love and to a sense of community on their respective institutions' part. Institutional figures often adopt affective approaches, either for the rehabilitation and reacceptance of a potential dissident, or to ensure compliance and conformity in general. National love is a recurring element in *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz,* especially alluded to by the chorus, as is the investments and sacrifices in the name of such a love. *Chips with Everything* and *Hothouse* both feature institutionally celebrated Christmastimes, with the expected dose of sentimentality, as well as institutional authority figures who espouse their love for the institutional subjects. Evocation of a familial love is perhaps the most prominent in *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, though love of the nuclear family is also a driving force in *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz*.

Though they are distinct thematic concerns in the plays, the division between language, visibility and emotion is perhaps not that severe. On a theoretical basis these three are often intertwined. For Sara Ahmed, sentimentality is certainly not detached from language and visibility, as these operations frequently intersect. In terms of language, Ahmed points out to how emotions often take the form of speech acts, and to their performative nature. The historical and cultural processes through which certain emotions stick to certain objects, "this model of sticky signs," show "how language works as a form of power in which emotions align some bodies with others" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 195). In terms of visibility, Ahmed (2014) also points out that emotions often work through "concealment" of such stickiness (p. 198), and the political and cultural histories behind our emotional associations. Ahmed (2014)

works in conjunction with Judith Butler's (2004) examinations of grief, in regard to the conditional recognition and visibility of lives, in terms of "whose lives can be marked as lives, and whose deaths will count as deaths" (pp. xx-xxi). Visibility is also a crucial element in what subjects and objects can be visible for, or recognized by, which emotions. Ahmed's example is that grief, for one, doesn't see all losses as its object; what losses can be grieved is culturally and politically contingent.

Another point in Ahmed's (2014) work that lends itself easily to a Foucauldian interpretation is the elements of contradiction that she locates, in how emotions position their objects and subjects. Strengths and weaknesses of the subjects are paradoxically reliant in such relationships. In feeling disgust, for example, "position of 'aboveness' is maintained only at the cost of a certain vulnerability" (Ahmed, 2014, 89). Likewise is fear, which as Ahmed (2014) reminds the reader, is at its greatest just when its object is gone. With the object out of sight, "the world itself" is "a space of potential danger" (Ahmed, 2014, p.69). This paradoxical relationship isn't only for what would be considered obviously negative emotions, either. Love, as it is politically configured, is contingent on a similarly counterintuitive dynamic. Love in its national or institutional forms, is "sustained only through its failure to be actualised in the present" (Ahmed, 2014, p. 197). What keeps the subject invested in this kind of a love isn't reciprocity, but instead, the deferral of its promise.

So far, I have outlined the most prevalent thematic concerns in these plays as language, visibility, and emotion in institutional settings. Institutions operate heavily in these sites of both concentrated power and furtive vulnerability. Therefore, the plays would surely be interested in these operations due to their interest in institutions themselves. However, these sites of power aren't central for institutions

alone. Institutional operations on these sites of language, visibility, and emotion intersect extensively with dramatical operations on similar axes. In this respect, the toolset of institutional power and the toolset of the theater are not vastly different from each other. This character of institutional power as something very discursive and performative, inevitably puts theater in a peculiar position when it comes to its depiction. Though they themselves are performative and discursive in form, the four plays, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour, Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz, Chips with Everything* and *Hothouse* are all very suspicious of performances. They appear deeply conscious of their shared toolset with institutions. In this respect, the plays can be very enlightening as to the discursive limits and possibilities of drama. Terry Eagleton (2013) summarizes Brecht's work, by pointing out that "putting a factory on stage will tell you nothing about capitalism" (p. 90). How can particular trappings and minute details of institutional power be stopped from overshadowing the underlying framework, especially when institutions work the way they do by their emphasis on such details? In "From Stock to the Stage: Prison Theatre and the Theatre of Prison," James Thompson (2004) points out that the greatest problem in this process may not be the impossibility of a correct or true representation. In putting the institution on stage, there's always the risk of a harmful representation, where the state's or the institution's performance or discourse is simply replicated (p. 63). In the face of such concerns, I would argue that these four plays have adopted and developed an assortment of strategies, which they use to (one) try and differentiate dramatic toolsets from the institutional, (two) to undercut their own performativity/discursivity, and (three) simply navigate the trappings and banalities of institutional power.

One such strategy that features predominantly in all four plays is humor, and if not an outright comedy, then an abundance of comedic elements. Often owing to irony, the humor in these plays is dark, dry and grim. If we look at the individual instances of laughter in the plays, the comedic elements appear to stem from one of two sources: It is either the result of a highlighted inconsistency within an institutional, discursive stance, that is, an accentuated "banality" (Ahmed, 2006, p. 253) or the plays amplify the institutional discourses, with the institutional operations taken to their logical, operational extreme. Ultimately, the humor of the plays often works to mark the dissonances and banalities of institutional discourses. This humor highlights internal inconsistencies. Institutional, discursive stances are shown to fail as the inconsistent threads within the same discourse clash. Consequently, the institutional discourse crumbles under its own weight, until it can't be successfully sustained by even its most archetypal proponents. The comedic strategy of the plays also works, in that enlarging institutional operations can be a way to dismantle the characteristic subtlety of Foucauldian discipline. When institutional exercises are comically enlarged, the no longer subtle operations can more easily be recognized. Once again, there are overlaps in the dramatical and institutional toolsets: The plays show an awareness of how ridicule can also be used by institutions, as a form of disregard and disparagement. The humor in the plays isn't entirely unselfconscious. In that regard, humor seems to commonly take on a very particular character in these plays, with a dryness that often undercuts the ridicule.

In terms of formal decisions and strategies, another line of inquiry will be the general setting and tone of the plays. All in all, the plays depict institutions in a heavily stylized manner. Though the plays themselves may not necessarily and fully conform to another tradition, such as epic or expressionistic theater, the depictions of

institutions in these plays are far from a complete realism. The institutional settings of these plays very often have an eerie, undefined distortion around them that denies any photorealism. As Foucault points out, a great portion of discipline in its modern form lies in its concentration on the details, and its regulation of the minute by policing the smallest of actions. The plays' reluctance to conform to a realist tradition in their institutional depiction, in this respect, can be a way of undercutting the regular operation of the institution. By refusing to focus on all policed details, which the realist tradition prefers, the plays here can avoid a simple replication of the institutional operation. Instead, by the disabling the wide dispersion of power into the smallest details, they stand a better chance of getting at institutional power at its core. Another formal strategy in the plays can be found in the incorporation of music and rhythm. While *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* and *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* are both deeply and undeniably musical in their character, *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* has a prominent chorus and *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* has a full orchestra built into the performance. Wesker's *Chips with Everything* is perhaps less obviously musical; yet, still it features a scene where a song is its most important message, as well as choreographed dance sequences. In Pinter's *Hothouse*, one of the most evocative and meaningful sounds isn't an utterance, but instead the wordless sound of the patients. Even in these plays where there is less of a musical element, there is still some challenge to and a subversion of the expected cadences of language or linguistic patterns, in terms of calls and responses, etcetera. The reliance in, and the prevalence of these musical and rhythmic elements ultimately work to undercut the institutional emphasis on discourse. By balancing their own discursive elements with the inclusion of music and rhythm, the plays are able to approach their institutions, without fully replicating their operations.

This thesis aims to closely examine the plays, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* by Tom Stoppard, *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* by Aziz Nesin , *Chips with Everything* by Arnold Wesker and *Hothouse* by Harold Pinter within this framework of theoretical concerns and strategic elements: Thus, this thesis will be looking at these plays' thematic concerns, in terms of language, visibility and sentiment, and their formal strategies, in terms of setting and tone, humor, and musicality in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2

TRIANGULATING INSTITUTIONAL POWER IN STOPPARD'S *EVERY GOOD BOY DESERVES FAVOUR*

Every Good Boy Deserves Favour, written by Tom Stoppard in 1977 and composed by André Previn, concerns three Alexander Ivanovs all connected to a Russian psychiatric hospital-prison: Alexander, a political dissident who is detained as a patient under the pretext of insanity, Ivanov, a genuine psychiatric patient under the care of the institution and Alexander's roommate, and Sacha, Alexander's son, who uses the name's diminutive. The play most notably features a full orchestra. This orchestra is, at times, understood to be a delusion created by Ivanov's condition; at other times, it exists in the world of the play as a real orchestra, where the institution's doctor plays the violin. Alexander is in the hospital-prison for having protested the unjust imprisonment of other dissidents. He is incarcerated not as a political prisoner but as a psychiatric patient for the sake of publicity. The loud and public defiance of Alexander while incarcerated constitutes a threat to the law-abiding image of a modern and destalinized Russia. Yet the state is equally unwilling to let Alexander go and implicitly admit to a wrong conviction in the first place. Over the course play, the two institutions of *Every Good Boy* and their officers work to convince Alexander to recant, eventually recruiting his son Sacha for the effort. Alexander stands his ground and doesn't admit to being cured, whereas his cellmate Ivanov is genuinely but briefly cured before regressing back to the hallucinations of an orchestra. It appears that Alexander and the institution are stuck at an impasse, as neither of them are willing to step back. Until the head of the institution manages to

contrive a mix-up between Alexander and Ivanov, who share the same name and thus Alexander is discharged with no acknowledgement of mistakes and no recantations.

Stoppard explains how this peculiar orchestrated structure came about: He was first approached by Previn with the idea of a play that featured an orchestra. Stoppard had tentatively settled on an orchestra in the imagination of a triangle-player, but he then stalled until he finally found the play's subject matter. Stoppard met Victor Fainberg in 1976. Fainberg was a Russian dissident who had been institutionalized in the Soviet prison/hospital system for protesting the invasion of Czechoslovakia. He went on protesting his and other dissidents' unjust incarceration, until and after he was discharged—for Stoppard, he was "an insistent, discordant note, one might say, in an orchestrated society" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 20). The character Alexander was heavily inspired by the tribulations of Fainberg and his still-incarcerated friends, and so came to be the cellmate of the delusional triangle-player, Ivanov.

In *the Theater of Tom Stoppard,* Anthony Jenkins (1989) identifies *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* as the first "explicitly political" play in Stoppard's body of work (p. 132). Though it marks a turn in Stoppard's career, the play still bears many of the playwright's trademarks. It exemplifies the fast-paced, witty, zany comedy for which Stoppard had come to be known, "with a talent for verbal fireworks" (Jenkins, 1989, p. 6). By 1976, Stoppard had shown that he had an affinity for satire and comedy, which were farcical at times but also maintained a tender grasp on the human condition, according to Jenkins (1989)—always "self-conscious towards the ironies of one's own eternal inadequacy" (p. 7). Another consistent interest of Stoppard would be points-of-view and perspective, as the playwright often challenged the first impressions and assumptions of the audience

(pp. 58-59). In this respect, elements of *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* were the continuation of Stoppard's career-long explorations. Even some political elements in the play are predicted by the playwright's earlier work: Though language was always slippery and treacherous in his plays, from 1972 *Jumpers* onwards, Stoppard "works towards the *political* [emphasis added] implication of words that ensnare" (Jenkins, 1989, p. 76) Some of his previous plays feature oppressive or totalitarian regimes, such as *Jumpers* and as early as 1965, *The Gamblers.* Nonetheless, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* marks the first time such a regime immediately corresponds to an explicitly named, contemporary political reality.

This might be a good point to briefly outline the particular political reality that saturates *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*. In 1956, Khrushchev would posthumously accuse Stalin of "campaigns of mass repression, torture, and other violations of 'Socialist legality'" in his Secret Speech, and thus, commence the process of Russia's destalinization (Moss, 2002, p. 357). In a series of reforms, Khrushchev would roll back on Stalin's totalitarian measures, to "free the USSR from part, though not all, of Stalinist legacy" (Moss, 2002, p. 353) Destalinization represented a shift in the country's self-conceptualization, as the state claimed a break from repressive practices and human rights violations committed under Stalin. As a part of the destalinization effort, mass-incarcerated political prisoners were released from labor-camps and returned from internal exile. Stalin's antisemitic persecution, such as the so-called Doctors' Plot which targeted a group of predominantly Jewish doctors, was initially criticized and condemned. In the following decade, however, the reforms of destalinization quickly lost momentum, though its rhetoric was still maintained. In the 1970s, 10% of its Jewish population would emigrate from USSR under increased discrimination and harassment (Moss,

2002, pp. 390-391)—hence Ivanov's apparent non-sequitur, "and the Jew's harp has applied for a visa" (p. 103) Destalinization in its earlier stages emphasized legality and if not just, than at least a transparent application of the law. Yet, in 1966, writers Yuli Daniel and Andrei Sinyavsky, who had both been writing under pseudonyms, were sentenced to camps for "anti-Soviet propaganda" (Moss, 2002, p. 391). (Alexander mentions Daniel and Sinyavski in his monologue as A and B: "They arrested a couple of writers, A and B, who had published some stories abroad under different names. Under their own names they got five years' and seven years' hard labour. I thought this was most peculiar," Stoppard, 1984, p. 109). These sentences were soon followed by those of the protestors against the invasion of Czechoslovakia, in 1968, some of whom found themselves in prisons which were presented as psychiatric institutions to the general public (Moss, 2002, p. 392).

The primary institution in *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* is one such psychiatric hospital-prison, housing both the political dissident Alexander, and the genuinely delusional Ivanov. The demarcation between specialized institutional operations, under these circumstances, is already bound to be faint and tenuous. Secondary aims of any discipline the institution exerts are understandably muddled. *Every Good Boy*'s chief institution is headed by a Colonel-Doctor, and even its staff can't keep up with what kind of an institution it is meant to be at any given moment, blundering between "Doctor" and "Colonel," "cell" and "ward," "prisoners" and "patients" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 113). This is even more blatant in the prison-hospital that Alexander was incarcerated in "on Arsenal'naya Street," before the events of the play, with its orderlies wearing "KGB uniforms under their white coats" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 110). It's not only Alexander's hospital-prison that advances discipline ahead of other institutional missions, however. Sacha's school, the other visible

institution of the play, consistently operates as a supplement to Alexander's prison-hospital. The school and the prison-hospital system work for the same aim and undertake the same project; the teacher champions the same state rhetoric that the prison-hospital champions. The teacher positions these disciplinary institutions as one continuous system, even. She correlates Sacha's insubordination in school, with Alexander's dissident activity against the state. ("Is this how it began with your father? First he smashes school property. Later he keeps bad company. Finally, slanderous letters" Stoppard, 1984, p. 110). Any institutional insubordination is understood to be against the whole disciplinary system, in this case, and not the disruption of a secondary mission.

In the play's representation of institutions, there is a homogeneity of purpose underlying their institutional operations. The school and the hospital-prison work for the same aim more concretely, further down the line, and realize the same project literally this time, as Sacha's teacher works with Alexander's doctor. The two institutional figures coach Sacha to convince his father to recant. As Foucault theorizes, in this one disciplinary system underlying all institutional operations, treatment, education, and rehabilitation are only secondary to, and only for the sake of, the institution itself. This secondary, almost negligible nature of additional, specific aims of an institution is best illustrated, perhaps, by Ivanov's short-lived recovery. *Every Good Boy'*s prison-hospital vehemently yet unconvincingly denies that it functions as a prison. Even its accepted mission statement of treatment, however, falls by the wayside of institutional operation. Ivanov actually is treated for a brief moment and overcomes his delusions. Yet this recovery doesn't only go unnoticed by the institution but is actively disrupted by the doctor: "There is no orchestra!" "Of course there's a bloody orchestra!" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 119).

A particularly Foucauldian dimension in institutional operations in the play emerges from the treatment of the rhetoric of destalinization. Characters bring up the contrast between the era of Stalin, referred to as "the bad old days" (Stoppard, 1984, p 110), and their contemporary, destalinized Russia. Sacha's teacher is quick to espouse the differences between the two:

> Things have changed since the bad old days. When I was a girl there were terrible excesses. A man accused like your father might well have been blameless. Now things are different. The Constitution guarantees freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, of assembly, of worship, and many other freedoms. (Stoppard, 1984, p. 115)

Even Alexander acknowledges that there is a difference, and that Stalin's mode of power is a remnant of the past, and does so not entirely sarcastically: "The bad old days were over long ago. Things are different now" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 110). Yet as Alexander's situation clearly shows, the difference between Russia of Stalin and Russia of post-destalinization doesn't lie in the state's exercise of unjust power. Regardless of what the constitution might say, the freedoms that the teacher mentions are clearly still under question in practice. The difference between Stalin's Russia and destalinized Russia doesn't entirely appear to lie in the "Swan lake" or the "space technology," either (Stoppard, 1984, p. 110). Alexander approaches the exact nature of this difference in a rant that seems too bitter to be genuinely nostalgic:

> I want to get back to the bad old times when a man got a sentence appropriate to his crimes—ten years' hard for a word out of place, twenty-five years if they didn't like your face, and no one pretended that you were off your head. (Stoppard, 1984, p. 117)

In this respect, *Every Good Boy*'s conceptualization of these two Russias, that of Stalin and of destalinization, takes shape along a familiar line. "Bad old days" of Stalin is characterized by its blatant, obvious and extreme use of power, with its "terrible excesses" as the teacher recalls (Stoppard, 1984, p. 115). What Alexander recognizes as different in the application of state power, in contrast, is the shift in its

methodology. The difference is in the institutional attempt at masking the nature of state power, labeling its actions not as a suppression of dissent, but instead as rehabilitation, treatment, under the pretext that Alexander is "off [his] head" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 117) *Every Good Boy* presents the shift from "the bad old days" to destalinized Russia (Stoppard, 1984, p. 117), with its prison-hospitals, as a modernization of discipline in the Foucauldian sense, in that Alexander's punishment, masked as an illness instead, is "the most hidden part of the process" (Foucault, 1995, p. 9).

In *Every Good Boy*'s approach to institutions, one prevalent thematic concern emerges as language. The play remains conscious of a state discourse, and of the institutional application of "words that ensnare" all the way through (Jenkins, 1989, p. 76). Language proves a location of both power and vulnerability, in *Every Good Boy*, as the play engages with institutionally-oriented speech acts, power-knowledge dynamics as they fold into considerations around discourse and language, and notably positions the objective certainty of mathematics in opposition to the snares and treachery of language. As a prevalent example, the discourse of destalinization, and a new, 'civilized' Russia in *Every Good Boy* is handled as precisely that, a discourse. In that, as it works to further the institutional power of the state, it also often presents a point of vulnerability. The institutional discourse being pushed on Alexander, of destalinization and a new era of legality, is contradictory and peculiar by its nature. The main discourse that the institutions maintain and disperse, in *Every Good Boy*, is of the state as one that is just and lawful, where the freedoms of its citizens are observed—"the constitution guarantees freedom[s]" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 115). Paradoxically, the state's human rights violations rise from just such a state discourse about their observation. In its desire to cover up the previous deviations

from the discourse of legality, the state commits more violations and deviates further. In disseminating this discourse, the hospital-prison of *Every Good Boy* eventually paints itself into a corner. This is the impasse on which the play opens: “This means they’ve decided to let me go. But it has to be done right. They don’t want to lose ground. They need a formula” (Stoppard, 1984, p. 111).

Formulated as such, the institutional discourse in *Every Good Boy* has perhaps no choice but to be contrived. The precarious nature and the contrivances of institutional discourse is perhaps best exemplified in the teacher’s dictation to Sacha. Interspersed with mathematical facts read by Sacha, the teacher attempts to present parts of this discourse almost as corollaries, with one statement as the other’s logical next step: “The asylum is for malcontents who don’t know what they’re doing. . . . They know what they’re doing but they don’t know it’s anti-social. . . . They know it’s anti-social but they’re fanatics” (Stoppard, 1984, p. 105). Yet, simple proximity to mathematical axioms isn’t entirely sufficient to imbue this discourse with legitimacy, and its statements work more as refutations when arrayed in such a way, with every claim invalidating the previous in each step. The institutional discourse can only be sustained and extended through concession. At this level of complication and contrivance, the institutional discourses of *Every Good Boy* can’t altogether be sustained by even the most obvious institutional proponents of the play. The doctor insists that Alexander should use “ward” rather than “cell,” yet he himself trips up over the distinction, calling the occupants of the institution “prisoners” and correcting himself too late (“rather, patients” Stoppard, 1984, p. 113). The teacher “hesitates” to talk about Bukharin to Sacha (Stoppard, 1984, p. 116), and in that respect, she appears aware of how thin the institutional discourse she maintains can be: “The constitution guarantees freedom[s]” (Stoppard, 1984, p. 115), yet its writer

was executed, which she can only clumsily reframe as him being "unfortunately . . . shot" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 116).

In *Every Good Boy*, the Colonel in charge of the prison-hospital institution almost serves as a distillation of state discourse, and as a character, he is particularly illuminating in how language is used in institutional operations. The colonel is the most impressive, but also perhaps the most pompous character in the play, his entrance accompanied by the organ and preceded by the Doctor's fearful reverence. Positioned as a linguistic genius, the Colonel's capabilities are deemed exceptional within the institution. The colonel quite literally operates on and through language, he's not a medical doctor but a "Doctor of Philology," his specialty is "Semantics" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 114) The Doctor is apprehensive that the Colonel "can't do the impossible" despite all his capabilities and mastery over language, and let Alexander be discharged without excepting any wrongdoing, yet this figure in the end does just that. The colonel provides the "formula" that the state needs (Stoppard, 1984, p. 111), and knowingly confuses the two Alexander Ivanovs. With a careful engineering of the situation, Ivanov handpicked "personally" to room with Alexander (Stoppard, 1984, p. 113), the Colonel is able to declare that "there is absolutely nothing wrong with these men" (p. 123). At first glance, the Colonel's mastery stands in contrast to the buffoonery of the Doctor, and his more obvious, clumsier manipulation of language. The doctor aspires to a technical and very slim truthfulness, skirting around with a language of hypotheticals, all per se and "as such" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 113). He doesn't always succeed in manipulating language, and at least in the eyes of his institution, the Colonel is more sophisticated and powerful in that same operation. Yet the Colonel's great triumph is only possible through further, willful mistakes—he has to shut Alexander's and the Doctor's

attempts correction. Though the Colonel may have more pomp than the doctor, he ultimately proves no less banal.

Another dimension of the institutional, linguistic operation in *Every Good Boy* emerges in what Foucault would deem power-knowledge dynamics, a medicalized discourse being used as a tool of discipline, and as a justification of institutional operations. The doctor's diagnosis of Alexander works as such: "Your disease is dissent" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 116), or in more of a specialized and intentionally obscure language, "pathological development of the personality with paranoid delusions" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 112). Political dissidence is thus transformed into a medical matter, and in a way, that is what allows for a doctor/patient division, for the maintenance of the dynamics of power. The doctor likes a sharp line between who is considered medically sane and who is not: "No, I am a doctor. You are a patient. It's a distinction which we try to keep going here" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 112). Again, he reasserts the distinction more generally:

> DOCTOR: Of course. The idea that all the people locked up in mental hospitals are sane while the people walking about outside are all mad is merely a literary conceit, put about by people who should be locked up. I assure you there's not much in it. Taken as a whole, the sane are out there and the sick are in here. For example, you are here because you have delusions, that sane people are put in mental hospitals.
> ALEXANDER: But I *am* in a mental hospital
> DOCTOR: That's what I said. If you're not prepared to discuss your case rationally, we're going to go round in circles. (Stoppard, 1984, p. 113).

That distinction between who is sane and who is not is only possible through a discourse of medicine and pathology, of a specialized language of subjection. Once having medicalized 'sanity,' the doctor can discard any opposition to the institutional distinctions as coming from a place of insanity. Any objection to the institution as it operates automatically come from those "who should be locked up," and so forth (Stoppard, 1984, p. 113). Any objection has to be discussed "rationally" (Stoppard,

1984, p. 113), for the doctor to consider it, yet any criticism coming from Alexander is already accepted as insane, and as irrational, by definition.

As repeatedly brought up, Alexander's crime is "slander" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 104)—in this respect, it is not only a form of insanity, but as a crime, it's specifically a speech act. The crime is committed through language and it's the speech itself that constitutes the crime. In *Every Good Boy*, the institutional systems consistently accord language and speech with exceptional, almost metaphysical power. Institutional systems of the play equate speaking with many different acts, including crime as in "slander" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 104), in so far as language presents a challenge to the institution. Both the school and the prison-hospital imagine writing and repetition of lines as a form of correction or rehabilitation, however, and the speech as an act isn't only a crime. The teacher makes Sacha write lines as a form of punishment; the doctor prescribes Ivanov what is essentially a linguistic treatment. Power of will and suggestion, banish his imaginary orchestra linguistically. According to the Doctor, Ivanov should impress on himself that "there's no orchestra," and "keep saying [that] to [himself]" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 107). In this respect, as speaking can be the crime by itself, it can also function as a step in its redress Yet the play itself is more suspicious of its effectiveness and power. In the end, Every Good Boy sees manipulation through language as having its limits. What ultimately, briefly cures Ivanov isn't this linguistic regimen—it's Alexander's laxatives, instead.

What is, then, at the limits of institutional semantic mastery, and linguistic manipulation? *Every Good Boy* ultimately positions mathematics as the antithesis and almost the antidote to language, which is malleable in the hands of authority, and open to manipulation. Geometry represents the limits of language, and is positioned

beyond the linguistic reach of institutions in the play. Though knowledge can clearly be in service of power and of institutions as in the case of medicine, when it comes to geometry and arithmetic, Stoppard diverges from the Foucauldian power-knowledge conceptualization. Mathematics in *Every Good Boy* isn't in service of any one institution, and instead, has an existence irreverent of power. True and false isn't blurred, when it comes to the mathematics of *Every Good Boy*, and in it, characters can recover a resistant, unshakeable sense of truth. The teacher makes Sacha read from a geometry book, as mentioned, in what appears to be an attempt at coopting the axiom's legitimacy for state discourse, with mixed results. Sacha later supposedly misreads from the same book, trying to distort the axioms and manages the make his point, in the process.

> SACHA: A triangle is the shortest distance between three points.
> TEACHER: Rubbish.
> SACHA: A circle is the longest distance to the same point.
> TEACHER: Sacha!
> SACHA: A plane area bordered by high walls is a prison not a hospital.
> TEACHER: Be quiet! (Stoppard, 1984, pp. 111-112)

Sacha's intentional misreading works to show the limits of language, in that his claims aren't realized as truths on his saying so. Though it's worth noting that both axioms could circumstantially and technically be true, echoing most of the institutional claims in the play. If geometry doesn't allow for semantic stretching, there is possibility that the institutional maneuvers of language will also meet their limit. Alexander, in a similar vein, entreats Sacha to remember "one plus one is always two", and "[to not] forget [his] geometry" (Stoppard, 1984, pp. 121-122). The triangle, an instrument and a geometrical concept both, often emerges in the orchestra as the voice, or rather the sound, of reason—as well as one of dissent and resistance.

Another prominent thematic concern in *Every Good Boy* is visibility, in terms of how institutional subjects are accorded with conditional visibilities. Jenkins (1989) identified perspective as a career-long point of interest for Stoppard (pp. 58-59), who would continue challenging the first impressions and assumptions of the audience. Visibility is a significant consideration in the staging of *Every Good Boy*, as well. The orchestra and the three institutional stages (Ivanov and Alexander's cell, the doctor's office, and Sacha's school) play with visibility and assumptions around it, in complicated ways. Finally, there is visibility of personhood, and visibility of moral autonomy as another optical concern, for all three Alexander Ivanovs. According to Jenkins (1989) the comedy is often derived "from the clash of views," in *Every Good Boy* (p. 134). One running gag that plays on a dynamic of perspective is Ivanov and the doctor appearing to switch roles, from the perspective of other characters. Sacha assumes Ivanov is the doctor, because he finds him in the doctor's office. Before this, Alexander is "taken aback" and can't help ask if the doctor is a patient, too, when the doctor unknowingly echoes Ivanov's absurd question: "Do you play a musical instrument?" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 112). Yet for the doctor, there is nothing alarming or insane about the question, since it was inspired by his recent practice in a real orchestra. On a separate occasion, Ivanov asks the somewhat cliched question that universally recalls therapy, though granted, he can't resist adding his own spin toward the end: "Tell me about yourself—your home, your childhood, your first piano teacher … how did it all begin?" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 108). This playful confusion of the two roles puts the circumstantiality of institutional operations to perspective, and shows the framing on divisions between sane and insane, between authority and subject, which are used to maintain and justify institutional operations.

Perhaps the most obvious complication of visibility in the play, however, comes with *Every Good Boy'*s orchestra. The orchestra doesn't always exist in the world of the play, as it is sometimes only a delusion of Ivanov. In such moments, other characters don't react to the orchestra and ignore its existence. There are moments when the orchestra is considered real within this setting, when it's the legitimate state orchestra where the doctor plays in. This complicated visibility comes to a head, at a moment when Ivanov and the doctor seem to exchange their perspectives, as a briefly cured Ivanov declares that "there is no orchestra" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 119). Yet now it's the doctor who insists that "of course there is bloody orchestra" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 119), as he hurries to make it in time to his recital. In the world of the play, as mentioned, there are moments when the orchestra is meant to be invisible. To complicate matters further, from the audience's perspective, a full orchestra, on any stage, is bound to be viscerally real, and perhaps more present than anything else on the same stage. In this way, there can be three separate ways the same object, the orchestra, is seen and not seen—by Ivanov, by Alexander, and by us, the audience. In this manner, the play draws attention to the particularity of points-of-view, and the awareness of an inevitably limited perspective, comes with the recognition of how conditional and situational visibility can be.

The use and allocation of visibility in the staging of *Every Good Boy* is also very particular: Stoppard chooses to have "three separate acting areas" for the cell/ward of Alexander and Ivanov (Stoppard, 1984, p. 101), the doctor's office, and Sacha's school. Other than some very short transitions, these areas aren't really simultaneously lit. They continue to coexist as spaces on the same stage even when they aren't lit, rather than being set as spaces that occupy the entirety of the stage and

then get alternately changed for scenes. In this respect, *Every Good Boy* disrupts the assumption of a single line of sight and a single stable perspective. It's not one area that is seen in full visibility continuously with set changes between two scenes, but instead, the presence of something that the audience can't see is always there with the unlit areas. The three acting areas aren't always lit, and not always visible or accessible. The stage also doesn't offer one continuous narrative, on one changing area. In this respect, *Every Good Boy* denies an ultimate, full and complete perspective, there is no totality to its visibility. The setting of the stage is precisely not "panoptic" (Foucault, 1995, 217).

There is additionally a more metaphorical form of visibility at play, in terms of moral autonomy, when it comes to the institutionalization of Alexander, Ivanov and Sacha in *Every Good Boy*. None of the three Alexander Ivanovs of the play is recognized as a full person capable of moral distinction: Alexander and Ivanov are considered insane and Sacha is a child. With a refusal to see moral autonomy, and recognize them as fully persons, the institutions of the play can continue with their operations. Paul Rae (2009), talking of prisons and detention centers, but on covert prisons and detention centers especially, says this about visibility: "But arguably, any form of silencing, whether by means of threat, injunction or coercion, entails a form of disappearance, even when the subject remains in plain sight" (p. 68). In this respect, Alexander and Ivanov share the complicated visibility of the orchestra, paradoxically existing both in plain sight and as invisible. Alexander is ignored and discounted, Ivanov's short-lived recovery goes overlooked by the doctor. In contrast to his invisibility in the institution, what saves Alexander is his hypervisibility in international media: "Yes, your name goes round the world. By telegram. It is printed in the newspapers. It is spoken on the radio" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 105). His

hunger strike means that Alexander is no longer invisible, and "they don't like you to die unless you can die anonymously" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 110).

The final thematic concern to be explored in *Every Good Boy* is sentiment. As one pronounced example of this, Alexander and Sacha are often used against each other by their institutions, and there is definitely a sentimental coercion being practiced through appeals to family. Further, in terms of individual within and versus the institution, the boundary between this part and whole is evoked, and felt, to different degrees under different circumstances. One such complication of the boundaries between the institution and the individual comes with the doctor, pleading with Alexander to work together, appealing for a cooperation that isn't entirely institutional but it seems almost more individually-oriented. Relating again to the individual and the institution, generally, gratitude, favor and reward, as themes and as concepts, resurface in institutional operations in *Every Good Boy*. Finally, there is *Every Good Boy*'s own relationship to sentiment and sentimentality, in terms of how the play itself deals with the pathos of its subject matter.

Attesting to the general gentility of discipline, there are a number of moments in *Every Good Boy* where the boundaries between the individual and the institution, of the part and the whole of society, are at their minimal. A part of the institutional discipline relies on the minimization of the boundaries between the two, and institutional operations are bolstered by their felt unity. One such unity comes with the orchestra metaphor for society, with harmony and cohesion as this society's promised values: "I am a member of an orchestra and we must play together" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 106). The play's orchestral society is quite telling when examining music as a formal element in the play. There is a similar gentility in how the institutional officers of the play use Alexander and Sacha against each other:

"He's a good boy. He deserves a father" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 115). The doctor evokes and strengthens one bond, between Alexander and Sacha, seemingly for the reestablishment of more bonds, with the rest of the society. Discipline isn't only in punishment, in *Every Good Boy*, and can come as a consolation and a promise both, at times. As a part of the institutional operation, the teacher promises that "everything is going to be all right" to Sacha, who then echoes it to his father (Stoppard, 1984, pp. 112-123).

In addition to the theme of an orchestrated society where all parts play together, there are appeals made to institutional subjects to more simply play *along* with society, in the absence of social unity and institutional cohesion. Institutional figures aren't completely incapable of self-awareness in *Every Good Boy*, though this self-awareness is then merely used to sustain institutional operations further. These accompany moments where the boundary between the institution and the individual is felt, and the feeling of this boundary is perhaps even encouraged. The doctor certainly sees himself as a small part in the institutional whole, but a part that doesn't necessarily get immersed in it. The doctor is capable of disowning institutional bonds, and deny belonging to the whole institutional system, along with any individual responsibility: "It's not *me*! I'm told what to do" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 117). Denial of meaningful association with the system, disowning of the operation, is exactly how the doctor can continue going along with them. This acutely felt divide between the individual and the institution is instrumental in the second form of cooperation to which the doctor invites Alexander. The doctor seems to propose a form of togetherness that is not based around complete social harmony, unlike the orchestra: "Stupidity is one thing I can't cure. I have to show that I have treated you. You have to recant and show gratitude for the treatment. We have to act together"

(Stoppard, 1984, p. 114). The doctor paints this togetherness almost as him and Alexander being two dissidents together, and individuals not entirely in accord with the institution. A similar appeal comes from Sacha, who has been coached by the doctor and the teacher—an appeal for Alexander to "tell them lies" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 121). In this respect, both focusing away from and focusing on the division between the individual and the institution can be a supplement to institutional operations.

Gratitude, favor and reward as recurring institutional recourses in *Every Good Boy* showcase another interesting configuration of the part and the whole, of the complicated boundary between the individual and the institution. Institutional figures of the play bring up favor, as a promised reward for good behavior. Yet these are markedly named favors, not rewards or incentives. As such, what is expected in return for a favor isn't simply obedience but instead gratitude. Alexander has to show "gratitude for the treatment" he has suffered (p. 114), Sacha begs him to "tell them [he is] grateful" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 121). Earlier on, the teacher upgrades Sacha from the triangle to the drums, and when he breaks them in protest, wonders whether "this [is] how [she is] repaid" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 110). This sentimentalizing of reward paints routine institutional acts as exceptional, or rather, more significantly, reframes institutional operations not as institutional but as personal. Through this personalization, Alexander's rigidity can be rebranded as a form of selfishness, as a breach in manners, and not as institutional rebellion. In this respect, the boundary between the individual and the institution here is understated, in favor of overemphasized personal obligations, which work to obscure institutional operations.

The play itself, with its subject matter so befitting pathos, has a complicated relationship with sentimentality. It would be unfair to argue either that the play is

unsentimental or that its sentimentality is ultimately bad. In light of the events that inspired it, with the play drawing from the accounts of Victor Fainberg, stripping the prison-hospital of all pathos would be misleading, and perhaps even unethical. The play isn't devoid of sentiment, though with the depiction of Alexander's institutional subjugation supplying this sentimentality, there is still the danger of its replication on stage. The most of sentimental and emotional moments in *Every Good Boy,* however, originate not from the text itself but from the music. Alexander, when talking of his suffering and of his resistance, does so "flatly, not poetically" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 117)—the pathos doesn't come from Alexander himself. Jenkins (1989) describes the performance of the A-B-C speech, where Alexander narrates his and other dissidents' persecution at the hands of the state, in these terms:

> The speech moves with the cellos, which glide mournfully under the words until "I thought this was most peculiar" (23) when the orchestra takes over and allows us pause to consider the detention of writers who have published "mad" books. Timed to this accompaniment, the next words slow to a colourless monody as Alexander describes how C (Vladimir Bukovsky) went back to the mental hospital for protesting against the arrest of A and B. These impersonal letters match the notes of the musical scale and the points in Sacha's geometric figures but, as the litany progresses to Q, R, S, and T, the rising emotion in the music belies the dispassionate prose. In this way, Stoppard eschews all but the blackest comedy and protects Alexander from self-pity by giving him an air of detached astonishment. (p. 135)

As opposed to the emotionally charged language of the institutional figures, of gratitude and favors, *Every Good Boy* shifts sentiment away from language to music. Alexander's flat delivery consisting of simple rhymes is one element where the play is very careful with sentiment and where it is concentrated—in this case, markedly not around language. One other moment that Jenkins (1989) notes regards the depiction of Alexander's suffering, perhaps the most one emotionally packed moment comes with Sacha's observation that Alexander "smell[s] like Olga when she does her nails" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 111). With Sacha's this "innocent remark,"

"Stoppard highlights the most monstrous of the prisoner's sufferings" (Jenkins, 1989, p. 135): Alexander explains the smell as the byproduct of his body "[metabolizing] its own fat" as a result of his hunger strike (Stoppard, 1984, p. 111). This moment is very telling in terms of how the play deals with the sentimentality of suffering, and the potential threat of its replication. Even here when the suffering is at its most impactful, in the play, it should be noted that it is depicted not directly, but through its effects. Instead of replicating suffering under institutions, *Every Good Boy* sketches suffering indirectly, through what is around it, and through the effects that surround it.

One formal strategy that the play uses in the depiction of institutional operations is humor. Jenkins (1989) designates *Every Good Boy* as "Stoppard's blend of serious-play" (p. 134), with a subject matter that can't altogether be reduced to comedy, yet humor still comprises an undeniable element of the play. One considerable source of comedy in *Every Good Boy* is Ivanov, with plenty of puns and supposed Freudian slips in abundance. He complains of the horn section of his imaginary orchestra with creative word play: "when I try to reason with them they purse their lips" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 101). He then goes on to reassure Alexander of his tolerance of musicians: "I've had French whores and gigolos speak to me in the *public street*, I mean horns, I mean piccolos, so don't worry about *me*, maestro" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 103). Though Ivanov is presented as a potential source of violence and threat as well, there is something undeniably creative and energetic about him, and especially about his humor. Ivanov's version of comedy brings with it joy and spectacle. In contrast, figures of the institution are handled with a grimmer humor. The teacher occasionally employs a needling ridicule as a tactic of discipline. She proposes that Sacha read from "*Fathers and Sons*, perhaps," and points out how

"detention is becoming a family tradition" with the Ivanovs (Stoppard, 1984, p. 105). Yet overall, the humor is sadder, and more bitter than energetic in *Every Good Boy* when it relates to the institutional figures. The teacher's needling lacks Ivanov's absurd energy and inventiveness. The humor comes more from the banality of the institutional figures, such as the Colonel accompanied by the organ, and the dull, contrived ridiculousness of institutional operations.

Another formal strategy of *Every Good Boy* comes with the prominent role of music in its structure, though the play's orchestra isn't just a formal element, but also a significant thematic aspect. The orchestra functions as a metaphor for society, especially in how the institutional figures of the play configure it, though in practice, the orchestra is also imagined almost as an alternative to institutions, offering recourse from institutional operations. On the one hand, the orchestra evokes a society in harmony, where the whole is greater than the parts—"I am a member of an orchestra and we must play together" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 106). Alexander, Sacha and Ivanov, in this respect, emerge as the dissident, disharmonious noises, or as Stoppard describes Victor Fainberg, "an insistent, discordant note, one might say, in an orchestrated society" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 20). Being in an orchestra is literally mandatory, in the case of Sacha, and both Sacha and Alexander find scorn and shock, when they refuse to participate in an orchestra. It is worth noting that the orchestra isn't necessarily an equally orchestrated society. The orchestra mirrors larger social hierarchies in *Every Good Boy*, in some respects. Not all instruments are equal, as the teacher half-admits to Sacha, who is left with the triangle: "if you're a good boy I might find you a better instrument" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 106). The Doctor, who is "told what to do," is also "a lowly violinist" in the orchestra (Stoppard, 1984, p. 117), echoing his place in the institutional hierarchy. Thus, the triangle, associated

with both Sacha and Ivanov, is a dissonant sound in the orchestra from two directions: It is the sound of reason, with geometry and mathematics in the play marking the limits of linguistic manipulation, and additionally, as the lowest instrument, it's bound to be in its margins.

An orchestrated society may be the prominent metaphor in *Every Good Boy*, yet the orchestra of the play, and the orchestra that Ivanov imagines, don't always work for the strengthening of institutional, orchestrated societies and social hierarchies. The music often undercuts the metaphor of an orchestral society in harmony, and sides more with the dissidents and triangles, than with the institutional figures of authority. As Jenkins (1989) puts it,

> Lest we accept that [the orchestra is a metaphor of society], the music itself is often so radiant or so in sympathy with Alexander, when it punctuates his long speech about his arrest, that we are surely brought to wonder how orchestrated societies could produce such sound or, since Previn echoes composers like Prokofiev and Shostakovich, how artists create in spite of State directives. (pp. 133-134)

The orchestra of the play mocks hierarchies more than it supports them, as its does with the entrances of both the doctor and the colonel, who are higher in the social and institutional hierarchy than all three Alexander Ivanovs, but ultimately find less sympathy with the orchestra. Ivanov's orchestra is similarly subversive. He talks of his orchestra with admittedly violent but nearly revolutionary fervor: "Every member of the orchestra carries a baton in his knapsack. Your turn will come" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 116). Ivanov's orchestra also appears more inclusive, with invitations extended to both Alexander and Sacha: "You can be in [my orchestra]" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 119). There is even a hint of equality, in that respect, with Ivanov's promise to Sacha that "everybody's equal to the triangle" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 116). The orchestra stands, not always as a metaphor for the institutional society, but occasionally in spite of it.

As a formal aspect of *Every Good Boy*, the orchestra isn't only the principal source of the play's musicality, but it is also an important element of the play in terms of its staging and setting. *Every Good Boy* has three acting areas, as already mentioned in the discussion of visibility, which offer a conspicuously incomplete perspective of the action, and draw attention to invisibilities. Another, and perhaps the biggest, part of the stage however, is occupied by the orchestra, "which is always there before us" (Jenkins, 1989, p. 132). In terms of what is consistently visible, an actual orchestra on stage, is perhaps tonally bound to be outside of a complete naturalism or photorealism. With *Every Good Boy* "beyond a mere recitation for the concert platform" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 18), the orchestra isn't simply a non-diegetic accompaniment, but instead blurs the diegetic and non-diegetic, and raises questions as to what the boundaries of the play's action are. One concrete example of this is in the set-up for the performance: "The orchestra tunes-up. The tuning-up continues normally but after a minute or two the musicians lapse into miming the tuning-up" (Stoppard, 1984, p. 101). Preparation for the performance transition and becomes a part of the actual performance.

Ultimately, *Every Good Boy* triangulates its prison-hospital, its supplemental schoolroom, and both their institutional operations, by pinpointing the ridiculous banality of its proponents, with a remarkable awareness and complication of perspective/visibility both on formal and thematical levels, and finally through a musicality and a mathematics that remains resistant to linguistic manipulation. The orchestra in *Every Good Boy* is at the center of the play's examinations and configurations of sentiment, visibility, and language. The orchestra can present a subversion and a ridicule to institutional operations, as well as sympathy for its subjects and victims: The Teacher and The Doctor join the orchestra as the play ends,

yet notably Ivanov with his triangle finally gets to do so as well. Though perhaps more emblematically it is through its triangle, musical and geometrical, that *Every Good Boy* can ring a note so resonant as to the scope and limits of institutional operations. The play closes on the music play by a reunited orchestra, with Sacha echoing the same message of unity and social harmony, that “everything can be all right” (Stoppard, 1984, p. 123). Alexander can’t manage to say anything more than “Sacha” (Stoppard, 1984, p. 123), unable to verbally oppose the idea. Yet Ivanov as the triangle in the orchestra is perhaps enough to bely the supposed harmony and convey what Alexander is unable to put into words.

CHAPTER 3

THE RULES OF SMILES IN WESKER'S *CHIPS WITH EVERYTHING*

Arnold Wesker's 1960 *Chips with Everything* concerns a group of fresh recruits in the Royal Air Force who go through their initial training, and encounter the full scope of institutional military discipline for the first time in the process. Wesker had drawn on his own experiences in military service while writing the play, working from "letters he wrote and a journal he kept during the first eight weeks he was serving in the Royal Air Force in 1950" (Dornan, 1994, p. 49). Though *Chips with Everything* is primarily interested in the military institution it depicts, the greater dynamics of class are never too far away from the play's consideration: The militaristic brand of discipline to which the recruits of the play are subject, replicates the wider mercantile practices of the outside. The recruits in *Chips with Everything* are markedly, overwhelmingly working-class, and Pip Thompson, with his upper-class upbringing, education, and banker/general father, quickly emerges as the obvious and conspicuous outlier amongst them. Despite the initial friction between Pip and the rest of the recruits, who more memorably include Charles and Andrew, they actually manage to withstand and resist the officers' coercion for a considerable time. Yet the resistance comes to a halt just when it appears strongest: Smiler, a recruit who has drawn the ire of the officers from day one because his face naturally holds the semblance of a smile, is singled out and menaced by the officers. The rest of the recruits choose to stand with Smiler, culminating in a clash between them and the institution, that could potentially prove decisive and momentous—as well as, perhaps, equally catastrophic. Yet the standstill is broken by Pip before this clash can

fully play out, who backs down and joins the officers. Pip defuses the tension between them and the recruits, perhaps helping Smiler, but also dissolving any remaining resistance in the recruits' ranks.

Wesker had first gained recognition as a playwright with the Angry Young Men of the late-1950s, though even then "his voice was not as acrimonious as the others'" (Dornan, 1994, p. 2). He had been known as a socialist, working-class playwright, when *Chips with Everything* was first staged, and he had shown great sensitivity for and insight about the working-class life in his earlier plays. In this respect, *Chips with Everything* would come at a turning point in Wesker's career—it is considered to be "[by] many, Wesker's last great play" (Dornan, 1994, p. 49). While *Chips with Everything* continues the trends of Wesker's earlier plays, in terms of its socialist themes and sensitivity to class struggle, it also carries signs of deviation from those trends, and hints at the later concerns of the playwright. *Chips with Everything* was written on the cusp of Wesker's ideological shift from socialism to an, at the time, less-popular humanism, in addition to the playwright's estrangement from the other socialist figures of British theater. Until *Chips with Everything* Wesker had also been known as a staunch naturalist, who "often include[d] more stage directions than most playwrights" (Dornan, 1994, p. 23). While *Chips with Everything* is easily the most naturalistic of the four plays that this thesis will be examining, it was the first significant step away from naturalism in Wesker's own career.

What is perhaps most integral to this reading of *Chips with Everything*, however, in terms of where it is situated in Wesker's progression as a playwright, is in the play's blend of humanism with socialist sensibilities. Humanistic elements of Wesker's writing come with his focus on the individual and individual

enlightenment. In many of Wesker's plays, this individualistic humanism is blended with socialism, in that education and cultivation are presented as methods of emancipation in the class struggle. Such humanistic themes where individual cultivation serves as the precursor to a dedicated socialist struggle were also present in Wesker's earlier plays, such as 1958 *The Roots*. At the time, however, this more humanistic aspect of Wesker's work was somewhat overshadowed by "his platform as the son of a Communist and a family in London's East End and a self-avowed socialist" (Dornan, 1994, p. 37). Nonetheless, this concern with cultivation and emancipation reemerges in *Chips with Everything* thematically, in addition to Wesker's contemporary advocacy and activism based on the same concern. While *Chips with Everything* was being staged, Wesker had been the director of Centre 42, a project that had been imagined as a center of arts and culture for the working-class public, and one that eventually "died a slow death" (Dornan, 1994, p. 47). Wesker had initially carried great expectations of what the Centre could achieve:

> His mission was to redress injustices played on uneducated workers shut out by the snobberies of Britain's class system. He believed that a self-constructed education in the arts would not only improve daily life but could minimize class differences and open doors for the excluded. (Dornan, 1994, p. 45-46)

Wesker's blend of class-conscious socialism with humanistic self-cultivation in this manner wasn't without critics. Even in the Centre's committee, there were figures that were uncomfortable with the idea, and found the attitude patronizing. Another point of contention between Wesker and the rest of Centre would form around what precisely constituted as arts: Wesker was "convinced that the fine arts [were] superior to any of the popular forms" and held a deep suspicion of popular culture (Dornan, 1994, p. 37). He "stood against the others in Centre 42 in his opposition to the use of rock music, which he deemed paralyzing to its listeners and trivial" at a

festival that the Centre would organize (Dornan, 1994, p. 46). Wesker considered the forms of entertainment and culture that were popular at the time with the working-class public (such as rock music) to be a distraction, which ultimately only pacified the unrest and discontent in the ranks. According to Anne Etienne (2016), "*Chips* encapsulates the spirit that motivated [Centre 42]" in this manner (p. 3), which championed self-cultivation and remained suspicious of popular forms of entertainment and art. These concerns of the Centre and of Wesker, on self-cultivation and popular culture, will be doubly relevant in this chapter's discussion of how the play uses music, as well as how it sketches out class structures and hierarchies in general.

The primary institution in *Chips with Everything* is the military complex, and it is perhaps the most clearly defined institution in the four plays that this thesis will be examining. The military in *Chips with Everything* is undeniably structured and hierarchical as an institution, and the recruits at the center of the play are relegated to the lowest end of this hierarchy, once they become a part of it. Over the course of the play, the Royal Air Force manages a gradual yet conclusive concentration of power over the recruits, fully subsuming them under institutional discipline. The military complex in *Chips with Everything* is very Foucauldian in that the disciplinary practices of the military takes the form of an unrelenting, patient and long-term project. Further, though the secondary aims of the institution appear clear at first glance, in that it is meant to be a military force, thus a specific type of institution, discipline is still the principle goal of the project. The Squadron Leader's speech to the recruits early on is very telling, in this respect:

> You are here to learn discipline. Discipline is necessary if we are to train you to the maximum state of efficiency, discipline and obedience. You will obey your instructors because they are well-trained, you will obey them because they can train you efficiently, you will obey them because it's necessary for

> you to be trained efficiently. That is what you are here to learn, obedience and discipline. (Wesker, 1967, p. 12)

The Squadron Leader presents a discipline that is for the sake of discipline, one that overshadows any additional aims of the institution—he markedly doesn't make any appeals to the secondary institutional aims of the military, in terms of national defense or patriotism and so forth. There is a circular logic and totality to the last two sentences, where discipline is affirmed as its own reason, method and ultimately goal, all at once.

Further on the means and methods of discipline, the military institution of *Chips with Everything* practices an institutional discipline that is insistent and pervasive, yet also subtle. Earlier in the same lecture, the Squadron Leader proposes one additional goal to discipline, aiming to "foster feelings of self-respect and personal honor which are essential to efficiency" (Wesker, 1967, p. 12). Yet there is less truth to this statement; and this secondary aim of increased self-worth, claimed in the name of discipline, stands in stark contrast with the treatment of Smiler at the hands of institutional authority in Act 2. The officers attack any shred of dignity that Smiler still maintains, and their operation is more about stifling any self-respect, than about fostering it. Smiler is told that he is "an insult" and "a mistake," that he is "no good at all," that his "mother wasted her labour" (Wesker, 1967, p. 46) In the same scene, the Corporal Hill presents a more sinister additional aim to discipline, yet this mission statement rings truer than that of the Squadron Leader, when the institutional mechanisms operating on Smiler are recalled: "We'll break you because that is our job" (Wesker, 1967, 46). Pervasiveness of discipline is also highlighted in the play by Corporal Hill, who has an exhausting monologue in Act 1 Scene 3, and that full scene is almost solely dedicated to his description of military marching orders and standing positions. Institutional discipline of the military in *Chips with Everything*

wishes to regulate all, from the "toe of the right and heel of the left" foot, up to the placement of fingers, "thumbs straight and to the front" (Wesker, 1967, p. 8). Reminiscent of passages from which Foucault quotes from similar manuals, *Chips with Everything* has discipline endeavoring to control even the minute, by regulating the most trivial details. Institutional control is dispersed into the smallest details, which is how it can simultaneously be so ever-present and so hard to isolate. Yet *Chips with Everything* gives this institutional obsession with the details in a single concentrated monologue, where there can be no dispersion, and the play in this manner shows the extent of the control that the military institution is exacting. Yet this control isn't devoid of subtlety; in fact, it is carried through a certain gentility and delicacy in discipline. The Pilot Officer, while trying to recruit Pip to the officers' side, alludes to just such a change in the character of discipline: "You will not be a foolish, stiff, Empire-thumping officer—no one believes in those any more. You will be more subtle" (Wesker, 1967, p. 51).

One thematic concern in *Chips with Everything* is visibility, and most of this chapter's discussion of visibility in the play will concern the wider class structures as they reflect on the play's military institution. *Chips with Everything* accords particular attention to the visibility of class disparity, even within an institutional structure that is presented as removed from the general society that practices it. Visibility accorded to dissent and to discontent against institutional structures, and further the visibility of dissent against class hierarchy, emerges as another thematic aspect of visibility in *Chips with Everything*. More generally, there is also the visibility of the recruits in the eyes of their institutional superiors, even when they aren't in a state of unrest or dissent. The Squadron Leader explains his disciplinary role in these terms: "It is also my task to bring to notice those who, from incapacity

or apathy, are deficient in knowledge of their duties" (Wesker, 1967, p. 12). In this respect, the application and justification of discipline in the manner that the Squadron Leader presents it, echoes the previous discussions around moral autonomy. The Squadron Leader relates disobedience to "incapacity or apathy" " (Wesker, 1967, p. 12), which indicates the disobedient recruits lack moral autonomy, the capability to make moral decisions. This evocation of moral incapability then justifies the placement of such recruits further under disciplinary operations.

One aspect of visibility in *Chips with Everything* is in the illumination of class structures that are underneath institutional systems. As Foucault points out, modern institutional practices coincide greatly with the proliferation of factories. In many ways, institutions and factories, with their preoccupation with efficiency, emphasis on timetables, and ideological dependence on a unity that proves greater than the sum of its parts, share similar disciplinary frameworks. The military complex of *Chips with Everything* is meant to be removed from "the civvy street" as a demarcated institution " (Wesker, 1967, p. 36), with its own structure of power, and maintaining a hierarchy that differs from the hierarchies of economic class. What is seen underneath institutional operations, in the play, however, is exactly a continuation of the same class structures. Hierarchies within the military institution mirror those of economic class to the point that the institutional operation plays out almost as an extension of the class system, with invariably upper-class officers and recruits who are from "the good old working class of England" (Wesker, 1967, p. 25). In *Chips with Everything,* Corporal Hill is the first to separate class from the operations of the institution, while reprimanding the recruits: "Show your upbringing in your own home where it grew but not here, you hear me?" (Wesker, 1967, p. 24). Yet this is one of the first hints in the play that class structure is exactly what lies

beneath institutional operations, and that the "upbringing" of the recruits isn't ever completely irrelevant (Wesker, 1967, p. 24).

The division of labor within this institutional setting isn't vastly different from the society outside. The recruits dream of posts in fields that would be inaccessible to them under the larger capitalist structures of the civilian society: Ginger dreams of becoming a driver, Cannibal and Dickey hope to work in Radar, Smiler wants to be a flight-operator. Yet the vast majority of them are assigned as "administration orderl[ies]," with one errant typist, and of course Pip, the one upper-class outlier among the recruits, as the obvious exception (Wesker, 1967, p. 64). The military institution doesn't offer any further social mobility than the civilian society as a whole does, in the play. The recruits all eventually realize that the outside world with its class structure and the military with its hierarchy are part of the same disciplinary operation. Andrew's songs evolve into a point where he no longer sees a difference: "Don't it make you sick, eh? Don't it make you sick, just—these eight weeks, these two years, the factory—all of it?" (Wesker, 1967, p. 37). Andrew recognizes that the factory with its economic practices, and his eight weeks in the military institution, are dimensions of the same operation, and part of the same picture. A similar epiphany is shared by Wilfe after Smiler's punishments, who submits it to the other recruits when Dickey dreams of enacting his revenge on the officers:

> DICKEY: Give me the chance, just give me one chance and I'd have them. Five minutes in civvy street and I'd have them chasing their own tails.
> WILFE: Ah, you wouldn't, man—you talk like this now but you wouldn't, and you know why? Cos you'd be just as helpless there, you'd be just as much wind and nothing there, man. 'Just gimme the boss,' you'd say, 'just gimme him for one hour in uniform and I'd teach him what a man is.' That's all you'd say, civvy street, the forces—it's the same, don't give me that. (Wesker, 1967, p. 62)

In this respect, *Chips with Everything* isn't only concerned with the visibility of discipline and disciplinary methods, only as they are practiced in demarcated institutions, but the play also remains steadily invested in shedding light on the "discipline [that] reigns over society as a whole" (Foucault, 1995, p. 216) as these institutional practices relate to the enforcement of class structures and socioeconomic disparity.

In *Chips with Everything*, Pip and Charles, as representatives of two different classes with different upbringings, present a roadmap for the illumination of institutional structures, and for the recognition of disciplinary operations precisely as deliberate and calculated operations. The play has a tentative answer to how institutional disciplinary practices can be made visible, how one can learn to see this subtle and pervasive discipline when one comes across it. In *Chips with Everything,* visibility of the institutional operations is possible through education. While this education isn't necessarily one in the formal sense, it's not very far from it either: As the one upper-class exception among the recruits, Pip has the education and the upbringing to see the disciplinary methods that the officers use, and therefore he is extraordinarily aware of institutional practices. Pip understands institutional practices to an extent that surpasses any of the other recruits, though he isn't always forthcoming with his knowledge and only occasionally offers partial explanations: "So [the Pilot Officer] thinks you're not frightened? He's right—you're not, are you? But there are other ways—he's right about that too" (Wesker, 1967, p. 27). In contrast to Pip, Anne Etienne (2016) considers Charles "a more familiar Weskerian figure, as, with the scraps of learning he has received from Pip, he embodies the strength that can be gained through education" (p. 3). Pip proves ultimately a very flawed savior, if he can be considered one, and often a reluctant teacher. Yet his

awareness of institutional practices is rooted in his education, and to the extent that he acts as an example, the other recruits follow his lead. Earlier on, during the coal stealing scene, Pip proposes a coarse form of unionization in the event that they get caught: If the guard "does anything that means one of us is caught, then we all, all of us make an appearance. He can't cop the lot" (Wesker, 1967, p. 39). In the end, Charles and the other recruits, having internalized the idea, do the same to protect Smiler: "Charles, . . . after a pause, moves to his bed and sits on it. One by one the other boys, except Pip, also sit on their beds in defiance" (Wesker, 1967, p. 63). The rest of the recruits learn to recognize and counteract disciplinary operations, even when Pip ultimately himself gives in. "Charles' personal empowerment fails to affect the system but, . . . he has said 'no', breaking a pattern of inherited submission" (Etienne, 2016, p. 3).

One aspect of disciplinary operations around visibility, in *Chips with Everything*, concerns the institutional management of spectacles of rebellion, resistance and sacrifice. The military institution of the play refuses to acknowledge spectacles against disciplinary practices. It moves to nullify the meaning of rebellion and resistance, recontextualizes such acts and categorically denies any martyrdom. In the play, a part of the institutional operation lies in the denial of visibility when it concerns rebellion and defiance, these go unseen and unacknowledged by the institutional figures: "It goes right through us, Thompson. Nothing you can do will change that" (Wesker, 1967, p. 54). As his most blatantly rebellious gesture, Pip refuses to charge at a training dummy, therefore refusing a direct order of the Corporal. The spectacular character of this refusal ends up as a point of contention between him and Andrew, who scolds him for his spectacular defiance: "Don't go making heroic gestures and then expect gratitude," "I don't think I can bear your

martyrdom" (Wesker, 1967, pp. 53-54). Whether Pip really is "interested in the public spectacle" or not (Wesker, 1967, p. 53), the martyrdom of Pip, who is the clear and privileged outsider among the recruits, is bound to be problematic. In this way, it is perhaps easy to discount Pip's defiance as a delusion of grandeur or a misplaced sense of guilt, as the Pilot Officer does with derision—"Messiah to the Masses!" (Wesker, 1967, p. 56). Yet Pip himself resorts to a similar strategy once he joins the officers. He reframes the defiance of Charlie and the other recruits who defended Smiler, as an act that fits with institutional precepts, not opposes them. When the institution sees and acknowledges defiance, it is as something not defiant at all: "It was a good act. We like you for it" (Wesker, 1967, p. 64).

Another enduring thematic concern in *Chips with Everything* is language. The institutional language of the Royal Air Force in the play is represented as broken and tortured, stale with its reliance on banalities and clichés. In addition to this dearth of meaning, there are institutional figures who resort to particular linguistic maneuvers in conversation, faking dialogue and reciprocity linguistically while no communication actually takes place. As another subset of linguistic operations, knowledge-power dynamics are also present in *Chips with Everything* as a supplementation of institutional operations, where institutional subjects are subjugated under disciplinary discourses, and so rendered tractable. First, the language utilized by the military institution of the play surfaces as one that is devoid of meaning, where language is stretched to the point of exhaustion. The commands given by the officers often indicate a fragmentation of the conventional signifiers and meanings, and in this respect, the institutional language has a very problematic relationship with signification. Under the institutional operations, "attention" becomes "shun" (Wesker, 1967, p. 10), left and right "eft" and "ite" (Wesker, 1967,

p. 47). When it comes to the commands, recruits are expected to respond to essentially empty signifiers. Language isn't just fractured, in in terms of how meaning is constructed, but the language of the institution can be outright counterintuitive as well: "Now, on the word—MARCH—I want you only to take a step forward, not to march. I want you only to take a step forward, just pretend, got that?" (Wesker, 1967, pp. 8-9). The Corporal is angry when one of the recruits actually marches on the command to march, and berates him for his inability to "follow simple orders" (Wesker, 1967, p. 9). Yet the orders are far from simple in their relation to meaning, and even outright antithetical. In *Chips with Everything*, the institutional language is concerned less with the formulation of meaning, in this respect, and more with a pretense and semblance of it.

Stale clichés and banalities further contribute to the vacuity of institutional language in the play. Corporal Hill talks almost entirely in commonplaces, with a marked reliance on clichés especially when it concerns discipline and control over his subordinates: The recruits "can have it the hard way, or [they] can have it the easy way" (Wesker, 1967, p. 9), the Corporal was supposedly "born with eyes at the back of his neck" (Wesker, 1967, p. 7), he is "not a happy man" (Wesker, 1967, p. 2), among other such typified commonplaces. The recruits at least partially realize the banality and the practiced, overused nature of these disciplinary speeches, which rely on the same template even when the details slightly vary. After their initial meetings with their corporals, conscripts from two huts compare the monologues of their respective commanding officers:

> BOY What's your'n say?
> SMILER *[imitating]*. My name is Corporal Hill, I'm not a happy man.
> BOY *[imitating a Scotsman]*, My name is Corporal Bridle—and I'm a bastard! (Wesker, 1967, p. 3).

One other point concerning the banalities on which Corporal Hill, and likely the other lower-ranking officers depend, is how these clichés manifest in a language that is markedly coarse and abrasive. Both corporals stress their worst qualities in introduction, and this is how Corporal Hill consistently presents himself. Yet the lower-ranking officers, such as Corporal Hill who appears closer in the chain of command to the recruits under him than the higher-ranking officers above, constitute only one facet of the institutional practices of language, with obvious insults and performative highlights of their shortcomings.

If the Corporals introduce themselves through unmistakable displays of power and authority, the higher-ranking officers of *Chips with Everything* tend toward the opposite: In their first lectures, higher-ranking officers stress how reasonable and benign they are. The Flight Officer claims that he is "amenable and that [he does] not stick rigidly to authority" (Wesker, 1967, p. 12). Yet compared to Corporal Hill, the mild-mannered officers are the ones who actually carry out and embody the greater part of institutional authority. In the linguistic operations of the higher-ranking officers of *Chips with Everything*, there is often an attempt to mask power. The contrast between the language of Corporal Hill, and the diction of the other officers, is misleading by itself in terms of how institutional operations work. These contrasting languages misplace the greater part of institutional power, and situate institutional authority with the lower-ranking officers such as the corporals rather than the higher-ranking officers. In contrast, particularly the higher-ranking officers are careful to maintain an appearance of communication, and a reciprocity in their utilization of language. The Pilot Officer's description of institutional operations, "we listen but we do not hear" (Wesker, 1967, p. 51), points to such a simulation of dialogue as one strategy in the maintenance of authority. There is often

a pretention of dialogue in the play, and an illusion of choice and respect offered to the recruits. Hypothetical questions are especially prevalent in the speech patterns of institutional figures, and when the recruits actually answer the officers' questions, the action is read as a form of resistance and insubordination. The Officers in their lectures all courteously say "please" and "thank you" to the recruits (Wesker, 1967, pp. 3-12), and benevolently offer to answer any questions they may have in the end. The one time an officer's offer for further questions is taken at face value, however, Andrew's question goes entirely ignored. A pretended reciprocity in institutional operations is manifested linguistically, in the gentle and permissive language to which the officers adhere, and there will be a further discussion of this gentility itself, in the play, in this chapter's examination of sentiment.

One final part of the linguistic dimension of institutional operations, and one part of the play's concerns, emerges as knowledge-power dynamics in institutions, where institutional subjects become subdued through discourse. Though Pip is wise to the majority of institutional operations, one strategy that he ultimately isn't able to counteract is his psychologization by the Pilot Officer. The Pilot Officer's discussion with Pip almost takes the form of a psychological examination. It is a discussion of Pip's motives and complexes, upbringing and traumas. The Pilot Officer assigns him unflattering motives, and explains away Pip's friendship with the working-class recruits, until one of these proposed motives finally convinces them both. The Pilot Officer posits that Pip wanted to have uncontested power without competition, and he convinces Pip the unquestioned leadership he has over the working-class recruits, is why he associates with them, rather than the upper-class officers. Knowledge of motives constitutes a dimension of institutional authority, in this way. The Pilot Officer's investigation of Pip's motives has an element of science, hinting at a

medical matter. Discovery of Pip's motives recalls a diagnosis, and finally the Pilot Officer declares that "no man survives whose motive is discovered" (Wesker, 1967, p. 56). Knowledge, as it is thus established through language and discourse, involves subjecting institutional objects under its control. In the process, Pip's resistance and objection to institutional practices is reframed as simply another piece of knowledge concerning him. Once Pip has been scrutinized by the institutional figures, and "now that we know" what his motives are (Wesker, 1967, p. 56), he can finally be subdued under the power of the institution.

The final thematic concern in *Chips with Everything* that this chapter will be examining is sentiment. There are moments in the play where the borders between individuals and the military institution is deemphasized by the institution itself, which calls for greater cohesion, and makes appeals for a unification with the greater body of the institution. Underplaying of these borders is then followed by occasional abrupt reestablishments, to debilitating effect. The interaction between the smaller cogs and the greater mechanism of the institution, in terms of how individuals - particularly active and prospective officers- reconcile themselves with the military's institutional practices, constitutes a great part of the play's examination of sentiment, as well. Also concerning institutional incarnations of sentiment and emotion, smiling emerges as one important motif in *Chips with Everything*. In the play, smiles mark where the boundaries between institutions and individuals are troubled, and especially characterize an awareness of institutional hierarchies that are in place.

The so-called gentility and subtlety of the institutional discipline has a strong element of sentiment in its conception. The Pilot Officer, in an earlier interaction with Andrew, divulges that fear isn't the only sentiment to which the military institution appeals, though it is perhaps the most straight-forward: "I shall not merely

frighten you, there are other ways" (Wesker, 1967, p. 16). Pip, who is consistently characterized as someone who is wise to institutional operations, describes the nature of power that the institution exerts in similar terms: According to him, "absolute power" must be "efficient, precise, but humane" (Wesker, 1967, p. 39). The institution in *Chips with Everything,* of course, is far from consistently humane as the Smiler's outright torture at the hands of the officers proves, and in a similar vein, the officers certainly aren't beyond incitements of fear. Yet those "other ways" as the Pilot Officer puts it (Wesker, 1967, p.167), depend heavily on gentility; and the so-called "humane" nature of institutional power is nonetheless a seminal part of its operations (Wesker, 1967, p. 39). Pip should be "not broken in, sir, but loved" (Wesker, 1967, p. 47). The institution should treat its dissidents such as him "gently, . . . , anger will only make it easier for him to be stubborn" (Wesker, 1967, p. 47). Love and gentility as they are evoked by the disciplinary figures of the play, mask and deemphasize the friction on the borders between the individual and the institution.

The sentimental appeals of the institution can be felt acutely in the play, in such moments where borders between individuals and the whole of the institution are deemphasized and underplayed. The Corporal sees the recruits ideally working and "mov[ing] together as one, as one solitary man" (Wesker, 1967, p. 10)—which requires there to be no borders between the individual and the collective body of the institution, and perhaps no division between the two at the outset. The individual *is* the institution. At other times, the military institution is positioned as a family unit, evoking a familial and filial sense of love—Corporal Hill imagines them as "the happiest family in Christendom" (Wesker, 1967, p. 10). The Corporal truly can be paternal in his affections, if not even motherly under a more gendered reading: He

plays the recruits to sleep with his mouth-organ every night; he has his favorites among "[his] boys" (Wesker, 1967, p. 1). Corporal Hill isn't beyond some familial emotional manipulation, either, lamenting the betrayal of his favorites and how "[his] own little boys let [him] down" (Wesker, 1967, p. 36). Within this institutional family that positions the recruits as its children, paternal and patronizing attitudes aren't far apart. Throughout the play, the treatment of the recruits by the paternal officers oscillates between one extreme to the next; either "this hut has always been the best hut" (Wesker, 1967, p. 2), and the recruits are the best recruits to date, or they are completely useless and devoid of any merit. With these abrupt shifts between two sets of attitudes towards the recruits, the pressure on the borders between the institution and the individual are negated and reemphasized in turns. That this family exists "in Christendom" is another point (Wesker, 1967, p. 10), in terms of how the play's institution evokes love and unity. The institutionally celebrated Christmastime recalls "a time of joy and good-will" (Wesker, 1967, p. 24), with all associated sentimentality and sense of community. Yet the treatment of the recruits takes a sharp turn right after the Christmas holidays, after the calls for "joy and good-will" (Wesker, 1967, p. 24). After the holiday celebrations, both of those are abruptly withdrawn from the recruits, as the officers' treatment of them changes drastically. Anger may beget stubbornness by itself, as the Pilot Officer supposes about Pip, yet such familial love followed by the patronizing anger ultimately doesn't. The familial love offers a diversion from the separation that exists between the individual and the institution, by positioning the recruits closer to the institution. Then, the familial-institutional love is only strengthened by its deferral, after the occasional and abrupt reestablishments of the border. After all, the tension on the borders is diffused once more, once Pip gives in and sides with the officers—

placating their anger and the stubbornness once more with an institutional and familial love.

The interaction between the greater sum and the smaller cogs of the military constitutes a crucial part of institutional sentimentality in *Chips with Everything*, in terms of how active and prospective officers relate to their institutions at large. The play strongly implies that the Pilot Officer and Pip have a lot in common, and the Pilot Officer functions as a reflection of Pip's future within the military organization. The Pilot Officer promises, as he tries to convince Pip to side with the officers, that Pip "will learn how to deal with all the Pip Thompsons who follow [him]," presumably as he himself did (Wesker, 1967, p. 51). The Pilot Officer also mentions that he liked "the N.A.A.F.I." which is frequented by the recruits, "more than [he does] The Officers' Mess" (Wesker, 1967, p. 15). Pip's transformation into an officer exemplifies the effectiveness of institutional practices of persuasion and control, as a pattern of discouragement and capitulation emerges. There is a cycle of realignment between different generations of initially subversive officers, such as the Pilot Officer and Pip. Pip's acceptance to office commences with an emphasis of the boundaries that lie between him and the rest of the recruits; The Pilot Officer tells both sides that Pip is just "slumming" (Wesker, 1967, p. 15), accentuating the differences between Pip and the rest of the recruits. In this respect, the institution threatens not its own love, but rather the love of fellow subjects: Pip's insubordination is punished indirectly in Act 2 Scene 4, where all the recruits except Pip are punished, who in turn is left conspicuously exempt (Wesker, 1967, p. 47).

The Pilot Officer similarly leverages Pip's sympathy for the other recruits, with a subtle manipulation that seemingly plays into his closeness to them. As part of his pitch to Pip, the Pilot Officer argues for the greater good and the lesser evil, in a

sense—"if people like us aren't officers, imagine the bastards they will get" (Wesker, 1967, p. 49). Another argument, that Pip can change the system from the inside, follows a similar line of thinking. Both arguments seemingly acknowledge the sympathy that Pip guards for the other recruits; yet they also simultaneously separate Pip from the others, with "people like us" including Pip, disparate from a "they" which makes up the other recruits (Wesker, 1967, p. 49). In this respect, how the institution leverages subversive sympathies and sentiments for its own disciplinary aims, presents a contrast and a companion to the invisibility of rebellion. The institution recontextualizes obedience, as it does rebellion. This time, the disciplinary methods pose institutional operations of the officers, as acts that stand against the institution.

As one final part of the play's consideration of sentiment, smiling arises as an essential motif throughout the play. In *Chips with Everything*, smiles occur in moments where institutional hierarchies are felt acutely, both within the military complex and in terms of greater class structures. On the one hand, smiles are clearly situated as a key facet of institutional operations. According to Pip, institutional power is entrenched in smiles—"we'll do anything they want just because they know how to smile at us" (Wesker, 1967, p. 59). On the other hand, as in the case of Smiler's ever-present smile, they can pose a threat to, and disrupt, institutional operations. In this respect, smiles overall don't necessarily emerge as subversive of or supplementary to institutional operations by themselves. Rather they highlight within the play the existence of institutional hierarchies. More comprehensively, the smiles of *Chips with Everything* indicate both friction and contact on institutional borders, and indicate complications of hierarchical divisions. As Pip asserts, institutional rule is predicated on smiles. Augmenting this point, one crucial smile of

the play comes at a moment of undeniable institutional supremacy: “Pip and the [Pilot Officer] smile at each other, knowingly” (Wesker, 1967, p. 63), after Pip dons the officers’ uniform and joins their ranks. Similarly, the institution enforces rules about smiles, as we see with Smiler. Yet those rules don’t only concern recruits such as Smiler. The officers aren’t altogether exempt from a regulation of smiles, either. The Squadron Leader cautions the gloomy Wing Commander at the Christmas party; and the officers are obligated to smile, to main institutional rule: “Don’t let them see you scowl. Smile, man, smile” (Wesker, 1967, p. 23).

Throughout the play, the military institution denies reciprocity in its interactions with its subjects, while protecting a semblance of two-way communication and affect. The Pilot Officer’s description of institutional discipline draws attention to this one-sided nature of institutional advances—“we listen but we do not hear, we befriend but do not touch you, we applaud but do not act” (Wesker, 1967, p. 51) Yet contradictorily, borders and divisions depend on contact, and in the play, smiles carry an indication of mutual impression. Smiles constitute a reciprocal form of contact, on some level, even when only one party smiles. This bilateral contact, of smiling, is felt as friction on hierarchical borders, leaving a mutual impression. Smiling is an interaction that isn’t altogether one-sided, and the Wing Commander is perhaps bothered by the mutuality of contact, manifested in his reluctance to smile at the recruits at the party. The hostility that Smiler inspires in the officers from the very first moment can be read similarly, as a disruption of the one-sided relationship the institution cultivates with its subjects. The impact of Smiler’s smile on the officers thus registers as a threat with the institutional figures of the play. In this respect, the smiles in *Chips with Everything* deny the customary direction in which influence and affect flow. Another troubled smile which inspires

friction along hierarchical divides comes from the working-class man that Pip met at an Eastend café: “Four times he did that [wiped his eyes], and each time he did it he looked at me and smiled” (Wesker, 1967, p. 5). This smile inspires a strong aversion (“God, I hated that man”), but also a clear fascination in Pip. The interaction leaves a strong impression such that he remembers it long afterwards.

In terms of the reciprocal nature of smiles, there is one moment in the play where contact and friction are felt more positively, and though pressure along hierarchical borders remains, it’s not as troubled. Charles and Pip smile at each other at the end of a conversation following the Christmas party. This conversation is the closest any characters with disparate hierarchical standings come to a true and intimate understanding in the play, who often talk at cross-purposes. Pip and Charles maintain their own streams of thought, yet those streams of thought run along similar lines, with echoing sentiments and conclusions. At the end of the scene, “they smile, and start to leave” (Wesker, 1967, p. 35). Coexistence of hierarchical divisions with contact across borders, also constitutes the context of the conversation which precedes their mutual smiles. Pip and Charles are both talking of a fascination across class boundaries and about “enemies you like” (Wesker, 1967, p. 32). Charlie begrudging and wistfully muses about having an education on a level with Pip’s, Pip similarly shares his fascination with manual labor, “this yearning to be one of the toilers” (Wesker, 1967, p. 35). On the one hand, they both recognize the yearning to be on the other side of the boundary as futile. The smiles of Pip and Charles carry a recognition of the material realities of economic practices, and an acknowledgement of the class division that separates them. Yet there is also a humanity that resists class divisions in their contact. The preceding dialogue, as mentioned, is the most reciprocal one in the play, with a certain give and take. Though Pip and Charles

certainly don't constitute a harmonious unity, there is a clear negotiation of boundaries and mutual respect in their conversation, in this scene. The acknowledgement of their respective conditions is accompanied with an acknowledgement of each other as persons. The smiles between Pip and Charles ultimately recognize both division and contact, felt thusly on hierarchical borders.

One formal strategy in *Chips with Everything*'s depiction of instititutions, is the prominence of music and rhythm in the work. *Chips with Everything* is a loud and cacophonic play, both with its inclusion of musical elements (Andrew's guitar, Corporal Hill's mouth-organ, the pivotal folk song sang by the recruits at the Christmas party, and the national anthem on which the play closes), and with the rhythm of the military steps and marches. The play's utilization of music also constitutes one aspect of the play, where Wesker's ideas about self-cultivation and high arts are most prominent. *Chips with Everything* doesn't consider all forms of music to be equally constructive, and remains suspicious of its popular forms. Yet at its best, the play sees music as a medium that can assert dignity in the face of oppressive institutional practices, and can provide subjects under institutions with a sense of resistant humanity. Concerning musical elements that align more with institutions and supplement discipline, the military itself follows a rhythm in its steps and marches. The corporal puts the recruits to sleep at the hut with essentially lullabies on his mouth-organ, which perhaps also doesn't indicate much trust on the play's part, as to the potential of all forms of music.

As to the scene where music perhaps plays the most essential role, Etienne (2016) interprets the recruits' stand at the Christmas party as the response to "a cultural dare" (p. 2), and the tension between the recruits and the officers are played out through music. In *Chips with Everything*, cultural gatekeeping certainly

supplements institutional operations. The Wing Commander's brand of institutional discipline explicitly refers to the recruits' working-class culture and upbringing: "You heard of the [Ancient] Greeks? You ignorant troupe of anaemics, you were brought up on tinned beans and television sets, weren't you?" (Wesker, 1967, p. 13). During the Christmas Party, the same Wing Commander proposes "[a] dirty recitation-or a pop song" or "something from Elvis Presley" to the recruits (Wesker, 1967, pp. 27-29), with the implication that they are limited to those forms. Once again, there is a distinct mistrust of some forms of music on the part of the play. Popular forms such as Elvis Presley, or dirty recitations, are presented as, if not outright complicit, then at least not equally subversive or uplifting. Instead of turning to these forms in the Christmas party, Andrew reads a poem attributed to Burns[2] at the behest of Pip, and the recruits together sing 'The Cutty Wren,' a peasant revolt song. "As the song rises to a unified and powerful climax, we gradually realize that the boys are in fact menacing the officers" (Wesker, 1967, p. 29). Certain forms of music, according to the play, can imbue institutional subjects with a refreshed sense of dignity, as well as challenge the basis of disciplinary hierarchies.

Another formal element in *Chips with Everything* that this chapter will be examining is humor. Institutional figures of the play are certainly vulnerable to ridicule, and the military institution valiantly tries to suppress any signs of it. Corporal Hill introduces himself with an "I never joke" (Wesker, 1967, p. 2), and the institution even has an officer whose "task is to check any tendency in his officers to practical jokes" (Wesker, 1967, p. 21). Ridicule and defiance can go hand in hand. Yet the stance of the play itself is that the humor's effectiveness against institutions

[2]Priestman (1998) points out that Wesker actually misattributed the anonymous folk poem to "the more canonical Burns" (p. 222), who had collected and rearranged it, but wasn't the one to pen it.

perhaps also isn't without caveats, as it is in the case of music. In an early scene, Andrew intentionally takes his orders a little too literally, "taking the mickey" out of the Pilot Officer (Wesker, 1967, p. 14), and inconveniencing him at the very least. While the ridicule disturbs the Pilot Officer enough that he drops the pretense, as a strategy, and by itself, Andrew's humor isn't entirely enough to resist institutional practices in the long run: "As soon as I turn my back you'll merely give me a V sign and make a joke of me to the others, won't you? And they'll laugh" (Wesker, 1967, p. 15). Tet the fact remains that "you [Andrew and the other recruits] obey my orders, nevertheless" (Wesker, 1967, p. 14). Though ridicule perhaps isn't enough to topple institutions, *Chips with Everything* still also mocks its institutional figures. The play's own humor often arises from moments of discrepancy and limited awareness on the part of the institution and its representatives. As one memorable example, Corporal Hill screams at a soldier, at the top of his lungs, to relax: "RELAX! IF YOU DON'T RELAX I'LL PUT YOU ON A CHARGE!" (Wesker, 1967, p. 8). Humor can still be strategical against institutional discipline, though in this case it proves limited in its reach and potential, and isn't the strategy on which *Chips with Everything* focuses the most.

In terms of its staging, as mentioned, *Chips with Everything* is the most naturalistic of the plays with which this thesis is concerned. Yet as Dornan (1994) mentions in *Arnold Wesker Revisited*, it was a marked departure away from naturalism in Wesker's own career:

> *Chips with Everything* is one of Wesker's first attempts to move away from the straight naturalistic forms of drama to a more stylized or poetic form. In it Wesker experiments with the effects of mime, folk song, and minimal scenery to see if he could develop a cleaner, simpler style without the trappings of naturalism. (pp. 53-53)

In this respect, the institution is depicted not through an abundance of details, but in a stylized manner. One such stylized elements is the mimed and choreographed scene of the recruits stealing coal from a patrolled and fenced yard. Per the stage directions, "this scene … has to be, silent, precise, breathtaking and finally very funny" (). In terms of the actors' work, the scene is a show of spectacular discipline, and Pip even explicitly imagines it as such, as something that mirrors the institution's disciplinary practices. Their coal stealing has to be "efficient, precise, but humane. They happen to be the only qualities for absolute power" (Wesker, 1967, p. 40). Yet this discipline is used for the exact opposite purpose, even if it shares the same toolset with the institution as theater also does, it is ultimately redirected for insubordination. Martin Priestman also points out another aspect in the staging of this scene, in which there is a distinct metatheatrical element. Pip leads the recruits in defiance against the institution in the first act, one during the Christmas celebrations and one in the aforementioned coal theft scene, both of which are win for the recruits. Priestman (1998) suggests that "[t]hese two show-stealing events in fact owe a great deal of their force to their being 'pure theatre'" (p. 225). In the arrangement of these scenes of defiance, *Chips with Everything* "magically aligns Pip's role with that of the director of the play" (Priestman, 1998, p. 225). This alignment doesn't automatically mean an unquestioned celebration of the power of theater, however. Pip may be the play's theatrical mastermind, yet he still changes sides in the end, and turns to the institution. In this respect, as a strategy within the play itself, staging also isn't without caveats and nuances. The play, with the betrayal of the dramatically-inclined Pipi thus presents a challenge to its audience, particularly in conjunction with its "mock-closure backed up by the playing of the national anthem . . . when it would

have been guaranteed to bring any well-trained British audience to its feet" (Priestman, 1998, p. 226).

Throughout the play, we have seen the institution of *Chips with Everything* work to maintain a non-reciprocal relationship, where any contact between the institutions and its subjects are imagined as one-directional. In terms of language, the institutional figures refrain from dialogue with the soldiers, while depending on a pretense of mutual contact. In terms of visibility, the institution of the play constantly refuses to see and recognize discontent, refusing visibility to actions against it through insistent reframing and recontextualization. Within this single directional institutional framework for interactions, smiles arise as a principle motif of the play, in moments where contact and pressure are felt on more than one direction. A part of the Pilot Officer's description of discipline actually has a marked metatheatrical element, "we applaud but do not act—to tolerate is to ignore." The Pilot Officer is once again sketching out a non-reciprocal relationship, where applause and acting constitute not a fully bilateral interaction between the play and its audience. Dramatically aligned Pip's late betrayal, in this respect, compels an awareness in the audience of its own role. Ultimately, the audience interaction with the play isn't comfortably one-directional. The audience of *Chips with Everything* is no longer at their feet, applauding on the traditional signal of a national anthem, as Priestman tells. Then what else there is for the audience to do, but perhaps smile?

CHAPTER 4

INSTITUTIONAL AND THEATRICAL FRICTIONS OF PINTER'S *THE HOTHOUSE*

The Hothouse was written earlier on in Harold Pinter's career, in 1958, though the play wouldn't be published or staged until 1980, when its first staging was personally directed by the playwright. In any case, Pinter hadn't thought very highly of the play at first, and spoke disparagingly of it in a 1966 interview with *The Paris Review* (Bensky, 1968):

> I have occasionally out of irritation thought about writing a play with a satirical point. I once did, actually, a play that no one knows about… Wrote the whole damn thing in three drafts. It was called *The Hothouse*. … It was heavily satirical, and it was quite useless. (p. 361)

According to the author's note to the play, however, "in 1979 [Pinter] re-read *The Hothouse* and decided it was worth presenting on the stage" (Pinter, 1980, p. 1). In this respect, positioning *The Hothouse* within Pinter's body of work comes with certain challenges. Though it was penned earlier on in Pinter's career and carries the characteristics of his earlier plays, it also fits in with the later stages of Pinter's writing from the 1970s and onwards, when his work took a more explicitly political turn, and when the play was staged for the first time. In the same interview, Pinter describes *The Hothouse* as concerning "an institution in which patients were kept: all that was presented was the hierarchy, the people who ran the institution; one never knew what happened to the patients or what they were there for or who they were" (Bensky, 1968, p. 361). The play is accordingly about the staff of a vague and mysterious institution, the head of which, Roote, is faced with a crisis in authority from the moment the play opens. *The Hothouse* mostly concerns the internal strife in the hierarchy of the institution, and the power play between the staff: There is a

three-way competition for the position of director, and overall authority within the institution, between three members of its staff—Roote, Gibbs, and Lush. This competitive and triangular dynamic is repeated as Roote and Gibbs separately have affairs with the same member of the staff, Miss Cutts. Roote's waning authority is increasingly challenged as the play progresses. This crisis appears closely connected with the death of one patient, and the rape and impregnation of another, designated by the institution as 6459 and 6457 respectively. The play primarily implicates Roote for both of these crimes, though the complicity of the other staff members is also heavily implied. Roote's crisis of authority is finally resolved as the unseen patients of the institution rise up at the end of the play, with an uprising that is still not fully visible to the audience. It is revealed that the patients violently disposed of the staff with the exception of Gibbs, who ends up as the new director of the institution. Both of the two crimes committed against the patients are pinned on a member of the staff, Lamb, after the fact. Lamb is ironically the only member of the staff who isn't implicated for them by the play, as he hadn't yet been a part of the institution when they occurred. Lamb is interrogated and tortured by Gibbs and Cutts earlier on ("Do you ever feel you would like to join a group of people in which group common assumptions are shared?" Pinter, 1980, p. 77). It is Roote who first moves to position him as a scapegoat, yet Gibbs as the new head of the institution is the one to put the final nail in the coffin. Lamb is completely forgotten by the surviving staff after his torture, as the curtain closes in the wake of the patients' rising. Last time the audience sees Lamb, he is left silent and broken in the interrogation room—in a catatonic state of trance which surfaces often in Pinter's body of work.

Scholarship on Pinter generally agrees on the classification of the writer's plays into three categories thematically and chronologically, as the earlier 'comedies

of menace,' then the so-called 'memory plays', and later, the more politically conscious phase. 'Comedies of Menace' such as *The Birthday Party* or *The Caretaker*, are characterized by "an atmosphere of menace, mystery, evasion;" and in 'memory plays' such as *Landscape* or *Silence*, a nebulous and inaccessible past is more markedly the focus of the work (Dukore, 1988, p. 26). *The Hothouse*, with its chronically lying characters, prominent linguistic maneuvering, and bids for dominance within the institution which get realized primarily through language, coheres with these earliest Pinteresque themes of 'Comedies of Menace'. As with Pinter's other 'Comedies of Menace,' the stage of *The Hothouse* is claustrophobic, and it is encroached on by an approaching external threat. In this case, the threat comes from the patients of the institution, who always remain ominously off-stage as a presence. *The Hothouse* shares themes with Pinter's 'memory plays' as well, in that the history of its institution remains unverifiable and muddled, though this history is also potentially cyclical and repetitive in its patterns. In *The Hothouse*, even the less distant pasts of patients 6457 and 6459 are tangled with conflicting accounts, where memory and record-keeping prove equally useless. Yet *The Hothouse* is revised and staged in the later, final stages of Pinter's career, when his work takes on a more distinctly political character. The play has shared interests with Pinter's other work from the period of its staging, in its examination of incompetent and unjust bureaucracies and hierarchies, and a more concentrated investment in power and its nature.

Among the four plays that this thesis is examining, *The Hothouse* is the one where the secondary aims of the play's institution most conspicuously and markedly remain ambiguous. In terms of its purpose, the institution of *The Hothouse* is deemed "a convalescent home" and "a rest home" in turns, it is grouped with "nursing

homes, . . . sanatoria" run by The Ministry (Pinter, 1980, p. 38). Roote even alludes to a more ominous "crematorium" at one point (Pinter, 1980, p. 90), which evokes a darker possible function for the play's institution, when taken in conjunction with its numbered residents, and Pinter's own Jewish heritage in mind. The most that can be gleaned about the institution of *The Hothouse,* however, is that it is in fact "an institution in which patients are kept" as Pinter puts it (Bensky, 1968, p. 361). However, even this definition is somewhat precarious. "After all, they're not criminals" (Pinter, 1980, p. 21), Roote concludes about the residents of his institution. Yet Roote doesn't consistently think of the residents as patients, either. The distinction between a patient and a criminal, in the eyes of the institution, is flimsy and thin. This can clearly be seen when Roote accuses 6457 of having "an accomplice" for the crime of her pregnancy (Pinter, 1980, p. 48). There is further confusion and spillage between different institutional missions and fields. The institution of *The Hothouse* may be mostly medically aligned; yet Roote is a Colonel who "still possess[es] considerable military bearing" (Pinter, 1980, p. 78), recalling the head of the psychiatric hospital in Stoppard's *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*. Another institution exists in the sidelines of *The Hothouse*; this institution, "The Ministry" to which Roote's institution is subject, remains equally vague and ambiguous (Pinter, 1980, p. 21), and there is no further elaboration on what field exactly The Ministry administers. In this respect, *The Hothouse* doesn't sketch out domains of discipline as specialized and limited in their fields of missions. Lush more explicitly alludes to such generalized character of modern institutional discipline at one point—in that the "age of the specialist is dead" (Pinter, 1980, p. 87). The institution is instead led by Roote, who is markedly not a specialist.

Rather than characterizing its primary institution through its specialized disciplinary aims, *The Hothouse* instead highlights the generalized and dispersed domain of institutional regulation. Discipline in *The Hothouse* works to regulate, and maintain order in, all aspects of daily life. Even in the carefully edited and polished description of disciplinary operations that Lush gives to the bewildered mother of 6459, the extent of disciplinary dispersion rises to the forefront. Though it is only a public relations-friendly version of its operations, the institution of *The Hothouse* aspires to regulate not a limited field related to its secondary aims, but instead, the full existence of its subjects:

> It's *not* quite so *simple* as that. In a rest home, you see, you do not merely rest. Nor, in a convalescent home, do you merely convalesce. No, no, in both institutions, you see, you are obliged to work and play and join in daily communal activity to the greatest possible extent. (Pinter, 1980, pp. 56-57)

The control the institution exerts, and its power, are dispersed over a large field of disciplinary activity. The institutional work includes the regulation of "work and play" and "daily . . . activity" (Pinter, 1980, p. 57), in addition to rest or convalescence which are the purported domains of the specialized institution. This concern of institutions with discipline in all aspects of life, and "over society as a whole" in more precisely Foucauldian (1995) terms (p. 216), recurs in Roote's rendition of the ultimate institutional origin story. In *The Hothouse*, Mike is a legendary figure who is presented as the progenitor of all institutions, "the predecessor of [Roote's] predecessor, the predecessor of us all" (Pinter, 1980, p. 38). Mike is credited with the establishment of many institutions across the country, and he is perhaps even the originator of the concept. Yet ultimately, Roote doesn't define Mike's work through the specific missions of the institutions he is believed to have set up. In this story of institutional roots, Mike is credited with "[seting] in motion an activity for humanity, of humanity and by humanity" (Pinter, 1980, p. 38), yet for

Roote, and for the greater institutional structures of his society, humanity ultimately doesn't resonate as a keyword. Instead, "the keyword [is] order" (Pinter, 1980, p. 38), which is what ultimately characterizes Mike's project. In this respect, order remains the principle concern and chief aim of *The Hothouse*'s institution, and so, discipline within this institution can be its own aim, method and justification all at once. In comparison, any secondary institutional mission can be nothing but vague, as it is with the institution of *The Hothouse*, and practically irrelevant.

One essential part of the institution's disciplinary operations as well as one point of weakness, in *The Hothouse*, is language. On the one hand, language in the play is closely linked with authority, and it can serve as a source of potency and power. The competition among the members of the staff is played out mainly through language, where linguistic challenges, control and one-upmanship are significant in the institution's internal dynamics. In such institutional power play, language ultimately serves as the fighting ground for dominance and authority. Beyond the linguistic maneuvering of the staff, however, language is instrumental on a grander scale, in *The Hothouse,* in terms of institutional assertion of power through language, and more specifically through the medicalization and subjection of its patients. Yet *The Hothouse* is also conscious of the limits of such institutional, linguistic reach and play. As with Roote's crisis in authority, language in *The Hothouse* is also in a moment of crisis, with a burdened process of signification and dialogue, linguistic impasses, and a dependence on formulaic banalities.

Language serves as the root of authority and power in the enigmatic institution of *The Hothouse*. Language doesn't constitute entirely solid or well-founded roots, necessarily, in that the play often highlights the arbitrariness of power and its exercise within its institution. Yet in a moment where the institution's staff

comes closest to questioning its systems, it is telling that their examination imagines institutional power relations in primarily linguistic terms. In an early moment in the play, Roote talks about his predecessor, whom he once called sir. In this respect, getting called sir constitutes power, and the exchange between Roote and Gibbs imagines power arising in and being maintained through such linguistic practices:

> ROOTE: And have you any idea why you call me sir, now?
> GIBBS: Yes, sir.
> ROOTE: Why?
> GIBBS: Because you called him sir then, sir. (Pinter, 1980, p. 20)

Language is closely linked to power, in terms of how it is imagined in practice: Roote and Gibbs summarize the exercise of power in one emblematic, linguistic practice. Yet language also presents a root for institutional power structures, in that language is positioned at the heart of how systems of power are maintained, in the long run and across hierarchical generations of predecessors and successors. In this respect, language is in the center of a longer-term institutional project.

One other practice that closely connects language with authority in *The Hothouse* is the annual institutional Christmas speech. Roote's Christmas speech to the residents and the staff of the institution serves as the sign of his authority and dominance—as Gibbs puts it, "[i]t's [Roote's] privilege, sir" (Pinter, 1980, p. 130). The Christmas address and Roote's position of authority as the head of the institution are closely interlinked and almost causational in their relation. Roote and Gibbs' conflict over institutional power is replicated in their conflict over the Christmas address; Roote accuses Gibbs of coveting his authority to make the Chrismas speech, as Gibbs covets his position of authority: "You are dying to make it, aren't you?" (Pinter, 1980, p. 130) Curiously, the practice of the Christmas address isn't actually enjoyed by anyone. Lush, Gibbs and Cutts both dread hearing it: "Another one? Oh, God, I thought he'd forgotten all about it" (Pinter, 1980, p. 119). Though he doesn't

want to concede it to Gibbs, Roote isn't altogether exited to make the speech, either. Yet both Gibbs and Lush subject themselves to the speech in person, and to Roote's authority. It is a member of the staff, Tubb, that presents the mike used for the address to Roote on behalf of all the staff, "from the very all of us" (Pinter, 1980, p. 113). This is significant because both aversion and obedience are shown as essential components of institutional discipline, in the way it is practiced here in the play through the Christmas address. It is also significant, however, in that the mike as the sign of authority serves as a double to Mike, who is the legendary founder and the ultimate institutional authority in *The Hothouse*, and is present in the same scene in a statue that remains offstage. Cutts and Gibbs also establish their dominance over Lamb over a microphone, which presents to another mike that is integral to the establishment of institutional discipline. In this respect, *The Hothouse* links the continuation and maintenance of institutional hierarchies with language once more. Language is positioned concretely at the heart and root of institutional hierarchies in the *The Hothouse.* Yet as a foundation, language isn't ever concrete or fully present: The Legendary Mike is shrouded in mystery, and his statue is covered in "slush" (Pinter, 1980, p. 81). Even Roote's mike for the Christmas speech comes hidden in a cake.

In this equation of speech and language with assertions of authority and power within the institutional structure of *The Hothouse*, certain linguistic acts can automatically present a challenge to institutional authority. In the earlier scenes of the play, Gibbs bends language to avoid directly challenging Roote's authority in discussions. There is a stretch and a reach, linguistically, in Gibbs' unwillingness to contradict anything that Roote mentions; in their exchanges, he carefully avoids direct refutations. Gibbs always answers Roote's sometimes outlandish guesses as to

patients' physical characteristics non-offensively—"Fairheaded?" "Not darkheaded." and so forth (Pinter, 1980, pp. 23-24). As Roote's crisis of authority is intensified further, however, Gibbs and Lush find it in themselves to contradict Roote. They alternately mount linguistical challenges to Roote in conversation. This time, Gibbs clearly doesn't accommodate or maneuver around Roote's guesses:

> ROOTE: Tall?
> GIBBS: No, sir. Small.
> LUSH: Tall.
> GIBBS: Small.
> *Pause.* (Pinter, 1980, p. 99)

There is contention between Lush and Gibbs as well, and this three-way competition between Roote, Gibbs and Lush is played out mainly through linguistic terms. With power and language so intertwined, it isn't only Roote's Christmas address that shapes and maintains institutional power dynamics. *The Hothouse* spotlights the power of names, and the most obvious example of this are the patients of the institution, who are addressed by numbers and not with names. However, the particulars of address amongst the staff also evoke and realize different power dynamics (Colonel, Sir, Mr. Roote. Archie, Charlie, Miss Cutts). Any address in the play ultimately functions as a significant maneuver, burdened with hierarchical implications, and constituting either a concession or a challenge to its recipient.

Another part of *The Hothouse*'s examination of institutional language manifests with the medicalized and scientific discourse of the institution. Medicalization and record-keeping are part of the linguistic disciplinary operation of the play's institution. The medical language that the institution employs creates 'knowledge' about its residents, which then become subjects under its disciplinary authority. The institution of *The Hothouse* refers to its residents not with names but with numbers, which is one obvious instance of such scientific subjection under

language. Denial of names comes with a denial of the patients' personhood: "We lose sight of their names and they lose sight of their names" (Pinter, 1980, p. 21). Denial of names only serves as a precursor for the reduction of the patients' existence to simple record-keeping. Once these medical subjects are established, as Roote says, even rape can be "in the interest of science" (Pinter, 1980, p. 43), and therefore be acceptable as a medical matter, as long as the perpetrators "always send in a report" and fulfill this medicalization (Pinter, 1980, p. 43). The lives and deaths of patients are recorded, which is how the audience learns of 6457 and 6459. Roote even proposes to take this recording one step further with "[a] documentary – for educational purposes," and "devote a half-hour film to [Lamb]" after they first frame him (Pinter, 1980, p. 102). As one other scientific field, *The Hothouse* has a loosely botanical theme running throughout its institution: A hothouse can refer to a greenhouse; Lush, Daisy Cutts, and Roote all have vaguely horticultural names; Roote and Gibbs discuss the former's expertise in "phytotomy" (Pinter, 1980, p. 88), which is plant anatomy; Roote promises that his subordinates "won't get any tulips from [him]" for doing their jobs (Pinter, 1980, 97). This botanical framing, in a way, can be read as the institutional, scientific subjection being taken to its extreme. Under such strict scientific framing of its subjects and its denial of personhood, the institution of the play might as well be a greenhouse.

The botanical undercurrent of the play might be an institutional discourse taken to its dysfunctional extreme, yet it isn't the only moment of linguistic crisis in *The Hothouse*. Though language constitutes an important area of the disciplinary operations in the play, it nonetheless also comprises a point of institutional vulnerability. *The Hothouse* is very conscious of the limits of institutional linguistic reach and operations, and under the institution, language comes out stretched and

tortured. Early signs of crisis in language appear as linguistic impossibilities converge with linguistic, institutional necessities, and language can't support all institutional suppositions anymore. The play opens on one such linguistic crisis, where it is impossible for both Roote and the institutional records to be correct, despite the institutional necessity for just that. According to the records, the patient with whom Roote had a meeting is dead, which inevitably causes a "discrepancy" (Pinter, 1980, p. 15): "You come and tell me that a man has died and I've got it down here that I had a conversation with him yesterday morning" (Pinter, 1980, p. 15). These circumstances don't leave much room for further linguistic maneuvering in the vein of Gibbs' graceful half-concessions to Roote about patients' descriptions. Later on, Roote himself faces an equal linguistic impossibility, concerning Ministry issue typewriters which must simultaneously be brand-new and rusty. There are two contradicting statements, one that the typewriter is clearly faulty, and another that the Ministry has to be correct when they say it is new, and those two statements must both be true by institutional standards. Roote "can't sit here all night trying to work this out" (Pinter, 1980, p. 83), and ultimately finds no graceful resolution to the impasse.

Patient 6457's apparent conception without a father makes up another linguistic deadlock, and one that drives much of the play. In the end, Gibbs is able to resolve this blockage by framing Lamb, and this linguistic mastery is perhaps what eventually allows him to usurp Roote. Yet this isn't a tidy solution by any means, and it takes not only the framing of Lamb, but the violent overthrow of most of the upper staff, and Gibbs ends up attributing the crimes of murder and rape to Roote anyway. In addition to such linguistic deadlocks, the institutional language in *The Hothouse* is also limited in its formulaic nature. The descriptions of 6457, 6459 and

Lamb all mirror each other, with the same patterns of exchange. There is an exhaustion of meaning and language that comes with such formulaic repetitions. Roote in particular wages his own heroic fight with language, who is especially dependent on clichés and banalities even among his colleagues. This dependence is perhaps the sharpest in moments where Roote talks of institutional operations:

> To spend years and years, winter after winter, trying to perfect the working of an institution so fragile in its conception and execution, so fragile the boundary between the achievement of one's aspirations and their collapse, not only one's own aspirations; rather the aspirations of a whole community, a tradition, an ideal; such a delicately wrought concept of participation between him who is to be treated and him who is to treat that it defies analysis; trying to sustain this fine, fine balance, finer than a … finer than a …… far, far finer. (Pinter, 1980, p. 37)

Roote's lengthy and grandiose speech anticlimactically trails off, in the end, as Roote both reaches for a cliché and grapples with originality. Another moment of such linguistic vacuity comes when Roote boasts that he is "quick as a python," which gets corrected to "adder" by a by-then insubordinate Lush (Pinter, 1980, pp. 95-96). In this respect, the institutional language in *The Hothouse* is in a state of struggle, due to its formulaic nature and dependence on clichés.

One critical part of *The Hothouse*'s depiction of institutional operations is visibility. Visibility functions as a field in which discipline can be exercised; yet thematically, it is also a field that houses critical institutional vulnerabilities. In this respect, institutional sight and vision are important elements of disciplinary operations, in *The Hothouse*, as the intimidation of constant surveillance is one foundation of institutional authority. Visibility and institutional discipline further play off of each other, as the invisibility of its patients as autonomous human beings is how this discipline can be justified within the institution. The residents of the institution are therefore paradoxically denied complete visibility in the eyes of the institution, yet are threatened with surveillance. In *The Hothouse*, the patients'

invisibility is particularly complicated, however: The play, in terms of its subject matter, is essentially a reversal of the institutional focus of observation. In this potentially all-seeing institution, what the audience mainly sees is the highest ranks of its bureaucracy. This bureaucracy is partially defined in its ability to observe other institutional subjects, yet the play positions these observers as the focus of its attention. Patients of the institution, in contrast, remain literally invisible and always off-stage. Punishment and sacrifice present another line of inquiry for the play's handle on visibility. Visibility is both integral and complicated in this respect, particularly concerning Lamb and his martyrdom. As with Wesker's *Chips with Everything*, *The Hothouse* by Pinter alludes to tales of sacrifice, with a Christ-like figure. Recognition of dissent and resistance once again, figures into this discussion of visibility, in terms of how visible the patients' uprising is, both on stage, and in the recognition accorded to it in the eyes of the institution.

In the establishment of institutional authority, sight and vision may not play a role altogether as important as that of language, but optics still constitutes as an important element of *The Hothouse*'s institutional authority. Roote defines his authority through his vision at one point, and underlines his ability to see. Roote boasts about the difference between himself and other military men, who aren't heading their own institutions: "They've got no vision. Vision's very important." Roote, in contrast, defines himself through his vision. This institutional vision is presented in almost supernatural terms by Roote, and he ends up describing an all-encompassing view that very closely resembles the Foucauldian panopticon: "I've got second sight. I can see through walls" (Pinter, 1980, p. 128) This vision is also translated to insight, penetrates to patients' intentions. "I can see right through them. I can hear a whisper in the basement" (Pinter, 1980, p. 128). This faculty of sight that

Roote alleges is all-seeing, approaching omniscience. The institution's obsession with record-keeping aspires to a similar level of omniscience. The reports are assumed to reflect a complete and uninterrupted perspective, and continuous observation of the subject, which is reflected in how infallible they are taken to be by the staff. The setup of the interrogation room also coheres with these established institutional standards, of an observed subject under an observing authority—Gibbs and Cutts can see Lamb, yet Lamb can't see either of them. However, this omniscience is more theoretical than concrete, as the uprising that surprises the staff ultimately proved. Further, the play itself constantly undercuts an institutional omniscience, as will be discussed presently.

Despite their position as observable and ever-observed subjects, the patients of the institution are invisible in a different sense. They are subjects of the institution so far as they aren't recognized as morally autonomous individuals, and as long as the institution doesn't see or recognize moral capability. Patients are defined through an inability by the institution, and even an inability to be an individual specifically: Patients are "only people in need of help," which will ultimately "enable them to say 'I am … Gubbins', for example" (Pinter, 1980, pp. 21-22). Denial of moral-autonomous visibility is reinforced in the institution's denial of names to patients, and it is specifically a loss of sight—"we lose sight of their names and they lose sight of their names"(Pinter, 1980, p. 21). The ultimate invisibility of the patients on stage, in *The Hothouse*, can at first appear as a reflection of patients' invisibility as autonomous individuals in the eyes of the institution. However, the invisibility of the patients in the play actually offers a reversal of the usual setup of disciplinary observation. Rather than remaining visually accessible to the institution at all times, and yet never being recognized by it, the patients in *The Hothouse* are decisively

inaccessible, both to the staff and to the audience. In *The Hothouse*, the patients are a presence that is felt, but never directly seen. All knowledge of the patients and of the basement are reported second hand, which is also true of Gibbs' encounter with a patient's mother. The understaff similarly remains invisible, with the exception of one representative in Tubbs, though we briefly overhear their raffle. The part of the institution that normally observes, however, is what gets observed the most by the audience. It is principally the higher-ranked staff of the institution that is subjected to the audience's observation. Yet the audience is also not privy to a complete perspective: As with *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, the staging of *The Hothouse* depends on coexisting and alternately lighted sets. In this respect, the audience is also denied a full, panoptical sight and a continuous perspective.

Finally, one other dimension of the play's approach to visibility concerns institutional sacrifice and rebellion. *The Hothouse* plays with the idea of martyrdom, and there is more than one Christ-like figure in the play. Patient 6457's child makes a curious and perverse miraculous birth on Christmas, as well, who initially appears to have been conceived without a father. It is Lamb, however, who is the more obvious sacrifice and the martyr of the play: Even his name is immediately on the nose. During his interrogation, the headphones on his head and the electrodes on his wrists evoke the imagery of the crucifixion; one question that Gibbs and Cutts pose him is whether he is "virgo intacta" (Pinter, 1980, p. 73). Yet Lamb as a martyr is neither heroic nor tragic. His sacrifice by the institution defies profundity. For one, Lamb doesn't actually get sacrificed for the first sin that was attributed to him by the institution, that is, the murder and impregnation of the patients 6459 and 6457 respectively. Lamb is initially picked by Gibbs to take the fall for those two crimes, yet his martyrdom is later shifted to another crime, and he ultimately ends up as the

scapegoat for the patients' uprising. In this respect, Lamb's sacrifice doesn't carry much profundity, if it can so easily be redirected. As another point concerning the optics of sacrifice, Lamb makes a more complicated, and almost complicit scapegoat. Though he isn't responsible for the crimes that get pinned on him, Lamb also isn't entirely outside the hierarchy of the institution, or an opponent of discipline. On the contrary, he is almost overeager when it comes to discipline, and he is even "rather enjoying" the torturous experiment (Pinter, 1980, p. 78). Despite the imagery that is mostly played for laughs, the sacrifice of Lamb remains peculiarly unspectacular. The sacrifice perhaps doesn't occur in a climactic spectacle, but rather arises from Lamb's anticlimactic disappearance. After all, both schemes of Gibbs depend on Lamb's disappearance as a culprit, more than the spectacle of him suffering.

Compared to Lamb's institutional sacrifice and the imagery of martyrdom, rebellion and dissent against the institution is treated with relatively more gravity in the play. Questions about the visibility of dissent and rebellion within the institution rise with the patients' rebellion which leads to the slaughter of most of the institution's staff. This uprising is only ever partially visible, and recognizable through its effects more than itself. In a way, the uprising finalizes the tension built-up throughout the play, through the repeated unsettling and non-discursive sounds that are understood to originate from the patients. Though the uprising isn't entirely visible, it nonetheless carries a measure of climax and spectacle: "Shafts of light appear abruptly about the stage, as of doors opening into corridors and into rooms" (Pinter, 1980, p. 145). At first glance, the patients' uprising doesn't prove an optimistic outlook toward rebellion: It is strongly implied that the event is orchestrated by Gibbs, who is "able to take measures to protect [himself]" (Pinter, 1980, p. 152). The uprising ultimately serves Gibbs' own interests, rather than those

of the patients, and eliminates his principal competition within the institution. In this respect, the visibility and recognition of dissent appears contingent on institutional authorization. The uprising isn't detrimental for the patients themselves, addresses what appears as a genuine concern of the patients ("there is no doubt that Mr Roote was unpopular" Pinter, 1980, p. 153), and remarkably spares the understaff. Yet the fact remains that the spectacle of uprising isn't enough to bring about substantial change, or oppose the institutional, disciplinary hierarchy, which is maintained, only with Gibbs in charge of the institution instead of Roote. Roote earlier on, makes a point that can be read in similar terms: "Change is the order of things, after all. I mean it's *in* the order of things, it's not *the* order of things, it's *in* the order of things" (emphasis original, Pinter, 1980, p. 21). This would reinforce the idea that the institution of *The Hothouse* sees and recognizes dissent that benefits itself, and uprising is only an extension of the institutional operation. However, perhaps a measure of hope can be found in this scenario, not in the disruption of patterns as in Wesker's *Chips with Everything*, but in the patterns themselves. As is often the case with the memory plays of Pinter, *The Hothouse* suggests a cyclical chronology, this time concerning the institution. Predecessors of Lamb and Roote in particular hint at a repetition of patterns, with the indication that this is perhaps not the first uprising in the institution. Roote appears to have similarly gotten rid of his own predecessor: "When my predecessor … retired … I was invited to take over his position" (Pinter, 1980, p. 20). Lamb's predecessor, whose whereabouts and fate are unknown by the staff as Lamb's are at the end of the play, has maybe also similarly sacrificed. Gibbs mentions that Lamb's "predecessor used to give [them] a helping hand occasionally, too, you know" (Pinter, 1980, p. 66). In this respect, though the patients' uprising

isn't all conclusive at the end of the play, there remains a possibility, however small, that one day the cycle may be broken.

The final thematic concern that this thesis will examine in relation to *The Hothouse* will be the utilization of sentiment by the institutions, in terms of how individual and collective bodies interact. The interplay between the parts and the whole of the institution is integral to the examination of sentiment, and the manifestation of individual borders in *The Hothouse*, particularly in terms of how the members of the staff relate to the body of the institution at large. Since *The Hothouse* is mainly concerned with the higher-ranking staff of the institution, how these 'small cogs' in the disciplinary machine individually reconcile with the greater institutional operations that they undertake is particularly on the forefront. The borders between the body of the institution and the bodies of individuals are alternately emphasized and deemphasized over the course of the play in *The Hothouse*; and the intimacy of the interrogation/torture in particular, presents a complicated relation to these borders. Another arena where sentiment is felt strongly is in appeals that the institution of *The Hothouse* makes to a sense of belonging, and to the ties of family and community. Christmastime once again is a motif that connects with the institutional entreaties for unity and interdependence between the staff, which constitute the parts of the institution. One other motif in terms of sentiment, which is perhaps not entirely unrelated to the celebration of Christmas, emerges here as motherhood.

In *The Hothouse*, members of the higher-ranking personnel all appear to suffer from a curious lack of connection and contact. *The Hothouse* restricts its scope to the highest-ranking members of the institutional personnel from the beginning; and in a way, the very structure of the play bolsters the upper staff's isolation. Roote,

Gibbs, Lush and Miss Cutts are isolated from the rest of the institution, from the understaff and from the patients. Any interaction these characters have with the patients is reported only second hand. There is little positive contact between the upper staff themselves, and even in the respective affairs of Gibbs and Roote with Miss Cutts, there remains something stilted and distant. Such inability to communicate and insurmountable emotional distance are staples in Pinter's work. However, in *The Hothouse*, these characters' inability to connect and establish contact with others is linked particularly with their institutional positions of power. Miss Cutts steals patient 6459's nightgown, in seemingly an effort to try and copy a measure of intimacy that patient 6459 can manage, but Cutts, with Roote, can't manage by herself. This impossibility of human intimacy also manifests in the characters' curious treatment of mothers. Roote, Gibbs and Lush have a fight about whether they all had a mother themselves, after Lush mentions talking to the mother of patient 6957:

> ROOTE: How do you know she was his mother? … How do you know?
> LUSH: She looked like a mother.
> ROOTE: How do you know what mothers look like?
> LUSH: I had one myself.
> ROOTE: Do you think I didn't?
> LUSH (*pointing at* Gibbs): He didn't.
> GIBBS: Oh yes, I did, damn you!
> ROOTE: I was fed, Mister Cleverboots, at my mother's breast.
> GIBBS: So was I.
> LUSH: Me too.
> *Sudden silence.* (Pinter, 1980, pp. 106-107)

The excessive protests of Roote, Gibbs, and Lush reveal a lack of understanding and a certain vulnerability concerning mothers. Gibbs and Roote talk of the patient 6459's baby, and her motherhood, with similar ambiguity and cluelessness: "Don't you think the mother might miss the baby?" "I won't miss it. ... Then why should the mother miss it?" (Pinter, 1980, p. 46). As such, motherhood is almost an empty

signifier to the members of the upper staff, with no corresponding reference. In terms of connection and intimacy, this lack of a maternal connection emphasizes the isolation and distance to which the upper staff are confined. The higher-ranking personnel of the institution struggle with establishing personal connection, and they aren't able to communicate with other individuals. In this respect, the staff's troubled relationship with the other (such as the patients and the other members of the staff) extends to an incomplete connection with an initial other, in the figure of the mother, which remains abstract and absent.

Yet the institution of *The Hothouse* utilizes such familial connections to appeal to its subjects, promising a sense of belonging, and an erasure of rigid personal boundaries. The institutionaly-celebrated Christmastime strongly evokes a sense of family and unity. Even Roote is able to experience a measure of contact and connection during the celebrations: When gifted a Christmas cake by the understaff, Roote is "most touched. Most touched. More than touched. Deeply moved." In turn, Roote himself appeals to a sense of belonging, unity, and familiarity, in his Christmas address to the understaff:

> Remember that you are not alone, that we here, for example, in this our home, are inextricably related, one to another, the staff to the understaff, the understaff to the patients, the patients to the staff. Remember this, as you sit by your fires, with your families, who have come from near and from far, to share this day with you, and you may be content. (Pinter, 1980, p. 145)

Roote's speech emphasizes connection and contact, imagines the institutional subjects as members of one big family. However, this contact is perhaps not experienced altogether positively in the end. Afterall, Roote's Christmas address is what signals, and perhaps even instigates the patients' uprising; Roote's emphasis on unity serves as a last straw for the patients. It is ironically this emphasis on institutional unity that finally prompts the patients to turn against the institution. The

higher-level staff also don't generally experience their institutional connections positively: Gibbs, Roote, and Lush are all frightened of each other, and the limited connection that they feel is one of complicity—as Lush says, "we're all buddies, aren't we? We're all in the game together" (Pinter, 1980, p. 52). There is Roote, also, who briefly imagines himself as a reformer, yet is quick to disavow any actual attempt at change when he remembers his institutional allegiances. The higher-level staff, in this respect, experience contact with the body of the institution negatively, more as helplessness and complicity. Gillen (1983) considers *The Hothouse* "further than any of Pinter's other plays in supporting the radical assessment of Lois G. Gordon that Pinter's work 'condemns the initial contact that man makes with society, the unmanageable, indeed unworkable, negotiation of man and all institutions'" (as cited in Gillen, p. 87).

Contact along the borders of institutional and individual bodies is particularly complicated in *The Hothouse*, where pressure can be felt both as discomfort and as joy. Lamb's interrogation and questioning presents one such complication of borders under pressure, and of bodies in contact. Lamb is initially as isolated as the rest of the staff; he is similarly incapable of experiencing contact and connection: "I don't seem to be able to … reach the others. Don't know why" (Pinter, 1980, p. 35). He considers Miss Cutts his "only friend" in the institution (Pinter, 1980, p. 35), yet from their stilted and one-sided conversation, it is clear that Lamb also isn't entirely able to reach Miss Cutts. While Lamb hasn't "really got used to the place" (Pinter, 1980, p. 33), he is eager to become a part of the institution and dreams of a promotion. In this respect, the institution promises a sense of belonging, and a feeling of connection to Lamb, who is otherwise unable to establish such connections. "I mean, you really get the feeling here that something … *important* is

going on, something really valuable, and to be associated with it in any way can't be seen in any other light than as a privilege" (Pinter, 1980, p. 60). The institution offers "a group of people in which common group assumptions are shared" (Pinter, 1980, p. 77), as Gibbs mentions in one of his questions. Lamb's interrogation/torture is about contact and connection with the institutional body, in this respect. Miss Cutts also sees the process centering around contact and connection, which is felt as pressure on borders: The questions in the interrogation are "so intimate," to the point that that "intimacy becomes unbearable" (Pinter, 1980, p. 120). The pressure that Lamb is under is similarly two-faceted. Lamb feels "an extraordinary uplift" when called to the interrogation room (Pinter, 1980, p. 60), he is "rather enjoying" (p. 78), the questioning, "chuckles" intermittently (p. 78). Yet this contact is too much, uncomfortable and painful. In the case of Lamb, this pressure that contact with the institution causes, leads to a breakdown of borders. If Lamb doesn't fully break under the interrogation, which is both institutional contact and painful pressure, the repeal of all contact afterwards finishes the job. Lamb truly breaks once he is left alone, when all contact is withdrawn from Lamb and he is left completely isolated. The breakdown of Lamb comes with a breakdown of personal borders.

In terms of the play's formal strategies, the first element that this chapter will examine is music, sound and rhythm. *The Hothouse* is admittedly the least musical of the four plays that this thesis is studying; yet wordless, non-discursive sounds, and marked silences are elemental to the play's execution. Pinter frequently and distinctly marks silences and pauses on the text –"pause," "sudden silence" etcetera (Pinter, 1980, pp. 99, 107), which can be as impactful as the worded dialogue and takes comparable space. The silence in Pinter's works has certainly generated much discussion: In *Harold Pinter: The Poetics of Silence*, James R. Hollis (1970) argues

that such pauses in Pinter's plays mark "the limits of language" (p. 15). Elsewhere, Dukore (1988) proposes that silence can function as a means of resistance in Pinter's plays (p. 59). There are two instances in *The Hothouse,* however, where the non-discursive, both non-verbal sound silence, is particularly at the forefront. First, there is the patients' uprising, which is realized on stage in "squeaks," "clanging," and "rattle of chains;" the uprising is represented through the "whispers, chuckles, half-screams of the patients," all of which are markedly non-verbal (Pinter, 1980, p. 145). The intimation of the uprising happens through similarly non-discursive sounds. The members of the staff are disrupted by the commotion of the patients twice, before the uprising takes place—there is "a long keen," "a long sigh," "a laugh … amplified, dying away" (Pinter, 1980, pp. 51, 117). In both instances, the staff stop what they are doing in reaction, but they also don't verbally address the sounds. The nearest attempt at addressing and discussing these sounds, and the disquietude in the institution, is by Gibbs: "It is absurd. Something's happening, I feel it, I know it, and I can't define it. It's … it's ridiculous" (Pinter, 1980, pp. 121-122). Whereas institutional language works to subdue the patients through medicalization and scientific jargon, there is something that defies language and definition in the patients' noise. The second instance where the non-discursive is at the forefront of the play relates to Lamb. The interrogation of Lamb utilizes a shocking and deeply disruptive sound, which is heard through his "earphones, emitting high-pitches cries" (Pinter, 1980, p. 68). More importantly, however, there is the curtain line, which is not a line at all. The curtain closes on a still and broken Lamb, in a "sound-proof room" (Pinter, 1980, p. 154). In this respect, the silence of Lamb is the play's final statement.

As another formal aspect of the play, the humor in *The Hothouse* is bound to be complicated, due to the plays' concerns and ominous subject matter. Billington (1997) suggests that the comedic nature of Pinter's plays is often underplayed in stage adaptations, particularly later on in the playwright's career (p. 73). Yet there is no doubt that *The Hothouse* has darkly comedic elements. Billington (1997) traces the influences of contemporary town hall sketches in *The Hothouse,* likely referencing commercial formulas of comedy (p. 77). Within the play itself, humor can be applied strategically in the characters' fight for dominance within the institution. Roote is fearful of ridicule, apprehensive that someone may be "taking the old wee-wee out of [him]" (Pinter, 1980, p. 27), and is perhaps the most vulnerable to ridicule to his position of greater authority. The members of the staff ridicule and humiliate each other, and Lush in particular takes subtle jabs at both Gibbs and Roote. There are moments where humor is more broadly turned against institutional authority, where institutional grandiosity is undercut by the play: The microphone for the Christmas address, standing as a sign of authority, comes out of a cake. The cake is cut with a bayonet. Billington (1997) judges *The Hothouse* in particular as constantly skirting a fine line, where the play is funny, until it is disturbingly not (p. 366). As an example, Billington (1997) points out to the quickfire, comedic exchanges between Roote and Gibbs concerning the description of patients, which is abruptly followed by ruthless planning on how to eliminate 6457's baby (p. 366). Classic comedy is similarly followed by institutional violence in another scene: Gibbs points to a light -"You see that light?"- only to tell Lamb to "ignore it" (Pinter, 1980, p. 67). The joke is succeeded by Lamb's interrogation and torture. In this respect, violence and humor in *The Hothouse* are perhaps more interdependent than contrasting. The play isn't necessarily above slapstick in its

comedy—there are literal slaps and even an exploding cigar in *The Hothouse.* At one point, Roote, Gibbs and Lush engage in a physical tussle. In this respect, the humor of the play can originate in violence. Violence is perhaps not the limit of comedy, in *The Hothouse,* but a persistent aspect of it.

As the final part of the play's formal and technical examination, *The Hothouse* remains markedly non-naturalistic in its depiction of institutional practices, in its tone and staging. Tonally, *The Hothouse* verges on absurdity; as Gillen (1983) mentions, the play was initially drawing comparisons with Ionesco from critics (p. 86). Beyond its absurdist elements, however, *The Hothouse* proves particularly interesting in its form, because of its references in terms of genre. Billington points out that *The Hothouse* references contemporary popular commercial forms of theatre, such as the town hall comedy sketches that were previously mentioned. Furthermore, the very structure of the play's plot echoes and parodies popular murder mysteries, where the detective turns out to be the culprit: Roote is tasked to discover the mysterious father and the murderer in the institution, he turns out to be both (Billington, 1997, p. 103). In *The Hothouse*, there is an awareness about the theatricality of the institution, and a few moments of metatheatricality. Miss Cutts is presented as "our dramatic instructor" by Lush (Pinter, 1980, p. 56), who also claims that the mother of the dead patient "left much moved by [his] recital" (Pinter, 1980, p. 57). In addition, it's not only commercial forms that Pinter references, but also himself. Gibbs describes Patient 6459 as "a woman in her thirties," which "means nothing to [Roote]" (Pinter, 1980, p. 40). Gibbs' description echoes Pinter's usual dramatis personae, where he introduces his characters in the same formula, in simple terms, only through their age.

To conclude, what best characterizes *The Hothouse* is perhaps friction, which is inextricably linked to contact. The friction among the staff is what drives the play forward, in the characters' often linguistic bids for dominance and authority. Contact is felt as violent friction at its most impactful, as characters interact with each other and relate to the larger body of the institution. In this respect, *The Hothouse* also formally emphasizes friction, as both violence and impact, in its staging: Patients' sounds resonate most deeply in their abrasion, the play's humor depends on violent contact and collusion. Thus, the sinister violence of *The Hothouse* often draws attention to the audience's own contact with the institution. On the one hand, interaction with the institution is always bound to cause friction, which is often felt violently. In that regard, the audience's own contact with the ominous hothouse is no exception. Yet friction is also how resistance to the institution and the pushback against this institutional contact can be felt, and ultimately this is what *The Hothouse* manages.

CHAPTER 5

ON THE TURKISH STAGE: "BLACK-BOUND" SEMANTICS OF *YAŞAR NE YAŞAR NE YAŞAMAZ*

Initially written as a twelve-week radio play by Aziz Nesin in 1973, *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* was first adapted into a television script for the Turkish Radio Television company. Nesin later novelized it in 1977, and eventually turned it into a stage play. Though it was performed by a number of private and amateur theater companies in the 1970s, the script was officially picked up by the State Theater in 1989. This production was directed by Kenan Işık, and benefited greatly from the composition of Timur Selçuk. The eponymous Yaşar Yaşamaz of Nesin's play carries two contradicting statements in his name—that he lives (Yaşar), and that he doesn't live (Yaşamaz). A clerical error in the state registry records Yaşar as dead: He is consequently considered alive when it suits the interests of the state and state-adjacent institutions, and deceased when it doesn't. In his bid to obtain unequivocal, official proof that he is alive, Yaşar ends up in increasingly absurd predicaments, and cycles through a number of institutions. His father's attempt to register Yaşar at primary school is what prompts the discovery of the peculiar, legal limbo that he occupies for the rest of the play. Yaşar then has run-ins with the military institution, with courthouses and government offices; he is institutionalized in turns in medical and mental hospitals. He is perhaps most significantly, however, eventually incarcerated for slander against the state, and the play itself is framed as a performance acted out by Yaşar's fellow inmates on stage. While he is incarcerated, Yaşar gets acquainted with institutional operations, their ins and outs, and learns to assimilate and even profit from this larger institutional, bureaucratic system. He is

introduced to Black-Bound Nizamî while in prison, who is an emblematic figure that understands and knows how to take advantage of institutions. Thus, Yaşar dramatically turns his fortunes around and leaves prison as a newly minted Black-Bound Nizamî himself at the end of *Yaşar.* He is no longer a victim of the institutional system, but one of its veritable masters as well as one of its accomplices, in a complicated, bittersweet ending.

As with Stoppard's *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, Nesin's *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* is colored by its historical context. A break with a previous regime and at the same time an older mode of discipline shapes the background of the play. *Yaşar* begins in the early days of the Turkish Republic, which historically "[emphasized] the differences between itself and the empire" (Zürcher, 2010, p. 247). This break with the previous regime doesn't only coincide with, but perhaps explicitly depends on first the introduction, then the propagation of institutions as we know them. The Turkish Republic's break from The Ottoman Empire is, ideologically, characterized by reforms such as the "passing of the law on the unification of education in 1924 and the introduction of a European-style family law in 1926" (Zürcher, 2010, p. 145). The introduction of "European-style" institutions, in this respect, means the dispersion of a new mode of discipline, in the Foucauldian and modern sense, across the Turkish Republic. Cemal Süreya (2005) considers the public's contact with and response to such institutions, in this process of emergence and dispersion, a particular and career-long interest on Nesin's part:

> Aziz Nesin has a concern that goes beyond humor: To tell, within the changing Turkish society, how the public has responded to new institutions, new tools, new modes of thought, and the public's conflict and friction with these new elements (p. 360-361).

In this respect, *Yaşar*'s interest in institutions is particularly significant, in that the play sketches out the emergence and dispersion of the modern, institutional forms of

discipline in Turkey, and the initial reactions of the Turkish public in the face of these institutions.

Yaşar cycles through more individual institutions in its episodes compared to the other plays that this thesis is studying: As mentioned, Yaşar first discovers his peculiar legal status, not dead yet not alive, when his father tries to register him at a primary school. He later completes his mandatory service in a military institution. In his bids to obtain legal proof that he is in fact alive, Yaşar visits various bureaucratic state institutions, as well as a courthouse for related proceedings. He finds himself institutionalized in mental and psychiatric hospitals in turn, when his attempts to prove that he is alive misfire. However, the central institution of the play is the prison in which Yaşar is finally incarcerated, as it serves as the structural center of the play. The conceit of *Yaşar* is that the episodes are recounted by Yaşar to his fellow inmates, who in turn reenact them for the benefit of the audience, as per the play's prologue. The other episodes of *Yaşar* are ultimately anchored back to this initial prison environment; the prison guardian's repetitive whistle and warnings reestablish the prison as the play's principal setting at the end of each episode: "Inside… Nobody must stay out… Everybody get inside…" (Nesin, 1992, p. 37). Though the play involves a number of different institutions, the overall institutional structure depicted in the play is precisely panoptic; and in this, the prison is the most emblematic of such institutional, panoptic structures. As the inmate who presents the play-within-the-play puts it in the prologue, "in truth, which part of the world is not a prison, dear audience? Even those of you who think themselves most free, aren't you both the guardian and the convict of your own prisons?" (Nesin, 1992, p. 19) This element of a self-imposed, gentle discipline is visible with Yaşar, who often willingly subjects himself under institutional authority, with the hope that it may

finally legitimize his existence in the eyes of the authorities. Further, the prison of *Yaşar* can host and accommodate other institutional structures within its body. The prison of the play duplicates hierarchical class structures; *Yaşar*'s prison is unofficially divided by class, with separate dormitories for "sans-culottes" and "lords" (Nesin, 1992, p. 25). In the epilogue and the prologue both, the actor/convict talks of "prison, which is a school," equating two institutions that are meant to be unique in their missions (Nesin, 1992, p. 23). While this equation of schools and prisons questions demarcated fields of institutional operations (education versus rehabilitation, etcetera), it also highlights the emblematic position of the prison in *Yaşar*. Yaşar interacts with a number of institutions, yet it is in prison that he learns to recognize, and even master, the course of institutional operations.

Its central prison may be the most emblematic of *Yaşar*'s many institutions, yet there is one more significant characteristic that institutions share in the play. The institutions of *Yaşar* define themselves chiefly through their difference—these institutions are defined in their modernity and gentility; they highlight the role of due-process and legality in a newly-emerging mode of discipline. In *Yaşar*, there is marked friction, and even competition, between older sets of institutions and the emerging new ones, which are introduced as more orderly and more legal. Yaşar's father, Reşit, considers both the modern "government" schools, and the earlier seminary schools which teach the "old scipt," for Yaşar's education (Nesin, 1992, p. 27). Yaşar and Ayşe later on have to make choice between civil and religious ceremonies of marriage, as two disparate sets of institutions. All modern institutions of *Yaşar* stress their legality first, however, and the legality of such modern discipline is closely connected with practices of orderly record-keeping. In an early moment of the play, Reşit tries to take advantage of the rivalry between older and

modern sets of institutions, during Yaşar's school registration, and finds his efforts backfiring: His bluff that "you don't need identification for the old-script school," results in a terse "you do for the government school" (Nesin, 1992, p. 28). The headmaster's answer implies a radical difference between the two schools of the two regimes. There is no doubt that the importance accorded to record-keeping, order and legality (such as Yaşar's missing identification) is integral to this difference between the two modes of discipline practiced in these schools. In the newly emerging institutions of *Yaşar*, order is both the novelty and the foundation of discipline.

In *Yaşar*, a significant part of the institutional, disciplinary work takes place in the field of language. Likewise, language stretched and forced to the point of breakdown is an inevitable area of vulnerability in institutional operations. *Yaşar* opens on and centers around a moment of total linguistic crisis, which isn't resolved until the very end of the play. Even the eventual resolution is complicated and incomplete. Further, there is a governmental, institutional mode of speech in *Yaşar*, one that isn't only disparate from the daily, common language spoken by people like Yaşar himself, but perhaps one that directly contradicts it. Record-keeping, though more legal than scientific in *Yaşar*, lies at the core of this institutional language of power: Institutional records can turn people into objects of knowledge, in the play, and thus hold power over their life and death, as Yaşar experiences first hand. Contradicting the institutional mode of speech is penalized heavily, and Yaşar comes to learn and master this mode of speech over the course of the play. On the one hand, *Yaşar* draws attention to actions of speech and feats of language; words and names both carry power in the play, and mastering the institutional mode of speech can be the most powerful linguistic maneuver of them all. On the other hand, the institutional language of power in *Yaşar* is very precarious; it is prone to

dysfunctionality and contradiction both. *Yaşar*'s institutional language is also not without banalities or clichés, and this institutional dependency on stock phrases only aggravates the play's linguistic deadlocks. Overall, the institutional, linguistic operations in *Yaşar* appear unsustainable in the long run, though at the end of the play, they are still maintained and only ever get further entangled.

Speech in *Yaşar* can be active and transformative, and so can the act of naming. As one prominent example, Yaşar is ultimately incarcerated for "slander"—a crime where it is speech that constitutes the criminal act: "His crime? His crime is slander… Against who? (Laughing sardonically.) You know who it'll be against." (Nesin, 1992, p. 19) In another instance, parents of Yaşar and Ayşe negotiate Ayşe's bride price, where speaking of the agreement functions as a binding act, and where both parties perform various linguistic maneuvers in a relatively low-stakes power play (Nesin, 1992, p. 38-39). On a related note, Yaşar's family certainly believes there is some power in names and in the process of naming. Yaşar (literally 'he lives') is named so because their children before him died, and his parents hoped Yaşar may live (Nesin, 1992, p. 31). Yaşar's son with Ayşe, Hayati (literally 'vital') is named according to the same tradition, in the hopes that he may escape the legal purgatory in which his father is trapped. The influence of names, in this respect, ultimately proves more ironic, however: Yaşar doesn't legally live, and he can't register the birth of his son, either. His father-in-law Sadık (literally 'loyal') turns out to be not entirely loyal, reneging on his earlier permission and friendship once he sees that Yaşar is unable to shake off his legal troubles. One other dimension of naming concerns the names of those in power. Highest-ranking positions in the play aren't named at all. The actor-convict presenting Yaşar to the audience in the prologue is careful not to replicate the slander, and doesn't name its target: "You

know who it'll be against." (Nesin, 1992, p. 19) Similarly, when he is first introduced to the concept of a Black-Bound Nizami, Yaşar guesses that Nizami could be a "lawyer," "a member of the parliament" or "a minister or something" (Nesin, 1992, p. 63). Yet he can't find it in himself to name a position above that, and dances around it instead: "Oh dear… He's not like whatsit-or-something? (Nesin, 1992, p. 63)" In this respect, names carry considerable power in *Yaşar*, and the simple act of naming can be transformative. However, names are inexact in their effects, and there remain powers that are beyond the reach of naming.

There may be power in speech and naming, yet at first glance, the most successful linguistic tool of *Yaşar* is the institutional, bureaucratic mode of speech. *Yaşar*'s institutional language depends heavily on record-keeping, and it accords great importance to matters of legality. Accordingly, the institutional operations that create subjects of knowledge operate largely on a legal basis instead of a scientific one in this play. Institutional subjects such as Yaşar are turned into objects of knowledge through the bureaucratization of their existence, rather than its medicalization: "It's all written in the registry. It even knows what's inside a man's guts" (Nesin, 1992, p. 29). In this respect, the authority of record-keeping is total; its control is extended to all aspects of life. In *Yaşar*, record-keeping serves as the heart of institutional potency and knowledge. The legal/bureaucratic records, collected and personalized in official books or notebooks, don't only justify institutional authority overall but serve as a cardinal authority in themselves: "What can I do, it's what the book says" (Nesin, 1992, p. 35). The records are considered infallible by the play's institutions, and this infallibility serves as the justification for institutional operations: "All manner of things are written in this book. There aren't any hitches." (Nesin, 1992, p. 35) Thus, in *Yaşar*, institutional practices are conducted through a

separate, bureaucratic language, a language of the book, which centers around record-keeping.

This institutional, bureaucratic mode of speech is essentially a foreign language to Yaşar at first, who needs this unknown mode of speech to be translated. In his first brush with bureaucratic institutions, Yaşar is confused by the language that the civil servant employs, and has to ask his father to translate the speech: "What's he saying, dad?" "Don't you hear it, son, he says nothing" (Nesin, 1992, p. 35). Later on, Yaşar asks his lawyer for a translation in the face of similarly bureaucratic language, during the legal proceedings for his father's inheritance: "What does he say?" "You wouldn't get it, he's speaking lawyer-ese." (Nesin, 1992, p. 49). Finally, Ayşe asks Yaşar to translate a similar branch of bureaucratic legalese when they try to register their son's birth in a government office and meet resistance. In any case, challenging the institutional record-keeping and pointing out the mistake in Yaşar's records never leads to any results. Going counter to this bureaucratic language which is predicated on record-keeping is penalized heavily by the institutional system, instead. Rejecting the institutional mode of speech isn't only unconducive to success under institutions, but even penalized by them. Reşit falls into this mistake early on when he insists on the error in the registry: He dares to say that he is fine "as long as the error is understood." (Nesin, 1992, p. 33) The attention that Reşit draws to the error serves as a catalyst for the rest of the play. It is only after Reşit's declaration of an error in the registry that Yaşar's situation truly snowballs out of control. Yaşar's lawyer is much more fluent in the institutional, bureaucratic mode of speech compared to Reşit. Yet he is similarly powerless to make an impression about the error in the records: "Due to the error in the records…" (Nesin, 1992, p. 51) Yaşar's lawyer similarly goes unheard when he talks of a fallibility in

the records—his mastery of the bureaucratic, institutional language alone isn't enough to sustain his attack against its very source of authority.

One other distinct mode of speech in *Yaşar* is the 'külhanbeyi' dialect of İstanbul, and how Yaşar relates to this local mode of speech can shed light on his eventual relationship with the greater institutional mode of speech dominating the play. Yaşar is introduced to the Külhanbeyi dialect by Kâzım, who uses it to take advantage of Yaşar and swindle him out of money. Yaşar tries to later copy this dialect himself, however, with its characteristic intonations and the rhetorical "You see me?" almost as punctuation (Nesin, 1992, p. 79-82). Yaşar uses this local dialect to his advantage with Ayşe, underhandedly convincing her to forego various luxuries and even necessities of their married life. Eventually, Yaşar comes to do the same with the institutional mode of speech—he learns to adopt its affectations to his advantage. At the end of the play, Yaşar emerges as a newly-minted a member of the Black-Bound Nizamî brigade. Black-Bound Nizami (literally "orderly") is introduced early in the play as a mysterious and almost magical figure of great power, with powers that extend over life and death: "There is nothing Mr. Black-Bound Nizamî can't do. He snatches the dead from the noose, puts the living back on it. He can deal with Death himself." (Nesin, 1992, p. 62). In this respect, Nizamî comes to symbolize linguistic mastery within the institutional structure. He is repeatedly presented as someone that would have succeeded within the institutional framework where Yaşar failed. Unlike Yaşar's lawyer or Reşit, Nizamî doesn't challenge the linguistic operations of the play's institutions. Nizamî instead works within the system, copies the institutional mode of speech, similar to Yaşar's earlier adoption of the 'külhanbeyi' dialect. "Meaning, he makes it fit with the black-bound book... He never does anything unlawful"—"conducting all business in an orderly

fashion," Nizami operates within the institutional structure to his advantage (Nesin, 1992, p. 63). Thus, when Yaşar masters the institutional languages of legality and record-keeping, he joins in with the myriad Black-Bound Nizamis who adopted the language of the book. Only when he stops trying to overturn the mistake in the records, only when he stops challenging the source and power of institutional language, Yaşar manages to acquire the long sought-after papers of identification.

In this respect, the institutional language based on record-keeping in *Yaşar* is still held up at the end of the play. Its operations are extended even further, as Yaşar becomes yet another fluent speaker of the institutional language, of the language of the black-bound record book. However, such institutional, linguistic operations are clearly unsustainable in the long run. Language is undeniably at a point of crisis in *Yaşar* from the play's very beginning. Yaşar exists as an impossibility with two opposing claims in his name, that he lives and that he doesn't live. The very title of the play duplicates this complication ("Yaşar Yaşamaz neither lives nor he doesn't," Nesin, 1992). The play is rife with similar linguistic complications, double and triple negatives and so forth, with such nesting paradoxes repeated elsewhere in the play: "May you live long, Yaşar Yaşamaz." (Nesin, 1992, p. 26). In this regard, the language of the institution is already very delicate and unstable. The institutional language of the play doesn't allow for corrections and retractions, either. Instead, the institutional language of *Yaşar* denies the paradoxes it creates, along with any error in the record-keeping process. Yaşar gets his identification card in the end, yet the linguistic impasse that is at the heart of his predicament is never really resolved—the initial mistake in the records are never recognized or amended. In this respect, language is burdened only further at the end of the play, as more people such as Yaşar come to adopt the institutional mode of speech. After he masters the record-

based language of the black-bound book of law and record, Yaşar achieves a type of individual emancipation. Yet the overwrought and lethargic linguistic operations of the institution continue on uninterrupted despite Yaşar's personal salvation.

Institutional dependence on banalities and clichés adds to the load that bears on language throughout the play. By the time he is eligible for his mandatory military service, official records show that Yaşar has died twice, in two separate military conflicts. Institutional responses to this impossibility of a two-fold death is formulated through clichés and stock phrases, which ultimately only deepen the absurdity of the situation. Thus, language is mired further in crisis through the continuation of the conventional institutional, linguistic operations. The military commander responds with the expected platitudes in the face of Yaşar's supposed two-fold death: "But you can't die twice…" "What kind of talk is that? One would die not twice but a hundred times over for the fatherland." (Nesin, 1992, p. 43) Similarly, during the proceedings for Reşit's inheritance, the lawyer for the state treasury argues that the recorded double deaths of Yaşar only serve as double proof of his demise (Nesin, 1992, p. 51). Linguistic operations continued in this way point not to a clear sign of wrongdoing and contradiction in the records, but instead to their surety for the lawyer. In this respect, the continuation of institutional linguistic operations through expected commonplaces and stock responses burdens language further in the play. Though the institutional language based on the record-book is still held up at the end of the play, when Yaşar leaves prison, how long this precarious language can be sustained remains a question. The initial linguistic deadlock is never truly resolved and the error at its heart is never really corrected.

The complicated visibilities of institutions and persons constitute another line of inquiry for this chapter, as the institutions of the play allocate visibility only in so

far as it suits their operations. Further, a significant portion of institutional operations lies in the allocation of visibility and invisibility in itself. Visibility in the eyes of law lies at the heart of Yaşar's predicament, as he spends the play trying to obtain full legal visibility and become a legal person. A recognition of legal and complete personhood is related to a recognition of capability and moral autonomy by Hunt, which is withheld from Yaşar throughout the play. In contrast, Yaşar is relegated to a form of conditional visibility, and thus he only has a partial personhood conditional on institutional interests. Yaşar is denied complete visibility by the state when it concerns institutional obligations, and his existence is recognized legally only when it suits the purposes of the state institutions. Yaşar is only ever visible, if it benefits the institution. How are the institutions themselves seen, in turn? Further, on a similar vein, do the institutions of Yaşar recognize the visibility of dissent and rebellion? As he isn't always seen, Yaşar is initially not able to see, and it takes time for him to come to recognize institutional operations for what they are. However, Yaşar's epiphany in prison is complicated as well, when these two issues are concerned—the issues of the recognition of institutional operations by individuals, and of the visibility of dissent against the institution.

In the play, Yaşar finds himself in a treacherous and unstable position where he is neither a non-person nor does he enjoy personhood fully, with the full extent of rights and privileges implied by the title. Rather, his visibility in the eyes of institutions is conditional and is subject to change, according to the interests of the institutions. He is considered dead when institutions are obligated to him, where he is denied legal visibility. Yet Yaşar is considered alive when he is beholden to institutions, where he is then strategically accorded with legal recognition by those same institutions. Yaşar is taken to be alive when he is conscripted to military service

or when he has to pay taxes; yet he is considered dead when he asks to be discharged or when he tries to collect on his father's inheritance. In this respect, Yaşar is only partially a person in the eyes of the state. The opposing lawyer in Reşit's inheritance proceedings says as much, denying the legal existence of Yaşar altogether: "This person claiming his name is Yaşar, and whose claim that he is alive is nothing more than a self-declared and unproven allegation—who incidentally does not even legally exist" (Nesin, 1992, p. 49). On the other hand, as the other part of this conditional visilibility, Yaşar's existence is taken to be self-evident when it benefits the institution. The commander is dismissive of Yaşar's legal invisibility when it is time for him to conscripted, considering him capable and alive: "So, you are trying to pass Yaşar off as dead?" (Nesin, 1992, p. 41).

In *Yaşar*, Reşit is the last member of Yaşar's family to legally exist, and to register as a full person in the eyes of the play's institutions. Recognized as a full citizen, Reşit is a person who exists always and fully in front of the law, unlike his son, Yaşar. Reşit's name has legal connotations, of a person who is legally accountable—meaning someone of age who possesses majority and moral autonomy, and therefore exists in the eyes of the law. In contrast, Yaşar who is only partially and conditionally a person, often finds his moral autonomy and mental capabilities questioned. Whenever he describes his legal predicament, as someone who is already dead yet simultaneously clearly alive, he is almost always assumed to be mentally-ill. A fellow inmate "makes a cuckoo sign with this hand" when Yaşar first starts recounting his story (Nesin, 1992, p. 20), and this initial response is echoed by others again and again each time his situation is brought up. Though *Yaşar* challenges the sequence of the cause and effect, in that Yaşar's perceived lack of moral autonomy arises from his legal invisibility and not the other way around, the two concepts are

still wound tightly together in the play. The recognition of Yaşar as a legal and political person is connected with the recognition of his moral autonomy—both of which hinge on a complicated and conditional visibility in control of the institution.

Controlled and conditional visibilities of personhood and of autonomy lie at the heart of Yaşar's predicament. It is gradually revealed, however, that this complicated and partial form of visibility isn't limited with Yaşar. Yaşar's case isn't as exceptional as it may first appear—though his predicament is certainly emblematic. Rather, the control over Yaşar's conditional visibility is the usual course of institutional operations when it is taken to its extreme. Yaşar is institutionalized in a mental hospital at one point in the play, as a result of his insistence that he is neither alive nor dead. Ironically, he is perhaps received the best in this mental institution, where his sanity and moral autonomy aren't actually questioned by its chief physician. The chief physician is unamazed by Yaşar's story, and makes a somewhat familiar point: "I know it, son. You are crazy just as much as anyone else, no more no less. Like those outside, I mean." (Nesin, 1992, p. 77). The physician doesn't quite refer to the trope identified in *Every Good Boy*, that the only sane people are those labeled insane. Instead, however, this draws attention to the institutional denial of, or rather only a partial and strategic allocation of visibility across the board. Significantly, this manner of allocation doesn't only concern Yaşar. Though the conditional invisibility is more starkly recognizable in his case, the inmates can still empathize with Yaşar and his incomplete existence: "Which one of us truly lives?" (Nesin, 1992, p. 26-27). An old man who takes pity on Yaşar and tries to teach him how to make a living through insurance fraud makes a similar point: "A poor person can neither live nor die; they only suffer as you do" (Nesin, 1992, p. 100). Institutional operations hinge on a careful allocation of visibility, that

also doles out personhood and livelihood accordingly. Recalling that not all lives are recognized and seen exactly as lives, Yaşar's life isn't the only one who is recognized only conditionally. It is only that this selective recognition of persons and lives is amplified in Yaşar's case, and the conditionality of this visibility is made manifest.

Another aspect of the allocation of visibility in the play relates to the institutional operations themselves—to what extent these operations are seen and recognized by their institutional subjects, particularly as these operations depend on subtlety and invisibility per Foucault's definition**?** Similarly, the visibilities of dissent and rebellion under institutional rule are of particular interest, as institutions tend to deliberately not recognize or instead coopt spectacles of dissidence and protest. To start with the visibility of institutional operations before moving on to their recognition by its subjects, one aspect of the institutional framework is marked as particularly subtle in *Yaşar*. Though Black-Bound Nizamî doesn't stand for all institutional operations as such, he certainly represents the operations that supplement institutional systems. Black-Bound Nizamî is described to Yaşar as a figure whose power is dispersed so that it can consequently be both subtle and ever-present: "He is like a spirit, then…" "Well said, Mr. Black-Bound Nizamî is a spirit. There is no time and place where he doesn't exist" (Nesin, 1992, p. 64). Institutional discipline shares the same characteristics, and Black-Bound Nizami is integral to institutional operations in the play in any case. Initially, Yaşar begins the play oblivious to workings of institutional operations. He is educated over the course of the play on the disciplinary operations carried out by institutions, and he comes to recognize these operations for what they are. Differing from *Chips with Everything*, Yaşar's education is imagined in entirely informal terms in *Yaşar*. The play positions

prison as a school environment, which is where Yaşar comes to learns the subtleties of disciplinary operations. It is in prison that Yaşar learns to see these operations, and the disciplinary frameworks are made visible to him: “Thankfully my eyes have been opened in the jailhouse” (Nesin, 1992, p. 112).

The extent to which Yaşar’s eyes have truly been opened concerning institutional operations, however, relates to the visibility of dissent and protest within the institutional system. Dissent against institutions appear almost hyper-visible at first glance. Yaşar isn’t able to find a police officer who would take him to a hospital after a car crash despite all pleas and efforts by both him and bystanders. One word of dissent, however, is enough to summon four undercover police officers to his side, once he starts badmouthing “the order” (Nesin, 1992, p. 103). In this respect, institutions see dissent anywhere it may exist and recognize it immediately. However, the visibility of dissent is more complicated in that Yaşar doesn’t entirely make a willing or passionate dissident even initially, and Yaşar doesn’t stay a dissident for very long. First of all, Yaşar is almost goaded into his eventual “slander” by officers of the institution (Nesin, 1992, p. 19), either by clerks or by the police. He comes close to the act twice earlier but doesn’t fully commit slander until his son is also denied papers of identification. Secondly, Yaşar doesn’t remain a dissident against the state institutions for very long. By the end of the play, Yaşar has learnt to become a part of the institutional system, where he doesn’t only learn to recognize its operations but assimilates to them. In this respect, *Yaşar* doesn’t present a way out of institutional oppression from inside of the system. Even Nizami, who at first appears to exist outside institutional legality, to operate outside of the institutional framework, turns out to be an extension and an integral part of it. Thus, Yaşar’s education on institutional operations is complicated: Though Yaşar comes to

recognize institutional operations with his newly opened eyes, this visibility doesn't ultimately result in an emancipation from institutions. Yaşar leaves prison rich and with the documentation he sought after all along, but the prison that he was in still remains after his departure. Any dissent Yaşar may have expressed has been turned into a self-serving opportunism following his expansion of vision concerning institutions. In this regard, Yaşar certainly doesn't break the pattern of institutional oppression and assimilation, though there may be some comfort in his individual salvation. Instead, the epilogue of the play highlights the existence of those patterns and presents Yaşar as an example of the patterns in practice: "How many more Mister Black-Bound Nizamis will be trained here [in prison], if things go on as they are…" (Nesin, 1992, p. 115).

In *Yaşar*, appeals to sentimentality constitute an integral and final dimension of institutional operations. First, sentiment is a significant factor in the institutional appeals to national love, which shapes the interactions between the bodies of individuals and the bodies of institutions. It is perhaps no coincidence that the records show that Yaşar died in two separate military conflicts, being martyred once in Çanakkale and once in Dersim. Through the evocations of national bonds of love, as the borders between the bodies of individuals and the bodies of institutions are deemphasized. Instead the institutions foster a sense of unity and connection. National love features heavily in *Yaşar*, where it markedly never meets its promise and is only strengthened in its continued deferral. As previously mentioned, the state never acknowledges its obligations to Yaşar, and only acknowledges Yaşar himself when its institutions have something to gain from him. Yaşar is expected to complete his military service, pay his bills and taxes; the institutions, however, don't acknowledge Yaşar enough to discharge him or grant him his father's inheritance,

and so forth. Yet Yaşar is initially completely taken in by the sentimental appeals to national love as they are made by the play's institutions. One verse Yaşar repeatedly sings throughout the play reproduces this sentimental call for unity and sacrifice. "What of it if we live / What of it if we don't / It would do if Yaşar wasn't / So long as the fatherland lives" (Nesin, 1992, p. 18). Significantly, Yaşar repeats this verse and reaffirms his love for the nation and its institutions every time his appeals to the state institutions go unanswered. When he can't be discharged from the military service or the mental hospital, when he is unable to claim Reşit's inheritance, Yaşar ultimately resorts to the same refrain and finds comfort in his patriotic love. Yaşar's verse positions any answer that his patriotic love may find as irrelevant at the outset—Yaşar doesn't even have to be valued enough to be kept alive, or to have his life recognized by the state and its institutions. His love for the nation is the only thing in which he can find comfort, when all other forms of recognition and contact are withheld from him. As such, Yaşar's love for the nation is formulated precisely through the deferral of an answering devotion. This patriotic love is reaffirmed through song every time Yaşar is refused and let down by an institution.

One other significant aspect of sentiment in *Yaşar* is how the individual parts of the institutional machine reconcile their existence with the disciplinary operations that they facilitate. *Yaşar* is consistent in its depiction of civil servants and institutional officers as petty tyrants, and there are hints as to how they have been shaped by the dominant institutional system (Nesin, 1992, p. 109). Individual bodies in *Yaşar* are shaped by institutions, even beyond the formation of felt borders between institutions and their subjects. *Yaşar* isn't entirely unsympathetic towards its institutional officers and to the cogs in grander disciplinary machines. The bystanders during the registry scenes agree that while Yaşar is justified in his anger

and frustration in the face of clerical error and inefficiency, the clerks too must be grappling with their own problems and don't have it easy. Yaşar himself isn't condemned by the convict presenting the audience the play's epilogue, either, though he too has come to join the cogs of institutional machinery. The cogs, officers and clerks, are also disaffected with the institutional system that they represent. The plain-clothes police officers who arrest Yaşar for slander can't help but quietly echo his dissatisfaction: The police officers covertly whisper "me too…" to Yaşar's slander (Nesin, 1992, p. 110), and their agreement is soon taken up as a chant by the rest on stage. The musical number done by the civil servants and bureaucratic clerks shows a similar self-awareness and dissatisfaction on the part of the smaller cogs: "Struggling to make a living / We thus took on a new form / Would we want to be like this / I suffer inside as you do / So we took on a new form" (Nesin, 1992, p. 61). The civil servants have been pushed into their positions as cogs in the institutional machinery by necessity and circumstance. The clerks' disillusionment and dissatisfaction are closely connected with their banal tyranny, according to this verse, and it is how they come to be petty tyrants in their "new form[s]" (Nesin, 1992, p. 61). The borders between individuals, in their interactions as institutional agents and institutional subjects, are reshaped in such a way that any contact is felt both acutely and negatively by the clerks and officers of the play. Due to the inflated sensitivity of borders that create two separate groups of individuals, any contact along these borders are bound to be traumatic. As the play highlights, just touching a button on an institutional officer is thus an unforgivable crime and an undesirable form of contact.

In *Yaşar*, however, it is not only the borders between the bodies of institutions and individuals that are restructured under institutional discipline, but the

bodies of individuals are reshaped as well. His contact with institutions eventually leads to Yaşar losing a leg. In this regard, his prolonged interaction with institutions irrevocably reforms Yaşar's body. On a similar note, the clerks and servants "take on a new form" in their role as institutional agents (Nesin, 1992, p. 61). The play often depicts the reformations of bodily borders as reformations of the body, where bodies are shaped by the commanding institutions. Accordingly, *Yaşar* often resorts to mime when depicting disciplinary operations on a grander scale with many agents. In practicing the role that they are assigned under institutional discipline, the two lawyers arguing about Yaşar's inheritance are stylized as two roosters having a cockfight, which is as a typical transformation of their bodies. The lawyers "[take] on a new form" in this stylization (Nesin, 1992, p. 61), as the clerks and civil servants admit that they do. Elsewhere in the play, the civil servants are reshaped more visibly as well. There are miming scenes with records and clerks in which the movements of institutional agents take on new characteristics and rhythms that are unnatural, beyond expected human shape and movement. In this respect, the influence of institutions reaches the formation of bodies in themselves, going beyond even the restructuring of the borders between individual and institutional bodies.

The mime scenes in *Yaşar* constitute one formal element in terms of the play's staging. Music, the technical staging decisions and metatheatrical considerations, and finally humor are all important strategies in *Yaşar*'s depiction of institutions, however. First, Yaşar is undoubtedly a play with a very strong musicality, considered "a musical play" by Nesin and composed as such by Selçuk (Nesin, 1992, p. 13). As one important element of its musicality, *Yaşar* has a chorus that serves a pseudo-classical purpose and goes beyond existing as a simple ensemble of singers. The chorus of *Yaşar* often functions as the imparter of a certain

collective wisdom. The chorus advises and reprimands Yaşar at times, with one common back and forth between him and the chorus concerning “fate” (Nesin, 1992, p. 18). In his part of the refrain, Yaşar bemoans his fate. In response, the choral members don’t hold back in their judgment either, advising Yaşar, “oh fool, you fool / [to] forget about fate” (Nesin, 1992, p. 18). Yaşar’s internalized notion of fate, in this respect, ties in with the recognition of meaningful decision making, and thus with the previously discussed question of Yaşar’s conditional visibility as a person.

Perhaps more meaningful, however, is the positioning of this choral and musical wisdom regarding the language of the book, where music is an alternative to the institutional linguistics of legality and record-keeping. The musical verses are perhaps where Yaşar can truly express himself, when under institutional discipline his complaints would go unheard. There is no room for Yaşar’s and other subjects’ frustrations and concerns under the institutional language of legality. It is often after institutional encounters where he is ignored and unheard that Yaşar takes up verse and sings. In this respect, Yaşar’s recourses to verse are different than his eventual adoption of the institutional language of legality. Whereas Yaşar and his predicament are denied any significance under an institutional framework, his suffering can be meaningful and acknowledged in the play’s musical interludes. It is also perhaps in the chorus that the institutional operations of the play find the most explanation. Though Yaşar learns of Black-Bound Nizamî and other institutional operations in prison, as well as how to take advantage of these operations, his fellow convicts actually mostly talk around these issues. It is through much prodding that Yaşar comes to understand who exactly Black-Bound Nizamî is. One musical exposition as to the inner-workings of institutions that goes beyond the surface level concerns the clerks and the officials of institutions: In the previously mentioned song “we took on

a new form" (Nesin, 1992, p. 61), the smaller cogs sing about what they couldn't acknowledge through a language based on legality. In this regard, music in *Yaşar* allows for the expressions of institutional wrongs and operations.

It is perhaps harder to pinpoint the specifics in play's utilization of humor, and how laughter relates to the representation of institutions in *Yaşar*. Nesin is often known as the Turkish humorist, and the play is fitting with his brand of humor in this respect. To more precisely point out the source of the play's humor, Yaşar himself occasionally emerges as the target of the joke, as an everyman and a clueless fool. Yet the play's humor is perhaps more unforgiving when it is turned to the people who hold positions of institutional power. The most scathing mockery in the play is directed towards The Director heading the department office related to Yaşar's bureaucratic battle. Though the play mocks both Yaşar, and institutional officers and clerks, however, the vast majority of the play's humor arises more from the surreal and absurd nature of Yaşar's predicament. Yaşar is clearly alive when he is considered to be dead, and this absurdity of his condition is only ever amplified over the course of the play. Further, the funniest moments in the play perhaps come from contrived gravity and exaggerated importance of institutional operations—the inflated self-importance of the lawyers constitute one such source of humor in the court scenes stylized as cockfighting. Conversely, a type of dignity can occasionally be found in humor. One choral verse addressing Yaşar is clearly facetious, yet it is also not unsympathetic to his plight: "Withered before you blossom / You've died before you've been born / Buried in the book / You don't live, Yaşar" (Nesin, 1992, p. 37).

As some distinctive technical elements of *Yaşar*'s staging, the mimes and other expressionistic stylizations have already been mentioned, in that these elements

relate to play's representation of sentimental institutional operations. The restructuring of the borders between the bodies of individuals under institutional discipline are mirrored in the play's restructuring of the bodies of actors and their movements. The reformation of lawyers' bodies as roosters, or the puppet-like movements of the clerks are examples of this. However, the framing of *Yaşar* as a play that is staged within the prison, where Yaşar's fellow convicts perform as actors and presenters, is potentially more important as a technical decision. One other prevailing theatrical reference of *Yaşar* perhaps relates to the play's framing: "What did Sheikh Zubeyr[3] say? [Verbatim, phonetically.] To be or not to be" (Nesin, 1992, p. 17). Though the quote from Shakespeare -which is untranslated into Turkish from its original- is a joke, Hamlet's soliloquy isn't actually irrelevant in Yaşar's case. Hamlet's dilemma about life and death isn't that far away from Yaşar's own predicament. Yaşar is similarly stuck between these two states, albeit for different reasons.

To conclude, *Yaşar* opens on a moment of linguistic crisis, which is never truly resolved even after Yaşar's gradual mastery of the legal, bureaucratic language of institutions. Yaşar is only conditionally recognized by the play's disciplinary networks, where his existence is acknowledged exclusively when it is convenient. The insight that Yaşar acquires in prison concerning institutional operations proves perhaps similarly incomplete in the end. Yaşar learns to adapt to and thrive under the disciplinary, bureaucratic system, which is still sustained as the play ends, however precarious its position may be. By itself, Yaşar's journey proves a peculiar cautionary tale. The framing of the play-within-the-play can be considered a variation on a different Shakespearean conceit, and a offer succor here, however. The

[3] Nesin refers here to the claim made by Libyan dictator Gaddafi that "Shakespeare was in reality, an Arab" who was originally named Sheikh Zubeyr (Bhattacharyya, 2007, p. 11).

prologue of *Yaşar* characterizes "all the world [not as] a stage" as the epilogue of *As You Like It* does (Shakespeare, 2006, 2.5.139), but as a prison instead: "In truth, which part of the world is not a prison, dear audience? Even those of you who think themselves most free, aren't you both the guardian and the convict of your own prisons?" (Nesin, 1992, p. 19). Thus, *Yaşar* positions the prison, and not the stage, as the underlying measure of the world—"we are no longer in the amphitheater … but in the panoptic machine" (Foucault, 1995, p. 217). The stage is also not absent, however, from *Yaşar*'s variation on the quote—the quote is said on stage, after all, even if the stage is supposedly in a prison. In *Yaşar*, it is possible for the stage to meet "the panoptic machine" at the end of the day (Foucault, 1995, p. 217), even if the two must be intertwined in a hybrid prison-stage housing convicts-actors.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This thesis has looked at the representations of institutions in plays by Tom Stoppard, Arnold Wesker, Harold Pinter, and Aziz Nesin, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour, Chips with Everything, The Hothouse* and *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz,* respectively. In the light of the peculiar characteristics of modern Foucauldian discipline that defines institutions such as prisons, military barracks and classrooms that these plays are venturing to put on stage, representation of the institution presents a challenge. Part of the challenge in representing the institution onstage lies in the movement away from spectacle and theatricality in modern, disciplinary practices. In such modern institutions, power is dispersed and depersonalized, which renders the isolation of any one moment or one operation onstage as being particularly representative of an institution challenging. In this respect, the panoptic machine of modern discipline is far from the amphitheater of the earlier spectacles of power. Though modern discipline isn't theatrical, institutional nexuses of power and vulnerability coincide with elements of theatrical representation, nonetheless. The second challenging aspect of an institutional representation without the direct replication or extension of its operations thus lies in the similarity of institutional and theatrical toolsets. Thematically, these four plays draw attention specifically to the linguistic practices of institutions, to their strategic allocation of visibility, and finally the appeals to sentimentality in the dispersion of action and responsibility. Yet, these plays themselves have to depend on language and linguistic maneuvers, negotiate the partitioning of visibility on stage, and finally deal with the sentimental weight of their subject matters. In this respect, certain formal strategies implemented by these

plays allow for the representation of the metaphorical panoptic machine on stage. This occurs in the first part as the plays counteract the dispersion of disciplinary power and present institutional operations in their utmost concentration. Secondly, these four plays complicate and downplay the toolset that they share with the institutions they endeavor to represent, by shifting the foundations of their representation away from the shared fields of power and vulnerability.

Stoppard's *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* triangulates the disciplinary operations of its institutions, the psychiatric hospital-prison in which Alexander is incarcerated and a supplementary classroom, with its three sets on stage and three Alexander Ivanovs. As "insistent, discordant note[s] in an orchestrated society," Alexander, Sacha and Ivanov are the triangles of *Every Good Boy*'s sometimes visible and sometimes invisible orchestra, in which they stand in defiance of the linguistic manipulations of their institutions. In Wesker's *Chips with Everything*, what is perhaps at the forefront of the play's concerns are a regulation of smiles and an institutional rule founded on them. The military institution of *Chips* aspires to guard a one-directional relationship with its subjects in all interactions, where the institution exerts and extends its power gently through smiles. Yet, it is threatened by the potential reciprocation of its subjects through this connection and would seek to strictly regulate any interchange between itself and its subjects. In Pinter's *The Hothouse* the language of scientific objectivity makes up a significant portion of the institutional work, and the play, overall, sketches out contact under institutions as something ultimately troubling and inevitably explosive, prompting a cycle of mutually assured destruction. In Nesin's *Yaşar Ne Yaşar Ne Yaşamaz* the "black-bound" semantics and a language based on legality lies at the heart of institutional

authority, which is overburdened and unstable as a foundation, and cannot be expected to go on.

All in all, the principal common strategy among these four plays in how they all address and respond to the dispersion and depersonalization of modern institutional power is in their establishment and maintenance of a non-realistic tone. This non-realistic tone emerges through the accumulation of their stylistic staging decisions, musical and expressionistic sounds, and absurdist humor. Overall, it is in the non-discursive elements of their acoustics, and in the substantial utilization of musical and rhythmic elements that these plays undercut their own dependence on language, which is shown to be precarious and untrustworthy under institutional rule. The staging decisions in the partitioning of sets or scenes, and the stylistic elements of these plays, often serve the denial of a complete and objective, uninterrupted view. Perspective in these four plays is precisely not panoptic and always emphatically compromised. Finally, these plays amplify and exaggerate the dispersed and mellowed operations of the institutions that they depict, to the point that they can be recognized in one concentrated, emblematic representation. In all four of the play, this exaggeration occurs in the province of humor more heavily than in the province of sentiment.

Though it is perhaps particularly at the forefront as a concern in *Every Good Boy* and *Yaşar*, all of the plays are thematically interested in their institutions' manipulation of and dependence on language. Language in these plays serves as a justification of institutional authority, as well as being one of its chief operations in practice. Commonly, all four of these plays undercut their own dependence on language strategically, through their inclusion of either musical and rhythmic, or otherwise non-discursive elements. Alternatively, they disrupt expected cadences and

rhythms of dialogue and speech. Its orchestra is integral to *Every Good Boy*, and the final scenes of the play aren't in regular dialogue format, but instead recited as rhyming quatrains by Alexander and Sacha. Wesker's *Chips* is a loud and cacophonous play and one of its most important scenes of resistance against the institution happens through folk songs and recitations. Pinter's *The Hothouse* doesn't feature music; yet, non-discursive and evocative sounds of the patients off-stage constitute an essential element of its dramaturgy. The disruption to the expected cadences of speech and dialogue is also a part of *The Hothouse*'s undercutting of its own dependency on language. Another downplay of language comes with the weighty presence of silence in the play. Nesin's *Yaşar* is heavily musical and generally loud, with its formal elements such as the chorus and singing numbers, and the repeated whistle of the guardian ties up each scene.

Their institutions' attempts at omniscience, and claims at a complete, infallible perspective are thematically a concern in all four of the plays. These plays themselves are careful not to offer omniscience to the audience, and their own allocation of visibility is often strategically conspicuous. In their staging decisions, these plays often do not offer a full or complete view in their construction of sets. They are precisely not panoptic, in this respect. *Every Good Boy* divides off its stage into three areas of action and does not light all of them fully and simultaneously; the blind spots are there and blatant. Perspective is similarly and conspicuously incomplete in *The Hothouse*, where the interrogation room is meant to be rarely lit. *Yaşar*'s stage isn't incomplete per se; yet, the play's representation is twice removed, as we the audience are reminded that we only see the play-within-the-play. In this respect, *Yaşar* also does not purport to offer an objective and complete perspective. Wesker's *Chips* similarly presents the audience with a second staging on its stage,

with the dramatically inclined Pip undertaking the role of a director. Also, *Chips* does not offer the audience an objective and disinterested perspective, in that the play puts particular emphasis on the role of the audience and its relationship with the stage. The relationship between the audience and the stage is decidedly not one-directional, and thus could not be objective.

Due to their dispersed and subtle nature, institutional operations in these four plays are exaggerated and amplified overall. The four plays that this thesis studies ultimately represent one emblematic and extreme institution that is devoid of trappings and particulars. Yet the enhancement of these institutional operations could perhaps cause an amplification in the subjection and suffering of the represented institutional subjects, as well. Therefore, the magnification of institutional operations is in danger of continuing and replicating the work of the represented institution, by also intensifying the repercussions of discipline on their subjects. In this regard, we can say that the intensification of disciplinary operations in these four plays occurs more in the direction of humor and absurd comedy, rather than sentimentality. The institutional operations are extended to their absolute limits and become recognizable not in their violence, but more in their comedic absurdity. In all four of these plays, humor mainly arises from the absurdity of the heightened institutional operation. As such, *Every Good Boy* is perhaps bound to be particularly sentimental due to its subject matter, as Alexander is based on a real-life prisoner, however loosely. Yet it isn't in the details of his suffering or the torment of his hunger strike that the play amplifies institutional operations. *Every Good Boy* ultimately chooses to intensify not the suffering of Alexander, but rather to take the absurdity of the institutional operations to their more easily recognizable extreme. The play represents institutional operations through the exaggerated absurdities of the prison-hospital in

which Alexander is incarcerated, magnifying the ridiculousness of the discipline practiced there through various mix-ups and misunderstandings. Violence and humor are intertwined in *The Hothouse* and there are undeniably dark implications to the play's heightened version of a modern institution. Yet the violence of the institution is not extended and concentrated any further than its absurdity at the end, which is evident in the torture/interrogation of Lamb. The same can be said for Wesker's *Chips*, though perhaps to a lesser extent. The military institution of *Chips* is also capable of violence and menace, as it is seen in the treatment of Smiler. Yet Smiler's suffering isn't really shown without attention being also drawn to the absurdity of its reasons and the ridiculous banality of the officers' grudge. In Nesin's *Yaşar* the greatest source of the play's humor remains Yaşar's bureaucratic predicament and its increasing absurdity. The play isn't unsympathetic to Yaşar's plight, but the sympathy towards Yaşar is never completely divorced from humor and even Yaşar's own attempts to bask in his suffering are accompanied by a tinge of ridicule.

These three formal strategies, in terms of the four plays' staging decisions, music and non-discursivity, and humor and comedy, all ultimately contribute to the common non-realistic tonality of the plays. Considering all this, the two aspects of the representational challenge presented by modern incarnations of discipline are perhaps not entirely disparate. In many ways, the ascent of modern discipline coincides with the emergence of realism as both nineteenth century phenomena. Consequently, certain conventions in realistic dramatic representation also follow modern disciplinary trends. Working from these four plays, it can be said that the dispersion of power into the minute, the extensive regulation of details in modern disciplinary institutions, and realism's similar emphasis on the precise minutia make institutional representations within this tradition particularly challenging. Similarly,

the objective and extended visibility accorded by realism on stage echoes the threatened omniscience of the Foucauldian panoptic machine.

In this respect, the particular strategies of *Every Good Boy, Chips, The Hothouse* and *Yaşar* when taken collectively, work to distance their dramaturgy from realistic representations regarding the workings of disciplinary institutions. *The Hothouse* obscures and discards all detail even to the purported purpose of its institution, which remains ominous yet vague throughout. The psychiatric hospital-prison of *Every Good Boy* is only slightly more concrete in its purpose which is ultimately not more specific than simply discipline, muddying distinctions between military, hospital and prison. *Chips* concerns a military institution distinctly, yet its operations such lectures are presented emblematically as culminations, not in realistic detail. *Yaşar* also has a number of institutions that are distinct in character at first glance, yet the play is ultimately more interested in what is common in them all rather than their individual operations. To conclude, the dramatic strategies of *Every Good Boy, Chips, The Hothouse* and *Yaşar* tend to an amplification and exaggeration of institutional operations, reaching to represent the panoptic machine on stage which they can only manage in an emblematic and stylized culmination, rather than a detailed, realistic precision.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2014). *The cultural politics of emotion*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Arendt, H. (2006). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. (A. Elon, Trans.). London: Penguin Books.

Bensky, L. M. (1968). Harold Pinter: An interview. In G. Plimpton (Ed.), *Writers at work: The Paris review interviews* (pp. 347-368). New York: Viking.

Bhattacharyya, J. (2006). *William Shakespeare's Othello*. New Delhi: Atlantic.

Billington, M. (1997). *The life and work of Harold Pinter*. London: Faber.

Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: the powers of mourning and violence*. London: Verso.

Dornan, R. W. (1994). *Arnold Wesker revisited*. New York: Twayne.

Dukore, B. F. (1988). *Harold Pinter*. London: Macmillan.

Eagleton, T. (2014). Realism, literature and spirituality. In M. Hartwig & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Critical realism and spirituality* (pp. 90-98). London: Routledge.

Etienne, A. (2016). “Visions don’t work”? The role of Wesker’s theatre and Centre 42 in 1960s’ British culture. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, *36*(2), (pp. 1–15.) doi: 10.1080/14682761.2016.114 9769

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Anchor Publishing.

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

Hollis, H. R. (1970). *Harold Pinter: the poetics of silence*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Jenkins, A. (1989). *The theatre of Tom Stoppard*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moss, W. (2002). *A history of Russia*. New York: McGraw-Hill Primis Custom Pub.

Nesin, A. (1992). *Yaşar ne yaşar ne yaşamaz ; Bir zamanlar memleketin birinde ; Başarımı karılarıma borçluyum ; Sait Hopsayıt*. İstanbul: Adam.

Pinter, H. (1980). *The hothouse*. London: Eyre Methuen.

Priestman, M. (1998). Chips with everything: A snob's progress? In R.W. Dornan (Ed.), *Arnold Wesker: A casebook* (pp. 221-232). New York: Garland.

Rae, P. (2009). *Theatre & human rights*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shakespeare, W., & Dusinberre, J. (2006). *The Arden edition of the works of William Shakespeare*. London: Thomson Learning.

Stoppard, T. (1984). *Every good boy deserves favour*. London; Boston: Faber.

Süreya, C. (2005). *"Günübirlik"ler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi.

Thompson, J. (2004). From the stocks to the stage: Prison theatre and the theatre of prison. In M. Balfour (Ed.), *Theatre in prison theory and practice* (pp. 57-76). Bristol: Intellect.

Wesker, A. (1967). *Chips with everything*. London: Blackie.

Zürcher, E.J. (2010). *Young Turk legacy and nation building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey (Library of modern Middle East Studies; v. 87)*. London: I.B. Tauris.