



Power From Pinteresque Discourse in *The Birthday Party*

YUAN Yu^{[a],*}

^[a]School of Foreign Languages, China West Normal University, Nanchong, China.

*Corresponding author.

Supported by Foundation of Sichuan Educational Committee: Pinteresque Discourse and Power Games in Pinter's World (No.13SB0023) and the Foundation of School of Foreign Languages, China West Normal University: The Power Struggle in Pinter's Works (No.12WW01).

Received 18 June 2013; accepted 16 September 2013

Abstract

Harold Pinter is widely regarded as one of the most influential representatives of British theatre in the twentieth century. The significance of his tremendous contribution to modern theatre has been summed up in one theatrical terminology, namely, "Pinteresque". Though Pinter's plays are characteristic of minimal plots and limited characters, the dialogues are filled with powerful tension. Power, however, is not only an important element, but also a recurrent theme in his plays in many ways. Indubitably, there are power struggles between dominating and dominated characters in his plays. Aligned with the French philosopher Michel Foucault's theory of discourse and power, this article analyzes one early play by Harold Pinter, *The Birthday Party*, arguing that the characters in this play possess strong desire for power, which makes them aware of the menace all around. What is more, the reflection of power exhibited in *The Birthday Party* anticipates Pinter's radical anti-hegemony politics in his later period.

Key words: Harold Pinter; Michel Foucault; Power; Discourse

YUAN Yu (2013). Power From Pinteresque Discourse in *The Birthday Party*. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 7(2), 72-78. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/j.sll.1923156320130702.2768>
 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320130702.2768>

INTRODUCTION

Harold Pinter, one of the most distinguished dramatists in Great Britain in the twentieth century and the 2005 Nobel Prize laureate in literature, has ushered in a new era in the dramatic world. In many ways, Pinter does not belong to any single school and he creates a series of works of his own uniquely and recognizably. "Pinteresque" has come into common usage as a term capturing the essence of Pinter's unique, innovative, and highly influential theatrical style. Those dramatic ingredients which include his characters, his theme, and his language make up of his innovative theatrical style. Roger Copeland (2001, p.23), among the commentators who have praised Pinter's language for its realistic replication of the rhythms of everyday speech, states that "No playwright has ever possessed a better ear for the way people actually speak than Harold Pinter".

In Pinter's plays, language functions in a way as a crucial means of characterization, a way to serve as a weapon of attack or a fortification for defense, or a way to provide a nebulous metaphor for the past. As an important part, or maybe a hard core of Pinteresque language, Pinteresque discourse becomes the most distinctive feature of Pinter's plays.

The Birthday Party is Pinter's first finished play. Critics fault that the characters in his plays cannot express their own actions, thoughts and feelings, and the dialogue is so obscure as to be ultimately meaningless. But with more attention to his play, people begin to appreciate the unique charm of the play. Bamber Gascoigne in *The Observer* remarks that despite that Pinter has made the situation too ordinary, but his characters are not ordinary, who are a gallery of fascinating grotesques (Gascoigne, 1964). The play is frightening and funny, creating an atmosphere of unspeakable and undefined terror. Power is an important factor in the process of the emerging of menace. The interpretation of the issue of power is crucial to the understanding of Pinter and his work. Obviously,

Pinter struggles for a suitable form to display power relations among ordinary people in his earlier plays. Such relations are presented as various violence and conflict, in which Pinter's characters use words as weapons. Power is created and transferred throughout the conversation in the plays. As the representative drama of "Comedy of Menace", *The Birthday Party* is filled with menace from the characters' domination and power struggles. Obviously, power plays an indispensable role in the play. It is necessary to explore the profound implication of power in the play.

While probing into the power issue in Pinteresque discourse in *The Birthday Party*, this paper makes a survey with Foucault's theory. According to Foucault, power flows from everywhere and everyone, and discourse manifests itself as a form of power relations. Some kind of power works during the process of production and spread of statement, which reveals the arbitrariness of every rule and norm through discourse. Based on Foucault's thinking on discourse and power relations, people would find that the characters in this play have huge desire for power. The reason why the characters in the plays feel menace is that they become aware of others' power for control or domination on themselves. Pinter is treating with power as an underlying ingredient of his play. Nobody can escape from it. Pinter not only describes the world as an absurdity and presents a bleak prospect for modern people through his dramatic style, but also expresses his creative motivation and political attitude—the objection to authority through the exhibition of power via his writing.

1. POWER STRUGGLE IN *THE BIRTHDAY PARTY*

It is generally agreed that Pinter's plays are filled with power struggles between dominating and dominated characters. What Harold Pinter is dealing with and writing about in almost every one of his plays is related to authority, oppression, and power. He begins his play writing with two powerful plays between two people in a room in his play *The Room*, and *The Dumb Waiter*, both of which were written in 1957. He expands his couples into groups in *The Homecoming*, *The Collection* and *Other Voices*, then, he expands his groups into countries in *One for the Road* and *Mountain Language*. As a crucial element, power is always linked with Pinter's plays.

The early works of Pinter, including *The Birthday Party*, *The Caretaker* and *The Room*, are deemed as the "menace comedy", whose theme is the threat to the people by others or by the life—an out-comer barges in a "room" and breaks the sense of security of the people in that "room". Menace, thereby, becomes the subject in critical studies. In a sense, the reason why the characters in the plays feel menace is that they become aware of others' power or domination over themselves. Pinter is treating

power as an underlying element linking most of his plays. Power struggle is always highlighted in his plays. Through conversation, people in his plays are always struggling for power to show their control over the others. The dominator and the menacer take up the majority of the discourse, upon whom the discourse turns into a site of power struggle.

Silverstein (1993, p.438) in the book of *Harold Pinter and the Language of Cultural Power* makes an excellent case study for reassessing commentators' responses to Pinter's earlier work, pointing out that the dynamics of interpersonal power on display in such plays as *The Room* and *The Birthday Party* are structurally the same as those in *One for the Road* and *Mountain Language*. That is to say, a character's relationship to structures of power, particularly ideological domination, simultaneously constitutes and colonizes subjectivity as a site of domination: "Pinter...conceptualizes the subject's relation to power in more Foucauldian terms: the subject remains an effect that emerges from the operations of a power that remains irreducible to the dimensions of that subject". Thus, Goldberg and McCann's "interrogation" of Stanley in *The Birthday Party* as Silverstein notes, underscores the seemingly arbitrary behavior that, in *One for the Road* and *Mountain Language*, is named explicitly as state power.

The Birthday Party is Pinter's first commercially-produced and full-length play. Pinter describes a simple and strange story. The play opens in the living-dinning area of a seedy rooming house in an unnamed seaside town with three people living there. One day, two strangers barge in their life and take one of them away after a birthday party. In this play, need of power is filtered through the words of the characters, who always want to establish their domination over the others. From the beginning to the ending, all the characters in the play are always trying to control the others by means of language or discourse in order to acquire power over others. Just because of desire as such, the characters in the play, like Stanley, though in face of the two interlopers or other people, he can perceive through dialogue their struggle for power of domination. As a result, he feels the threat coming from far and near which will make him come down. In fact, the characters in *The Birthday Party* exemplify vividly their desire for power through their menacing discourse.

2. POWER AND SEXUALITY IN *THE BIRTHDAY PARTY*

Foucault explains the relationship between power and sexuality in *The History of Sexuality, volume I: An Introduction*, to be exact, Foucault sees sexuality as a point of departure for his discussion of power relation. The relation between sexuality and its power mechanism is the focus of his work. He contends that power produces, intensifies, and expands the sexuality.

According to Foucault, sexuality is not merely dissimilarity between men and women or sexual intercourse. Sexuality is expanded into an area of discourses and it is the way in which we talk, write, and discuss issues relating to sex. He thinks of sexuality as a human construct and not something that exists within us independent of our discourses and concepts. To Foucault, sexuality is a construct that has grown out of certain kinds of discourse. Sexuality is created not as a fixed term that identifies an objective concept in the world. According to Foucault (1978, pp.105-106), sexuality, as it were, is “a historical construct: not a furtive reality that is difficult to grasp, but a great surface network in which the stimulation of bodies, the intensification of pleasures, the incitement to discourse, the formation of special knowledge, the strengthening of controls and resistances are linked to one another, in accordance with a few major strategies of knowledge and power”. Sexuality is so closely related to power that it has turned into a contesting site of “controls and resistances”. Therefore, sexuality is “an especially dense transfer point for relations of power” (1978, p.103). The main purpose is to define the regime of power and knowledge that sustains the discourse on human sexuality in our part of the world. Foucault examines the way that sex is put into discourse and the way that power permeates that discourse as, in fact, it permeates all discourse.

At the beginning of 17th century, sex was largely out in the open. The traditional view is that Victorianism closed off sex and confined it to the home, and ultimately to silence. Foucault takes issue with the view that Victorianism led to the repression of sexuality in general and of sexual discourse in particular. As a matter of fact, he controverts the opposite side—the Victorianism led to an explosion in discourses on sexuality. As he says: “Since the end of the sixteenth century, the ‘putting into discourse of sex’, far from undergoing a process of restriction, on the contrary has been subjected to a mechanism of increasing incitement” (1978, p.12). Against this view of the repression of sexuality, he argues that sexuality has not been only repressed, on the contrary, it has been produced and propagated constantly along with its activation since the 16th century, which is the result of all kinds of power relations operating in sexuality.

In short, repression and liberation are just two aspects of interaction of power mechanism. A good expression in pushing power over physical body as well as government’s regulatory power over population comes forth, namely, “we all live in a society of ‘sexuality’ or live in ‘sexuality’”. The power mechanism warns body and life, reproduces living things, strengthens human race, minds one’s own power and controls competences or the competences that are deployed. Power talks of sexuality with sexuality...” (1978, p.2). Sexuality has become the locus of the power that rules and regulates life. Foucault claims that the operation of any modern power system cannot be divorced from sexuality, namely,

the sexual appetite, sensation, or any affection or state concerning with sex, which is not only the result of power operation, but also the requirement of operating of power. The power relations firmly catch hold of sexuality, the most remarkable and attractive issue, in order to filter into every domain or every stratum of people’s social life and attempt to control their thoughts or acts through the system of sexual discourse prescribing and expecting by power relation. The content of sexual discourse includes the matter of sex; however, the discussion about it is not for the purpose of sex or sexual satisfaction purely. Its motive is determined by the benefits of the power groups which produce and spread the sexual discourse. According to Foucault, power produces sexuality. Thus, it can be expounded that the pursuit of sexuality can be regarded as the pursuit of power.

Foucault thinks that sexuality turns into a locus of power that rules the life. So it is power that produces the sexual discourse and provokes people to talk and express sexuality. In fact, the creation of sexual discourse is the result of the operation of power. Accordingly, the presentation of power can be realized by means of the expression of sexuality; in other words, the expression of sexuality can be comprehended as the need of power.

In this play, Meg, a woman in her sixties is the hostess of the room. Despite her age, Meg’s desire to sexuality cannot be overlooked in this play. She has a strong impulse for sexuality, which can be manifested through her aspiration for beauty and youth and the affection to Stanley, all of which can be related to sexual discourse. To begin with, let us look at her aspiration for beauty. In the play, we can see that Meg is caring about her appearance or beauty very much. In Act One, Goldberg decides to hold a birthday party for Stanley when he hears from Meg that today is his birthday. Upon this news, Meg looks very excited. The first thing emerging in her mind is that she can wear her beautiful party dress. At that time, she has already imagined how she looks like on a party dress.

GOLDBERG. Sure. We’ll give him a party. Leave it to me.

MEG. Oh, that’s wonderful, Mr. Gold—

...

MEG. I’ll put on my party dress.

...

MEG. I hope I look nice in my dress.

GOLDBERG. Madam, you’ll look like a tulip.

MEG. What color?

GOLDBERG. Er—well, I’ll have to see the dress first. (pp.42-43).

In her mind, she always hopes that her beauty can last forever and she would seize every opportunity to display her attraction. A 60-year-old woman, for the sake of a small birthday party, will deliberately dress up to make her look pretty. After hearing Goldberg’s words that she would look like a tulip on her party dress, she immediately asks what the color is. She is also very pleased of people’s compliments, considering that the others really believe she

will be very beautiful. In the evening, when the birthday for Stanley begins, she asks others how her dress looks like for several times. She wants to hear the affirmative answers by repeated question, fishing for compliments. In fact, she thinks that she must look nice very much to a great extent.

MEG. I brought the drum down. I'm dressed for the party.
GOLDBERG. Wonderful.
MEG. You like my dress?
...
MEG. Oh, yes. Come on, Stanley...Do you like my dress, Mr. Goldberg?
MEG. Stan, what about my dress? (pp.63-64).

In the last act, when the play is coming to its end. Meg says to her husband who does not take part in the party that she is the most beautiful woman in the room, even though nobody has mentioned it. She wants to impress everyone with her beauty.

MEG. I was the belle of the ball.
PETEY. Were you?
Meg. They all said I was.
PETEY. I bet you were to.
MEG. Oh, it's true. I was.
Pause.
I know I was. (p.97).

In short, she never loses women's nature of picking up themselves. She should be still beautiful although she is in her sixties already. Through dressing up, she hopes to gain others' acknowledgement about her attraction, because she is minding her appearance so much that she has been yearning towards beauty all the time.

As to Stanley, Meg's attitude towards him is not like what a landlord should behave in front of a tenant. She tries to win Stanley's approval of her as a woman. Firstly, it is necessary to have a look of the relationship between Meg and her husband Petey. Like his wife, Petey Boles is also in his sixties. He is a deck-chair attendant at the unidentified seaside resort where he and Meg own their boarding house. He is dull and ambitionless, no more inclined than his wife to find challenges beyond the confines of their rooming house. His marriage to Meg has settled into mechanical routine. As an old couple without children living by the sea for decades, they have lost the enthusiasm of the old times. Especially for Petey, his life is always unalterable, such as reading newspapers in the morning. "Petey enters from the door on the left with a paper and sits at the table. He begins to read" (p.19). So his communication with Meg is always mechanization, let alone romance, as their listless and inane dialogue that opens the play reveals.

MEG. What time did you go out this morning, Petey?
PETEY. Same time as usual.
MEG. Was it dark?
PETEY. No, it was light.
MEG. (begins to darn). But sometimes you go out in the morning and it's dark.

PETEY. That's in the winter.
MEG. Oh, in winter.
PETEY. Yes, it gets light later in the winter
MEG. Oh.
Pause. (pp.20-21).

He has not much communication with others which can be reflected on his appearance—only in the beginning and the ending. For the evening birthday party, he does not show any interests. He cannot take part in the party which sounds amusing just because that night is his "chess night". In contrast, his attitude is much different with Meg, who expressed huge interest on it. Petey's life is always the same just like a clock. Meg, a woman still cares about her pretty and yearns for passion, is not satisfied with such a husband. She flirts with Stanley, trying to fill a second void in her life. Her behavior and words prove this. On the party, she tries her best to show the side of a woman.

MEG. (kissing him). Oh, Stanley.
MEG. Clink my glass, Stan. (p.67).

She further wants to dance with Stanley.

MEG. (standing), I want to dance!...Stanley. Dance. (STANLEY sits still. MEG dances round the room alone, then comes back to MCCANN, who fills her glass. She sits.) (p.69).

Rejected, Meg settles for dancing by herself. Then she strikes up a conversation with McCann, an Irish. She still tries to look for the approval of a woman from the Irish man. She talks about Ireland intentionally.

MEG. (to MCCANN). My father was going to take me to Ireland once. But, then he went away by himself.
MEG. I don't know if he went to Ireland.
MEG. He didn't take me. (pp.69-70).

She told McCann that she had got a chance to Ireland but finally she could not go, trying to establish a close relationship with the Irish tenant. After that, she breaks into a nostalgic reverie about her girlhood room in front of McCann.

MEG. There was a night-light in my room, when I was a little girl...And my Nanny used to sit up with me, and sing songs to me.
MEG. My little room was pink. I had a pink carpet and pink curtains, and I had musical boxes all over the room. And they played me to sleep. And my father was a very big doctor. That's why I never had any complaints. I was cared for, and I had little sisters and brothers in any rooms, all different colours. (p.70).

Her reverie about her girlhood room shows that she has been cherishing memory of her youth at all times. This indicates her retrospect on the past. She says that her room was pink; even the things in the room, carpet and curtain, were all pink. Pink represents the girl's illusion for romantic love. She mentions this to show that she is still yearning for romance and passion just like a young girl. She is an old woman with a girl's psychology.

Meg's psychology can be testified on her description of her house. She says that her house is "on the list" for four times in this play.

MEG. Yes, they must have done. They must have heard this was a very good boarding house. It is. This house is on the list. (p.22).

MEG. You're a liar. This house is on the list. (p.27).

MEG. This house is on the list. (p.30). (p.44).

Meg often boasts that her house is very well known for a very good boarding house for visitors and there are many visitors who wish to rent her rooms, in spite that there is only one tenant for a long time. In fact, her house is not as good as she describes, and on the contrary, an old and shabby one. Just like the house, her life is growing "old" gradually as the time passes by. There is no more passion and excitement within it. She is older and older; she is not young any more; passion of love also stays far away from her life. However, Meg still alleges that the house is excellent and it is well-known as a resort place. As a matter of fact, she is implying that she is still young, beautiful and passionate for love.

To sum up, her thirst for beauty, her retrospect for youth and the past as well as her pursuit of corporeal love can be regarded as an expression of her hunting for sexuality, in which the sexual discourse is abundantly embodied and interpreted. According to Foucault's view on power and sexuality, power inspires people to talk sexuality, to diffuse sexual discourse, and to urge the increase of sexual discourse, and in so doing reanimates them to convey sexuality. The birth of sexual discourse is the consequence of the operation of power, because power produces sexuality. Hence, a need of sexuality is but a need of power. In *The Birthday Party*, Meg's behavior, i.e. her concentration on sexuality, can be decoded as her pursuit of power, which turns Meg into an embodiment of the desire for power.

In this play, the relation of power and sexuality involved in Lulu reveals Lulu's desire for power as well. Depicted as a girl "in her twenties", Lulu is a first visitor to the house who first appears with Stanley's birthday present, the toy drum and drum sticks. As to Meg, her need of sexuality comes from her need to power. And to Lulu, her expression of sexuality is much more obvious than Meg. That is because she has a stronger desire for power than Meg. Just like Meg, Lulu is self-conscious about her face. To her, looks are more than important. Sexuality is the instrument of controlling power and the symbol of power. Physical attraction is of primary importance to sexual appeal. She sees Stanley as a "washout" because he seems to care nothing about his looks.

She sits, takes out a compact and powers her nose.

LULU. (offering him the compact). Do you want to have a look at your face? (Stanley withdraws from the table.) You could do with a shave, do you know that? (Stanley sits, right at the table.) Don't you ever go out? (He does

not answer.) I mean, what do you do, just sit around the house like this all day long? (Pause.) Hasn't Mrs. Boles got enough to do without having under her feet all day long?

STANLEY. I always stand on the table when she sweeps the floor.

LULU. Why don't you have a wash? You look terrible. (pp.35-36).

In Lulu's eyes, Stanley is just the subordinate of power in that a man with unkempt appearance has no power on the sexual discourse. When Lulu comes into the house for the first time, she speaks to Stanley as she is a commander.

LULU. I just want to leave this here.

STANLEY. Do.

LULU. You're not to touch it.

STANLEY. Why would I want to touch it?

LULU. Well, you're not, anyway.

LULU. Why don't you open the door? It's all stuffy in here. (pp.35-36).

She uses the words of "you" in almost every sentence. It seems that she is to be situated in a position that is more superior to Stanley. The imperative tone shows her desire for domination. Behind her glamour, there is some youthful innocence. She is blind to Goldberg's predatory nature and is drawn into his charm. In her sight, Goldberg is a gentleman with elegance. Especially after she hears Goldberg's speech on the birthday night, Goldberg's sentimental speech, in which he regrets the loss of love, impresses Lulu deeply. She deems Goldberg as a "marvelous speaker" and "the dead image of the first man" she ever loved. It can satisfy her desire of power by conquering such a gentleman. On the birthday party, she sits on his lap and flirts with him, a foreshadowing of what occurs between them later that night. To Lulu, her sexuality is more blatant than Meg's. We can see the desire of power from her bald-faced sexual discourse.

In this play, no matter Meg or Lulu, they all express their desire for power, which is revealed by the exhibition of their sexual discourses. The desire of power visualizes upon them. *The Birthday Party* is filled with power struggles of the characters.

In *The Birthday Party*, the struggle for power and people's aspiration for power exhibit in the life scene. Power and struggle for power infiltrates into the various aspects of life in different forms. Under the pressure of power which is invisible and ubiquitous, people unconsciously become timid, self-enclosed—they are hiding in a room or breaking off their exchanges with others to avoid to be controlled. To dominate the others by means of discourse is demonstrated much more obvious in *The Birthday Party*. "All conversations are contests in which self-satisfaction, or mastery, is the prize". For Eveling (1984, p.86), this is because "All of Pinter's characters are unreformed egoists who only see from the standpoint of an intense anxiety about themselves". Power-struggle makes people have trouble in communicating.

Communication is another central factor in *The Birthday Party* that contributes to the ruin of the characters, as it is in many of Pinter's plays. His plays are often characterized by what is termed as a failure to communication because of the pause and silence largely used by Pinter in his plays. However, Pinter (1998, p.20) does not see his characters have no communication; instead he views communication as an all too powerful force within his plays: "We have heard many times that tired, grimy phrase: 'failure of communication' ... and this phrase has been fixed to my work quite consistently. I believe the contrary. I think that we communicate only too well, in our silence, in what is unsaid and that which takes place is a continual evasion, desperate rearguard attempts to keep ourselves to ourselves. Communication is too alarming. To enter into someone else's life is too frightening. To disclose to others the poverty within us is too fearsome a possibility" (1998, p.20).

No matter what they are saying or what they are not saying, the characters in his plays absolutely have communicative attempts. As Pinter said, the communication which includes the words spoken or those not spoken is "alarming" or "frightening". However, more important, the communication in Pinter's plays has lost its primary function, namely, to understand better. Characters in the play are paying much attention to the power struggle in the process of communication rather than to understand the others. Hunting for power becomes their sole purpose of communication, and thereby, communication becomes difficult and sometimes "frightening" simultaneously for the sake of power-struggle.

The communication between Meg and Stanley is much more disharmonious and even inimical. Stanley always contradicts Meg. He seemingly intends to respond Meg with favorable replies with cruel and mean words.

MEG. What are the cornflakes like, Stan?

STANLEY. Horrible. (p.24).

What is more, the communication between Stanley and Meg seems ineffective. Sometimes, they even fail to understand each other.

STANLEY. Who is it?

MEG. The two gentlemen.

STANLEY. What two gentlemen?

MEG. The ones that were coming. I just took them to their room. They were thrilled with the room.

STANLEY. They've coming?

MEG. They're very nice, Stan.

STANLEY. Why didn't they come last night?

MEG. They said the beds were wonderful.

STANLEY. Who are they?

MEG. They're very nice, Stanley.

STANLEY. I said, who are they?

MEG. I've told you, the two gentlemen. (p.44).

Both of them, especial Meg, cannot understand the others through the communication. Something blocks off them. It is because that Meg's communication with

the others always establishes on her motive of power-seizing rather than the understanding. For these people, communication does not function as an efficient tool for understanding, rather an instrument for power-hunting. Meg attempts and pays more attention to seek power over Stanley and Stanley tries to resist her power via the communication between them. They do not know what others want to express but the power struggles through the communication. When people have no ability to communicate effectively, they will develop certain fear among one another. Therefore, the transformation of the intention of communication makes the communication itself difficult and frightening.

CONCLUSION

Power emerges in Pinteresque discourse in *The Birthday Party*, and whereby, nobody in the play can escape from the network of power relation. In fact, this type of power game recurs in all of his plays. This is a battle that shifts between the role of the victim and the role of the aggressors. Power struggle as such fills the whole play with tension and repression. Power struggle in the play also demonstrates "Pinteresque" domination and menace. The fight for power is a never-ending fight and the characters will always remain victims in this world. It acts in the way that power corrupts people. Actually, the exhibition of power in Pinter's early works is related to his political views that he holds for the rest of his life.

Pinter's identity as a political writer is already much more evident. What one can do is reading his Nobel Acceptance Speech to see that he has strong political consciousness and he is more than willing to express it whenever possible. In his later plays, Pinter is overtly commenting on the role of a dictatorship of the state. He advocates human rights and opposes the war. In the world, everybody wants to seize power and take control over other people. It is greed for power that incurs war fares. In fact, his early works also reflect his political views. Pinter enhances power relations and power struggles in his early plays, which give voice to his discontent to the society, or the institution. That is the reason why the power issue is so obvious in his early works. The consideration of power exhibited in *The Birthday Party* reflects Pinter's political standpoints of anti-hegemony in his later period.

REFERENCES

- Aragay, M. (2001). Pinter, politics and postmodernism (2). In P. Raby (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter* (pp. 246-259). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cahn, V. L. (1994). *Gender and power in the plays of Harold Pinter*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Cooper, B. (1981). *Michel Foucault: An introduction to the study of his thought*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

- Copeland, R. (2001). A room of his own. *American Theatre*, 18(8), 23-26.
- Dukore, B. F. (1982). *Harold Pinter*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Esslin, M. (1977). *Pinter: A study of his plays*. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Esslin, M. (1980). *The theatre of the absurd*. London: Penguin.
- Esslin, M. (1984). *Pinter: The Playwright*. London: Methuen Inc..
- Eveling, S. (1984). Pinter's stagecraft: Meeting people is wrong. In A. Bold (Ed.), *Harold Pinter: You never heard such silence* (pp. 86-97). London: Vision Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Archeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Trans.). London: Tawostock.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Vol 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge, selected interview and other writing, 1977-1984* (C. Gordan Ed.). London: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and Power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 51-75). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1986). *Death and the labyrinth: The world of Raymond Roussel* (C. Raus Trans.). New York: Doubleday.
- Foucault, M. (1996). *Foucault live: Interviews, 1961-1984* (L. Hochroth, & J. Johnston Trans.). New York: Semiotext.
- Gascoigne, B. (1964, June 19). *The Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.gale.com>
- Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell (Ed.), *Discourse and social theories* (pp.72-78). London: Sage Publications.
- Hinchliffe, A. P. (1967). *Harold Pinter*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- King, K. (2001). Harold Pinter's achievement and modern drama. In L. Dorden (Ed.), *Pinter at 70: A casebook* (pp. 243-256). New York & London: Routledge.
- Norrick, N. R., & Baker, W. (1995). Metalingual humor in Pinter's early plays. *English studies*, 76(3), 253-63.
- Pinter, H. (1978). *Complete works: One*. New York: Grove Press.
- Pinter, H. (1978). *Poems and prose 1947-1977*. New York: Grove Press.
- Pinter, H. (1998). Waiting for the theatre. In *Various voices: Prose, poetry, politics, 1948-1998* (pp. 16-20). London: Faber and Faber Ltd..
- Pinter, H. (2006). Art truth & politics: Excerpts from the 2005 Nobel lecture. *World Literature today*, 80(3), 21.
- Quigley, A. E. (1975). *The Pinter problem*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schreiber, E. (1994). Stream-of-consciousness and Freud's primary process: Comprehending Pinter's *Old Times*. *Literature and Psychology*, 40, 71-80.
- Silverstein, M. (1993). *Harold Pinter and the language of cultural power*. London: Associated U.P..