

Annotation

to

Dissertation on

Art, Truth and Politics in Harold Pinter's Plays

By Darina Mskhaladze

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for PhD Degree of Philological Science

Faculty of Humanities

Department of European Studies

Batumi, Georgia

Copyright

2019

Scientific Advisor:

Professor

Tamar Siradze

General Overview of the Research

The thesis explores one of the most significant playwrights of English literature of the 20th century, Harold Pinter. In particular, how art, truth and politics are intertwined and connected in his oeuvre. He represents post-World War II playwrights. It was a period when English society underwent dramatic transformations in every field and undoubtedly, in the theatre. Pinter's works are characterized by his distinct and unique style which entered the English language as an adjective: "Pinteresque, Pinterish" ("Pinterism," "Pinterian," and "Pinterishness" are also acceptable terms). Obviously, not all playwrights manage to rise to the level of the adjective. The given style first and foremost refers to his magnificent use of "Pauses" and "Silences" in his plays. Harold Pinter was recognized as the greatest playwright in his lifetime, which is acknowledged by dozens of awards he received including Nobel Prize in Literature which he was awarded in 2005.

The scientific significance of the study lies in prolific work and life of Harold Pinter. He was not only a prominent British playwright, but also, a renowned screenwriter, director, poet and an actor who lived in a period when his contemporaries were such well-known playwrights as: Samuel Beckett, Eugène Ionesco, John Osborne, Charles Whiting, Arthur Adamov and John Arden. Initially, he was considered to be the practitioner of the "Theater of Absurd". Later, he was commonly associated with a literary movement "Angry Young Men". However, eventually Pinter established his separate place in English and world literature.

The significance of the thesis lies in the fact that it depicts Pinter's style as original, autonomous, individual and outstandingly recognizable as Pinter's which he achieves in his plays through small plot structures, brief dialogues with unpredictable comic twists and surprisingly minimum number of characters. Besides, his plays fall under the name: "Comedy of Menace" due to his ability to create both comedy and tragedy simultaneously.

The methodology presented in the research is mostly qualitative. It includes researching the textual references acquired in libraries/online including Harold Pinter official web-page.

The study aims at researching correlation between Art, Truth and Politics. How politics can be part of art in such a way that it does not portray any political ideology or party politics. Besides,

our core purpose is to study all the literary peculiarities and fictional devices that characterize Pinter's plays. The given aims determined following objectives:

1. Structural-literary description of Pinterish Silence, Pause and three points;
2. Description of "Comedies of Menace" plays;
3. Defining the essence of Truth in Art according to Harold Pinter's work;
4. Reflecting on the influence that Harold Pinter's biography had upon his political plays.
5. Structural and literary analysis of political plays;

Current state of the study and sources of Study: Harold Pinter's works have been scrutinized and meticulously studied by many literary critics. Existing literature directly dedicated to the study of Harold Pinter's plays confirm this fact. A rather large list of works by British and American researchers as shown below presents a vivid acknowledgement of the fact that the study of Pinter's oeuvre takes due place in world literature. First of all, Pinter's dramaturgy was studied and researched by famous English literary critic Martin Esslin in his outstanding books: "Pinter the Playwright" (1978), and "Pinter: A Study of his plays (1973).

American literary critic Mel Gussow also dedicated several of his works to the study of Pinter's oeuvre, among them especially important is: "Conversations with Pinter" (1994).

Besides, Pinter's works are presented in the works of following literary critics and writers: English writer and theatre critic Michael Billington: "The Life and Work of Harold Pinter"(1996) and "Harold Pinter" (2007), English writer Ronald Knowles: "Harold Pinter" (1995), English playwright, critic and writer Ronald Hayman: "Harold Pinter" (1968), English writer and critic John Russell Taylor: "Harold Pinter" (1969). Moreover, Pinter's life and work was in the center of attention of following literary critics: Katherine Burkman, Ruby Cohn, Francis Gillen, Arnold P. Hinclicliffe, Bernard F. Dukore, Steven H. Gale, Irving Wardle, Marc Silverstein, Lois G. Gordon, Keith Peacock, Charles Marowitz and many more.

The scientific novelty of the study is as follows

- The dissertation presents Pinter as a multilateral productive playwright who had a great impact on English drama. He gave rise to lesser use of words in texts and focusing more on implied meanings;

• Despite of the fact that Pinter is one of the most influential modern British playwrights, his plays have not thoroughly been examined, especially in Georgia.

The empirical data covers analysis of plays based on Pinter's biographical nuances. **The practical value of the study** lies in the fact that the materials can be used in the teaching of modern English drama by students studying English Literature.

The **structure** of the thesis is determined by the goals of the study. The research consists of **Introduction, three chapters** (Chapter 1 - "English literature in the second half of the 20th century", Chapter 2 - "Art and truth in Harold Pinter's plays", Chapter 3 - "Politics in Harold Pinter's plays"); 11 sub-chapters, **Conclusions** and Bibliography.

Contents of the Thesis

The introduction presents scientific novelty of the thesis, its research aims, substantiates the significance and selection of the work, presents primary critics whose works have been a pivot for theoretical research.

Chapter I – "English literature in the second half of the 20th century", consists of 3 subchapters: 1.1 Existentialism; 1.2 "Theatre of Absurd"; 1.3 "Kitchen sink" drama;

The first sub-chapter considers Existentialism: literary movement in Literature.

The 20th century was revolutionary in its essence, due to social and historical changes. The WWII triggered much clash and discord in the world including England. On the one hand, it was a relief that the war was over, but consequences were severe. Countries were in an economic, political and social turmoil. Every sphere had been deeply affected. There was a growing sense of anger and isolation due to class conflicts, a sense of frustration and disillusionment, especially in younger generation and this was the case not only in England, but all over Europe. Conflict between an individual and a society entered a tragic phase that contributed to the creation of different distinctly bizarre rebellious literary movements and philosophies.

One of the repercussions of World War II was Existentialism. Existentialist ideas were formed as a result of deep despair that World War II had provoked. Jean-Paul Sartre is one of the key

figures of Existentialism whose post-war writings brought international attention to existentialism in the 20th century.

Sartre's early principal work was "Being and Nothingness" (1943) (sometimes published under the subtitle: "A Phenomenological Essay on Ontology") where he asserts that individual's existence comes before his individual essence ("existence precedes essence"). Sartre referred to his philosophy as a "philosophy of existence" and viewed it as a humanistic philosophy. It depicted human beings simply existing in a world that was void of any true meaning or purpose. He put an emphasis on the significance of choice in human life. Sartre believed in humans' "free will".

His other famous works include: "Existentialism and Humanism" (was originally presented as a lecture) (1946) and "Critique of Dialectical Reason" (1960). They also highlighted the irrationality of man's existence and stressed how important the freedom of choice and dignity of human beings are in shaping their own existence.

For Sartre, first of all, Drama was an opportunity to express his worldview and philosophy. This philosophy was aimed at considering moral issues, the existence of a person in society. Placing a human in the epicenter of the universe, the fate of the individual, the loss of life and/or belief by humans are the ultimate concerns for existentialist writers. This "hard philosophy" is characterized by distinct criticism and visions.

Other 20th century philosophers who became known as existentialists are: Martin Heidegger, Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camus. Literary writers in Europe who have been inspired by Existentialist philosophy are: Jean Genet, Andre Gide, Andre Malraux along with the Norwegian Knut Hamsun and the Romanian Eugene Ionesco.

Existentialists writers use principles of philosophy to get people out of moral crisis they had been stuck after the war. Existentialists don't aim at making changes through destruction of existing social norms. Their goal is to let each individual find the truth in his/her existence, acquire existentialism, which can be accomplished through the fight against unhealthy, false "me".

Existential theory is often considered not a philosophical but rather a literary expression in art. But it would be better and more precise to approach existentialism in the light of movement in art created on the basis of Existentialist philosophy. To this end, representatives of existentialism are

trying to communicate their ideas through literary works such as plays, novels and short stories rather through philosophical pamphlets.

The philosophical concept of existentialism became the pivotal ideology for the new literary movement and gave rise to the revolutionary changes in literature. Its climax was “Theatre of Absurd”.

Existentialism inspired The Theatre of Absurd and leading and renowned European writers like Jean Genet, Fernando Arrabal Arthur, Max Frisch, Adamov, Edward Albee to represent it.

The second subchapter discusses literary movement “Theater of Absurd”. The use of the term "absurd" began in the mid-twentieth century by French thinkers and the representatives of existentialism: Albert Camus and Jean Paul Sartre. They emphasized how absurd and meaningless human existence in this world was. This literary movement is also known by the names of avant-garde and experimental theater. It is sometimes referred to as an anti-theater and a theater of derision. The avant-garde theater is contrary to bourgeois and mass culture. It is attempting to get rid of stereotypes of traditional theater and introduce new forms of thinking. New Theatre also excludes the traditional devices of the drama such as meaningful dialogue, logical plot development, and intelligible characters.

First of all, the manifest of the absurdist writers is a cultural outburst expressed by them. Absurdist writers rejected any rules existing before, ignoring firmly established laws that prevailed over the centuries and violated all the norms and rules.

The term “Theatre of Absurd” was first coined by literary critic martin Esslin. The use of this term by Esslin was encouraged by Albert Camus's philosophical essay “Myth of Sisyphus”. In this essay Camus introduces his philosophy of the absurdity, man's futile quest for meaning and lucidity in the light of an unintelligible world devoid of God or any values. Camus’s "Myth of Sisyphus" is considered to be a pivotal work of absurdist literature. It should be highlighted that Camus's notion of "absurd" was not only from a philosophical point of view, but he also linked it to art. According to Camus, Sisyphus is doomed to eternal ordeal by Gods due to his inadvertent behavior that angered the Gods. Sisyphus is also a captive and/or victim of his own destiny.

Albert Camus' idea of Absurdity, suicide and defiance also contributed to the dramatists' sense of a meaningless and irrational universe. Albert Camus, in his books "The Myth of Sisyphus" (1942) and "The Rebel" (1951) talks of the absurdity of the human situation which defied logical explanation or divine consideration. The World Wars had shattered all faith in human nature and society. There was a sense of dislocation and disillusionment; the universe had become 'schizophrenic', 'out of harmony' and 'devoid of purpose'.

Later, Martin Esslin published the book entitled: "The Theatre of the Absurd" (1962), which critics recognized as one of the most influential texts of the 1960s theater.

In the book "The Theatre of the Absurd", Esslin quotes one the most significant representatives of Absurd Theater, Eugene Ionesco as saying: "Absurd is what is devoid of the purpose ... is driven by his religious, metaphysical and transcendental roots; The man is lost; All his actions become meaningless, illogical and useless" (Esslin 1961: 23).

In "Theatre of the Absurd", Martin Esslin also claims: "Theatre of the Absurd strives to express its sense of senselessness of the human condition and the inadequacy of the rational approach by the open abandonment of rational devices and discursive thought" (Esslin 1961:3-15). The fact was that in 1930s and 1940s, commercial plays were a dominant form of writing. These plays failed to depict everyday life and its problems. Besides, characters in old plays belonged to high society. English drama had turned in a form of entertainment targeted at a small audience. It became vivid now that former literary devices were old-fashioned and did not comply with new post-world war realities.

Plays of "Theatre of Absurd" depict the frustration and disillusionment that modern man deals with. Their plot highlight the incongruousness of human existence. They reflect indifference at anguish that prevails in the society.

"Waiting for Godot" (1953) by Samuel Beckett and "The Bald Soprano" (1950) by Eugene Ionesco's are considered to be the most outstanding representations of this literary movement. Along with them, Harold Pinter was also considered to be the representative of the "Theatre of Absurd". Martin Esslin was confident that the play "Caretaker" by Harold Pinter had elements of Absurdist Theatre since it combined tragic and comic elements creating distressing effect. However,

these tragi-comic characteristics would rather be linked to “Comedy of Menace” which is more associated with Pinter’s dramatic works. Generally, it should be noted, that Harold Pinter’s work and plays confirmed that Pinter went beyond “Theatre of Absurd” and left his separate mark on English literature. His first play “Birthday Party” is still considered the work of “Theater of Absurd”. Famous literary critic Michael Billington notes that the problem in those times was that when Pinter started his career in 1950s, all critics immediately labeled him as an absurdist writer like Eugene Ionesco and NF Simpson; “One problem in the 50s was that critics assumed Pinter was writing in the absurdist vein of Ionesco and NF Simpson. Now it is much easier to see the play for what it is: a rep thriller invented by a man who’s read Kafka” (Billington, 2005:105).

The third subchapter explores “Kitchen Sink” drama that rose to prominence in the 1950s and 1970s along with “Theater of Absurd”. Its protagonists were called “Angry Young Men” due to the fact that they were literally angry at status quo of the time. It should not be forgotten that "Angry Young Men" lived and worked after World War II. The post-war mood was filled with exasperation and their dramatic works therefore illustrated frustration and despair. “Angry Young Men” were against Britain’s foreign policy and disapproved English governmental institutions. In English press, they published several critical articles. For instance, one of such an acute article was published by John Osborne in the newspaper "Encounter". Besides, they also participated in various political activities. John Osborne was arrested in 1961 for participating in a campaign against nuclear disarmament at the Trafalgar Square.

The literary critic John Russell Taylor interestingly formed the term "Angry theatre".

The origin of the name "**kitchen sink drama**" is connected to the painting of the same name by famous English expressionist painter John Bratby. The famous critic David Sylvester wrote an article back in 1954, reviewing new tendencies in English Art and named the article "Kitchen Sink". He had a painting of John Bratby in mind. Sylvester claimed that there was a new trend in English art: young artists painting domestic settings and everyday life thus emphasizing “Bland and uninteresting nature” of being. This term started to be frequently quoted and eventually, started to portray not only new trend in art but also new drama that was gaining ground in English Theatre.

The most distinguishing characteristic of this literary movement was the core message they strived to deliver which was social ideology. If earlier literature primarily depicted Victorian families, now “Kitchen sink” drama aimed at reflecting the social inequality and disparity of the working class thus portraying existing reality.

The Kitchen Sink drama sought to depict the lives of the ordinary in real settings. Depiction of domesticity, specifically, description of kitchen became the tradition for kitchen sink playwrights. If before that, Victorian drama obviously rejected any mention of it, Kitchen Sink drama, in contrast, put kitchen in the center of social life. The play “Roots” (1958) by Arnold Wesker starts with the leading character standing at a kitchen sink. Now the stage of the Theater presented kitchen and living spaces and a line of demarcation between public spaces and domestic life was blurred. Characters in these intimate settings wore unfurnished emotions claiming their dissatisfaction with intolerable status quo openly and harshly.

The playwrights of "Kitchen Sink" are English playwrights who were originally from working class families. They resented hypocrisy and mediocrity that prevailed in upper and middle classes. They scorned and disapproved established status quo. They showed dissatisfaction of the postwar welfare state and in their writings they demonstrated the raw anger and disillusionment since the postwar reforms did not succeed in meeting high aspirations for a better life and for the promised change. Most of their times they spent in pubs drinking and pondering over various topics including social and political issues such as abortion, homelessness, hardship, etc. They lived in rented rooms in extreme density and poverty.

These playwrights began to be referred to as "Angry Young Men" after the play “**Look Back in Anger**” by playwright John Osborne. The given play became a symbolic work for this movement.

Literary critic Christopher Innes states that this new literary movement was special in its ability to depict honesty that society was striving for. Therefore, “Angry Young Men” grabbed an immediate attention from the public and got themselves into spotlight. “What was new and struck the public nerve in *Look Back in Anger*, was the sense of naked honesty that came from the identification between author and protagonist, and the tone of self-lacerating (but generalized) anger” (Innes, 1992:103).

The phrase itself "Angry Young Man" belongs to George Fearon, a press agent at British Royal Theater, who reviewed the play "Look Back in Anger", calling its author an "angry young man". Actually, Fearon did not like the play and in point of fact used this phrase to criticize it, but unintentionally supported the promotion of the phrase and the play itself. After the success of John Osborne's play, the English press began to address all his contemporaries, who were angry at class discrimination and proud in their lower-class style, with this name.

This play introduces an angry young man Jimmy Porter. His anger is triggered by monotony and boredom that prevail every day. His desire to having a "real life" seems unlikely if not impossible. The world is disabled to offer him anything. Osborne's play depicts how frustration and social anger effect ordinary people. An American critic Paddy Chayefsky declares: "Drama of introspection explored the marvelous world of the ordinary. ("It was a self-observation drama whose aim was to study the ordinary world of the working class" (Rutherford, 1990: 77).

Critic John Heilpern emphasized how "Look Back in Anger" expressed such an "immensity of feeling and class hatred" that it managed to change the course of English theatre (Heilpern, 2007:87).

English critic Bamber Gaskon declared that after this play, the theatre of London acquired a new life and delight, which had been in a long deep sleep after Shaw and Galsworthy: "A new life and excitement has entered the London theatre, which had been in a state of fitful hibernation since Shaw" (Gascoigne, 1962:196-197).

Apart from Osborne's "Look Back in Anger" (1956), other famous representatives of this movement are Shelagh Delaney "A Taste of Honey" (1958) and Arnold Wesker "Roots" (1959).

The actions in these plays usually take place mainly in industrial areas. We witness working class Britons who live in cramped accommodations and spend most of their time in pubs drinking and exploring various controversial issues. Definitely, the harsh and realistic style of this new literary movement was in sharp contrast with refined and cultured style in the so called "well-made" plays of the previous generations.

"The "Angry Young Man" is synonymous with the following: impatience with the status quo, refusal to be co-opted by a bankrupt society, an instinctive solidarity with lower classes, an

undisciplined energy and unbounded rebelliousness, and an angry ambition that leads to unsuitable matches with the upper-class" (Gilleman, 2008:104).

At the early stage of Harold Pinter's career, his plays were met with initial incomprehension by critics since they assumed that his plays were totally related to avant-garde theater. Famous literary critic Martin Esslin in his work: "The Theatre of Absurd" directly claims that Pinter was an absurdist writer therefore placing him along with other absurdist writers, such as: Samuel Beckett, Eugène Ionesco, John Osborne, Arthur Adamov and Jean Genet: "One of the most promising exponents of the Theatre of the Absurd . . . in the English speaking world" (Esslin, 1964:205). Esslin states that Pinter, like Ionesco considers life absurd which is funny to some extent: "For Pinter, there is no contradiction between the desire for realism and the basic absurdity of the situations that inspire him. Like Ionesco, he regards life in its absurdity as basically funny--up to a point" (Esslin, 1964:211).

Pinter himself declared that he attempted to combine comic and tragic tones in his plays in order to acknowledge absurdity of existing reality. "Everything is funny; the greatest earnest is funny; even tragedy is funny. And I think what I try to do in my plays is to get to this recognizable reality of the absurdity of what we do and how we behave and how we speak" (Esslin, 1964 : 211-212).

Even to this day, some of Pinter's plays are still conceived as absurdist plays, especially his early play: "Birthday Party" (1957). When this play was first staged, Pinter was blamed for copying absurdist writers. In 1957, Lord Chamberlain wrote about this play, asserting that Pinter play was a mere attempt to steal some trick of Beckett and Ionesco: "An insane, pointless play. Mr. Pinter has jumbled all the tricks of Beckett and Ionesco with a dash from all the recently produced plays at the Royal Court theatre ... The result is still silly". (Lord Chamberlain's report on Harold Pinter's The Birthday Party. 1958).

Some critics, on the contrary, emphasized distinguishing features of Pinter's plays from absurdist writers. The critic James Vinson, for instance, claims "Pinter has indeed absorbed the insights of the absurdists. He has peopled his physically limited world with incomplete characters

whose internal life has been fully exteriorized. Yet, for all that, he is not an absurdist. For, despite the self-mockery of his characters and the painful inadequacy of their personal resources, Pinter can still conceive of human qualities which are not merely ironic (Vinson,1973:613).

Pinter was also considered to belong to “Angry Young Men” playwrights. After Pinter’s play “Caretaker” was staged, literary critic John Russell Taylor in his book “Anger and After” (1962) put Pinter along Arnold Wesker and John Osborne. Pinter and Osborne truly shared several common passions but it was never the writing style. The similarity was expressed in the spirit they had in relation to existing status quo. Both were young writers and thinkers who objected political totalitarianism and social inequality. They joined demonstrations in the fight against nuclear disarmament. Another fact why Pinter was thought to belong ““Angry Young Men” must have been the fact that he also portrayed life of ordinary, middle class people. He also depicted people who were angry at current state of affairs.

Thus, Pinter was affiliated with different literary movements of the day, “The Theatre of Absurd” and “Angry Young Men”. Pinter’s life and work proved this wrong. However, exclusion of impact of his contemporaries on his oeuvre would be also not applicable. Obviously, Pinter definitely, knew well all his contemporary playwrights and their works might have reflected in his plays: “He seems to have read all of the secondary sources—Beckett, Ionesco, and Genet” (Wellwarth, 1964: 197-198), but eventually, Pinter developed his unique, different style which should be addressed separately with due esteem.

Chapter 2. Art and Truth in Harold Pinter’s works. The second chapter explores how art and truth correlate and coexist in Harold Pinter’s literary works. Besides, it examines literary devices Pinter uses in his oeuvre and some of the major novelties in Pinter’s art.

The chapter consists of the following subchapters: 2.1. Pinterish Silence and Pause; 2.2. Truth in Harold Pinter’s plays; 2.3 “Comedies of Menace“ plays.

As a playwright, Harold Pinter was highly assured that the most successful communication lies in efficient eliminating of verbose language. He did not approve the idea that "failure of communication" appears when fewer words are applied and considered that successful communication is never dependent on the abundance of words. Therefore, Pinter gave preference

to the lack of use of words in plays and introduced his famous silences and pauses along with three dots.

Pinter himself commented on the use of silence and how it affects characters in plays and generally, on human communication, as follows: "I don't think there's an inability to communicate on the part of the characters. It's rather more - that they communicate only too well in one sense. Their tentacles go out very strongly to each other, and I think communication is a very fearful matter to really get to know someone, to participate with someone. [...] I think that we communicate only too well, in our silence, in what is unsaid, and that what takes place is a continual evasion, desperate rearguard attempts to keep ourselves to ourselves (Knowles, 1995: 12).

Pinter claims that he understood his characters in silence and not when they were eloquent. He underlines two types of silences: one when no words are uttered and literally silence prevails and the other - when character's speech is full of words but even this speech still equals to silence as it portrays nothing. It is only a tool to imply the words unsaid. Indeed speech we hear is an indication to the speech we do not hear: "The speech we hear is an indication of that we don't hear. It is a necessary avoidance, a violent, sly, anguished or mocking smoke screen which keeps the other in its place. When true silence falls, we are still left with echo but are nearer nakedness. One way of looking at speech is to say that it is a constant stratagem to cover nakedness" (Pinter, 1999:15).

Pinter always rendered high significance to these pauses and silences in his plays. He attempted to use as few words as possible, and by silence or pauses to imply more than mere utterance of words could do. However, pauses and silences should not be conceived as if characters have nothing to deliver if their verbal language is not loaded with words. It ought to be kept in mind that these pauses and silences carry just as important messages as spoken words.

We can differentiate between three categories of silences: an ellipsis, a pause, and silence itself. In plays, an ellipsis which is designated by three dots is an indicator of hesitation. A pause is much longer hesitation that Pinter uses to demonstrate more accurately the given utterance. Generally, when a pause prevails, the character is in deep thought and through this device, Pinter effectively creates a disturbing atmosphere. As for silence, it is a dead stop when no word is

pronounced due to the fact that the character has encountered a conflict and is unable to respond, he is flabbergasted and speechless.

Peter Hall who has directed number of Pinter's plays highlights the difference between pause, silence and three dots in Pinter's plays as follows: "There is a difference in Pinter between a pause and a silence and three dots. A pause is really a bridge where the audience think that you're this side of the river, then when you speak again, you're the other side. That's a pause. And it's alarming often. It's a gap, which retrospectively gets filled in. It's not a dead stop—that's a silence, where the confrontation has become so extreme, there is nothing to be said until either the temperature has gone down, or the temperature has gone up, and then something quite new happens. Three dots is a very tiny hesitation, but it's there, and it's different from a semi-colon, which Pinter almost never uses, and it's different from a comma" (Hall, 1975:10).

One of the first plays that Harold Pinter wrote was "Birthday Party"(1957) and that is the play where he introduced famous silences and pauses.

The play begins immediately with a pause. One of the characters, Pete, enters the room, sits at a table and starts reading:

MEG. Is that you, Petey?

Pause.

Petey, is that you?

Pause.

Petey?

PETEY. What?

MEG. Is that you?

PETEY. Yes, it's me. (Pinter, 1990:19).

As we see, after the question: "Is that you, Petey?" – a pause continues, leaving a gap before an audience. And as above mentioned, an upsetting mood evolves instantaneously. Pinter is reluctant to loosen the tension until the 6th line. Only after the sentence: "PETEY. Yes, it's me ", the stage is entered by Meg. Three questions that Meg asks are of the same character. However, these are not even questions rather than a challenge. Meg places the word "Petey" differently: sometimes at the end of the sentence, then with more domineering tone at the beginning. As if Meg wants her

presence to be accepted and approved. Pauses and silences that prevail between questions let the audience ponder over character's intentions beyond this silence. Pinter believes that it is not necessary for people to communicate with each other in a question-answer mode. Pinter understood the nature of daily conversations of people, their illogical character, non-linear nature, the idea behind what lies between those silences and pauses. Attention should be paid to what is unsaid and not to what is pronounced.

Pinter deliberately applies pauses in the play as it is a special strategy to create a suspense in the audience. He raises doubts in the audience regarding the existence of other invisible communications outside the dialogue, which is undoubtedly more important. The given dialogue is an attempt to reveal the real implied dialogue beyond utterance. And the words that this couple tells each other during the tea in the morning indicates the words that they do not tell but imply.

We can state that there is a quasi-communication in the play, even though Meg attempts to bond with Pete, the latter one is reluctant to participate in the communication. His responses are brief and automatic.

Another play which is also abundant with pauses and silences is "Homecoming".

In spite of the fact that the play consists of two parts, the word "Pause" is being used two hundred and twenty times. Director, Peter Hall who was in charge of the production of the play, recalls how once Pinter called him and told to open the play on page forty-seven and delete the word "pause" there. For Pinter deleting this pause was the same as deleting the same whole sentence in the play. Every pause that Pinter used carried an immense significance in itself therefore the reader should pay due attention to it as to the text. Those silences and pauses that are exploited between communication and dialogues are the best tools for Pinter to imply the meaning that cannot be depicted through words.

Thus, all the above mentioned demonstrated that silent spaces carry as vital significance as the words themselves. Pinter uses them as a device to insert ambivalence and intensify menacing atmosphere that is a core characteristic of his dramatic style. Characters' silences should not be interpreted as their inability of proper communication because they do understand each other well

through this non-verbal communication. Pinter's style of indirect language, incoherence and ambiguity is a tool to convey possessiveness, power struggle and menace.

Pinter's dramatic language and his unique the so called Pinterque style which is mostly presented through bizarre conversations, incoherence and vagueness, brought him special fame and distinctness in the 20th century English drama.

In dramatic art truth is an illusionary phenomenon as no one can grab the absolute truth. However, the quest for truth is inevitable. Generally, it is hard to distinguish between real and unreal, what is true and what is a lie. In most cases, their simultaneous co-existence is possible. Quest for truth is well portrayed in Harold Pinter's plays and reflected in the language and diction of characters.

Dictionaries define the truth as follows: "being in accordance with the actual state or conditions; conforming to reality or fact; not false", something which compiles with real status-quo. However, in dramatic art the concept of truth is not as easy and unequivocal as defined in dictionaries. Where is an objective truth which could be acceptable for everyone? Throughout human existence, it has always been disputable what truth really is. This question has been a challenge for many writers and thinkers and perhaps, there will never be one definite answer to it.

The above given definition for "truth" has never been acceptable for Harold Pinter. He believed that truth is elusive especially in literature. Pinter states: "Truth in drama is forever elusive. You never quite find it but the search for it is compulsive. The search is clearly what drives the endeavor. The search is your task" (Pinter, 2005:21).

Existence of several truths was something that Pinter believed in and portrayed in his plays. How absurd it might seem, it is possible that there might be several truths existing. There might even be an antithesis when one and the same thing is the truth and a lie. Therefore, we should not address from a limited standpoint. On the contrary, it should be studied from different angles. Pinter claims: "The real truth is that there never is any such thing as one truth to be found in dramatic art. There are many. These truths challenge each other, recoil from each other, reflect each

other, ignore each other, tease each other, and are blind to each other. Sometimes you feel you have the truth of a moment in your hands, then it slips through your fingers and is lost (Pinter, 2005:21).

The final sub-chapter of the second paragraph deals with the “Comedy of Menace”. It was the name of the subtitle of the play: “The Lunatic View: A Comedy of Menace” (1950) by David Campton. Later, John Irving Wardle, a theatre critic, borrowed it from him in order to depict certain playwrights and their plays including Harold Pinter in an English magazine related to contemporary theatre “Encore” in 1958.

The phrase “comedy of menace” is a controversial one. Generally, comedy is something which triggers laughter in people and menace, on the contrary, provokes fear in them. If we literally translate the phrase, “comedy of menace” must refer to laughing regarding something which is scary. Thus, plays of “Comedies of Menace” carry tragi-comic mood. And indeed, characters of “Comedies of Menace” deal with eerie situations with humor and mockery. They stay humorous about their hazardous state and even when dealing with dangerous situations, they keep absurdly cheerful attitude and thus provoking an anxiety in the audience. Critic John Russell Taylor emphasized the contrasting feature of these plays: "All of these plays are both frightening and funny" (Taylor, 1969:7).

Atmosphere of menace prevails in Harold Pinter’s plays. The language that Pinter uses is funny but the audience senses that there is menace lurking beneath it. Pinter creates the situation where a comic environment evolves into a serious one. With this technique, the audience realizes that comedy is just on the surface. Unexpected violent outbursts which appear in and out, confirm this fact and leaves the audience perplexed and baffled as what might happen next. Therefore, “Comedy of menace” as a literary expression, which is used in plays, appears a powerful weapon to create a suspense in an audience.

Usually, the primary setting for the play of “Comedy of Menace” is the room. It conveys security and protection from an outside world full of danger, insecurity and uncertainty. But this feeling of security is very brief, as an intruder will inevitably disturb their peace and sense of secureness. John Taylor defined plays of “Comedy of Menace” as follows: “The menace comes from outside, from the intruder whose arrival unsettles the warm, comfortable world bounded by four

walls, and any intrusion can be menacing, because the element of uncertainty and unpredictability the intruder brings with him is in itself menacing" (Taylor, 1963:22).

Harold Pinter's play, which is an exact exemplification of the above mentioned, is his early play "Room". As expected, the action takes place in a small room. The occupants of the rooms are the elderly couple Rose and Bert. The protagonist of the play, an old woman named Rose is cooking bacon and omelet for her husband Bert. Bert is curled up and unlike Rose is silent and speechless sitting at the table reading a newspaper. Pinter managed to pique a curiosity in readers from the beginning as why Bert is withdrawn from the conversation and why Rose incessantly keeps talking? It easily can be said that the play starts with a monologue since Rosie's speech is one-sided without any replies or responses. Rose speaks about the warmth and the comfort existing in their room and is concerned regarding the cold, dark outside. Rose is permanently asking her husband about a stranger living in a basement.

She says: "It's very cold out, I can tell you. It's murder... the room keeps warm. It's better than the basement, away, . . . I don't know how they live down there... I wouldn't like to live in that basement. I'm quite happy where I am And we're not bothered, And no body bothers us" (Pinter, 1999:70).

Definitely, her unease is not accidental. Rose senses that intruders will arrive soon "breaking their sanctuary". And she hears a knock on the door. Rose discovers Miss and Mr. Sandy at her door searching for an empty room. They had been informed that Rosie's room was free. Rosie feels restless. Her room is not available for strangers. Leaving the room is unacceptable for Rose. The name of Mr. Sandy is Todd (German word: "Tod" meaning "Death"). Perhaps, by naming the death to the stranger, playwright inferred disaster/death that was about to strike.

Another intruder from the basement named Riley will also arrive soon. The black skinned man called Riley insists on having a special message for Rose from her father. "Your father want you back, Sally" addresses the black man. Rose initially rejects this name but then it becomes vivid that this name is not unknown for her. Eventually, everything ends with a fatality as upon the arrival of Bert the blind Negro had not still left. Upon Bert's arrival, the play becomes very violent. Bert

becomes furious and hits Riley who hits his head on the oven and Bert beats him to death. And Rose goes blind. At the end of the play, Rose screams desperately “I can’t see anything” and the play ends.

Another play belonging to “Comedy of menace” is “Birthday Party”. The setting is the same as in the “Room”. Now Petey sitting at breakfast table, reading the newspaper and his wife Meg delivering meaningless speech full of questions that remain unanswered. The play has got a simple plot with a leading character Stanley Webber. He is in a boarding house with owners Petey and Meg. But intrusion upon seclusion occurs when his privacy is invaded by two intruders Goldberg and McCann. No piece of information is provided about the purpose or intention of their arrival whatsoever. One is obvious: Stanley becomes anxious and restless as soon as he is told that they are coming. He responds: “Stanley slowly raises his head, he speaks without turning: What two gentlemen?” (Pinter,1991:15). Surely, later it becomes clear why Stanley was so concerned. Those two came for him. To interrogate and take him. Apparently these three share a common past which the audience has no clue of. After a fierce interrogation these two intruders take Stanley to the place unknown further. They merely tell Petey that they are taking Stanley to Monty for a special treatment. This play as the previous one is a confirmation of the fact that there is no safe and secure place unreachable for outsiders. They will arrive and take your voice. Stanley is voiceless at the end of the play. The final scene of interrogation is a demonstration of it:

“GOLDBERG. What’s your opinion of such a prospect? Eh, Stanley?
Stanley concentrates, his mouth opens, he attempts to speak, fails and emits sounds from his throat.

STANLEY. Uh-gug...uh-gug...eeehhh-gag...(On the breath.)
Caahh...caaah.

GOLDBERG. Well, Stanny boy, what do you say, eh?

STANLEY. Ug-gughh...uh-gughhh...

MCCANN. What’s your opinion, sir?

STANLEY. Caaahhh...caaahhh...

MCCANN. Mr. Webber! What is your opinion?

GOLDBERG. What do you say, Stan? What do you think of the prospect?

MCCANN. What do you think of the prospect?

Stanley’s body shudders, relaxes, his head drops, he becomes still again,

stooped.

GOLDBERG. Still the same old Stan. Come with us. Come on, boy. (Pinter, 1991:80)

After World War II, introducing the setting of closed rooms/spaces is not startling as it has acquired a dramatic metaphor in plays depicting omnipresence of menace. Even though characters feel defended and protected in those rooms, this security is merely illusory since they are still vulnerable and threat and danger can penetrate into closed rooms too.

Pinter depicts fears, specifically, he describes people who retreat in closed spaces, they are horrified to leave and go out and they constantly feel haunted and fear that unwanted intruders might arrive and knock at the door causing panic and horror in them. They refuse to keep a touch with an outside world as the outside world symbolizes evil and death for them. The outside world is cruel and brutal which can only bring death to Pinter's characters. "Room" in this case is a safe place where they feel secure and cruel world can't reach them. Perhaps, Pinter intended to show how hostile his contemporary world was where people lived. People did not feel safe anymore in the world they dwelt, especially after World War II. People had not forgotten holocaust horrors and definitely their life was not secured from human evil and malice.

Apparently Pinter's inclined to portray how hostile the modern society was towards humans, reflecting the political reality whose part he had always been himself. People did not have a sense of security in the world in which they lived, especially after the Second World War. People had not overcome Holocaust horrors yet. They still felt threat lurking around.

The third paragraph deals with the Politics in Harold Pinter's plays. Harold Pinter as a playwright has never strictly been considered as a political playwright in literature. However, the speech he delivered for Nobel Prize Award makes it clear that politics is an integral part of his work and is clearly reflected in his plays. This speech which lasts up to 46 minutes, Pinter devoted largely to talking about politics. This speech can easily be considered a work of art and can be called a creative work of a playwright, since it clearly illustrates how art should denounce politics. This political belief is a source of better understanding of the political plays by Harold Pinter, as Pinter's political beliefs determine interpretations of his dramatic work that can be called the stage of

political plays. Famous literary critic Michael Billington calls him “a dramatist with an active political conscience” (Billington,2009:182).

What Pinter declared in his Nobel Prize speech in 2005, was not new in its essence since, throughout years, he talked about those issues in different places and times. In this regards, his speech is not an unpredicted novelty. However, it was this speech that attached him the status of a political playwright and brought him a lot of attention. Pinter began to be referred as a political playwright.

In 1950-60s, at the beginning of Pinter’s career, he was not considered a political playwright. At first look, one can hardly notice any political implications in his plays and despite the fact that Pinter’s early plays such as “Room” (1957) and “Homecoming”(1964) are considered apolitical, there still remain political elements that one can apprehend if those plays are closely scrutinized.

Famous critic Michael Billington in his essay: “Evil that man do” claims that majority of people see a dichotomy between his early, mysterious, comedy of menace plays and his late political plays but if one studies his early plays, one can notice Pinter has always been driven by his suppressed political motives: “What is fascinating is that many people see a dichotomy in Pinter’s own career between the mysterious early plays and jaded certainties of the later political plays. But recent revivals of “The Birthday Party” and “Hothouse” have shown that Pinter was always exercised by political oppression” (Pinter, 2000:28)

For example, when the play “Mountain Language” was directed for the stage, it was Pinter’s idea to direct it in duo with “Birthday Party”. Two plays belonging to different time periods and different types of plays but as an American critic Carey Perloff stated: “It became immediately clear that, for all their surface differences, both pieces wrestled with a concern that has been paramount in Pinter’s work from the beginning: the struggle of the individuals to survive the depredation and aggressions of society”(Perloff, 2001:2).

Pinter himself was engaged in Politics from an early age. His Jewish origin, his painful World War II experiences, which left an indelible mark on Pinter, and childhood feelings played a significant role for Pinter’s future political life and the life of a future dramatist. The themes

outlined in Harold Pinter's political plays are an integral part of his Jewish origin and are particularly related to childhood experiences. The birth of Pinter (1930) coincided with the rise of anti-Semitic movements in Europe, influencing the part of the West of London, where Pinter was born in Heinz. The birthplace of Pinter was largely settled by the Jews and forced to leave the city during the Second World War. He returned to London only in 1944, 14 years old. Pinter recalls back pain, because the first thing he saw was a flying bomb. He also writes that sometimes the garden was burning and wounded, the family had been evacuated several times: "One that day I got back to London, in 1944; I saw the first flying bomb. I was in the street and I saw it come over ... I opened our back door and find our garden in flames. Our house never burned, but we had many times to evacuate" (Gale, 1977: 18).

Therefore, the main theme that Harold Pinter has in his mind at the initial stage of creative work is fear. Fear of a Jewish child who underwent horrific War terrors. The childhood of the time is a leitmotif for Pinter oeuvre. "When Pinter began his playwriting career in 1957, however, one idea was foremost in his mind as a major theme: fear. As a young Jew living through the early days of World War II, he had gone to bed afraid that he might be awakened in the night by a knock at the door and that he and his parents would be taken forcibly from their home by unknown assailants, a picture vividly impressed on his mind by tales of Hitler's Germany" (Gale, 1977:18). Pinter's experiences were hidden deep down that were later seen in his plays portraying the oppressor and the suppressed relationship with a violence in it.

Pinter despised cold war policy which he officially demonstrated by the refusal of military service. He was brought to trial twice and was fined after refusing to sign up for National Service on the grounds of being a conscientious objector. Michael Billington remarks: "The whole episode also makes nonsense of the theory that Pinter belatedly woke up to political realities or suddenly acquired a questioning conscience in the 1980s. He was always an instinctive outsider; looking back, he sees Conscientious objector as first major political decision of his life" (Billington, 2009:243).

Surely, he was a great patriot, but as for faith, he soon revealed a stubborn irreconcilability. As a child grown up in the Jewish family, he took part in Jewish prayers but as he said, as soon as he

turned 13 his religion came to an end forever. "After the age of thirteen, that was it. I was finished with religion for good" (Billington, 2005: 9).

H. Pinter himself said in interviews that he remembered little of his childhood and that it was almost impossible to remember any history. The bad memory of the Pinter and the absence of childhood memories of him is more like the suppression of the past and the escape from him. It is better to remember the past. It was also acknowledged: "I cannot remember so much, but it is not really gone. It's hard to carry the burden" (Gale, 1977: 39).

It is noteworthy that his political activeness was encouraged by his marriage to Lady Antonia Fraser, a scholar of political history in 1980. Fraser's former husband was MP of English Parliament and her father was a famous Labor Party Peers.

In 1980s Pinter became actively preoccupied with world politics and his plays reflected his increasingly vociferous character. He started to express his indignation regarding such resonant issues as: violations of human rights, state torture, war, injustice, dictatorship, tyranny etc. that were actual political states of affairs in his contemporary world. Pinter criticized United States for abundant number of Human rights abuses and violations in different parts of the world. He also expressed his discontentment towards UK foreign policy by writing public condemnations. Indeed, Pinter had always been concerned with the relationship between an individual and a state. "The relationship between the state and the individual and how the self-perpetuating concerns of the former often obscure and override the dignifying rights of the latter" (Batty, 2001:91).

Pinter's first overtly political play was "One for the Road" written in 1984. This play marks the departure from Pinter's traditional plays and marks the beginning of his political plays. "This play was generally considered to mark a new departure in Pinter's oeuvre - an openly political play, almost a political pamphlet. Pinter dedicated this play to the depiction of torture and human rights violations. In 1980 Pinter paid a visit to Turkey after a coup in 1980 with Arthur Miller. He witnessed numerous human rights' abuses that horrified him. He publicly condemned violations that occurred in Turkey. The play was written in an interesting context. In 1984 Pinter met intelligent young women in Turkey who showed reckless and indifferent attitude towards such issues as use of torture in their country. Pinter's critic Michael Billington says: "Instead of strangling

them, Pinter came back immediately, sat down and, it's true, out of rage started to write "One for the Road".

The play is a one-act drama. The setting of the play is a room which represents a torture chamber. Oppressor Nicolas who is in charge of a cruel state institution tortures and abuses Viktor who is probably an intellectual dissident. Nicolas raped his wife and at the end of the play killed their offspring. This play demonstrates the cruelty and brutality of the system when people are unable to protect their loved ones. This play might be inferring the Holocaust fatalities when millions of people were tortured, raped and killed and how families were separated.

Another play which was also inspired by the visit to Turkey was "Mountain Language". The play illustrated how Kurdish people, minority in Turkey were oppressed. Authorities have issued ban for use of their language, thus, they are exempted of their primary right: freedom of choice. Moreover, this everlasting oppression has been going on this day as well.

The play which deals with tyranny and oppression is "Ashes to Ashes". At first glimpse, reader has an impression that there is a mere domestic conflict but shortly grasps the idea that conflict is of larger scale. The simple relationship between Rebecca and Devlin, a wife and a husband. The husband is attempting to verify past of his wife that is so obscure and ambiguous. This relationship may be the metaphor of world violence and world politics where victims get abused by those in power tyrannous.

Pinter never tried to directly depict or portray Holocaust cases. In general, it is noteworthy that it has never been Pinter's goal to describe violent scenes in any form. Even though in his overtly political plays, Pinter covered such political themes as Holocaust, Repression, rape, violence and other grave forms of crime he never directly described them. Instead, he made it more efficient through other means. As, for example, in the above mentioned play "One for the Road", the interrogatory chair, where the main character, Viktor sits, is indirectly causing more horror in the reader/audience. Moreover, the dialogue between the characters provoke reader more than it might have been possible through the description of Violence. Despite the fact that Pinter's plays were never abundant with words and his characters eloquent, Pinter succeeds in impressing his readers

more. As a rule, unlike other plays, Harold Pinter's political plays are short and laconic but not definitely less impressive or effective.

] When Pinter started writing political plays, they were met by skepticism from the society. First of all, public disapproved Pinter's decision to diverge from his traditional plays. They were doubtful about his political commitment and artistic autonomy. They considered it is not a playwright's obligation to write about politics. The public became uninterested in Pinter's play they thought wore political messages. However, what they didn't realize was that Pinter's politics here did not imply making political statements praising any party politics but what he intended was to portray those malicious intents of political systems aimed at suppressing and demeaning humans. In this case, Pinter will question and cast doubt on the truth of the accepted norm of society.

However, with the development of his plays, it is clear that Pinter's main message that he wants to deliver remains the same in every play, be it "comedy of menace" play or merely a political play: There is a corrupted power in the society, sickness, that make people enjoy torment and tortures of other people. Starting from his first play "The Room" till the play: "Ashes to Ashes" – the gap which covers 42 years Pinter depicts the fight for power among people.

Conclusions:

- Harold Pinter contributed immensely to modern drama. Moreover, he connected post-modern theatre with the modern one. His unique style and literary approach earned him an honorable place in world literature. Even though, primarily he never intended to become a life-long playwright, he succeeded in creating his worthwhile oeuvre. When Pinter wrote his first plays “The Room” and “The Birthday Party”, critics were bewildered not knowing where to locate Pinter and defined his works under various labels. He was initially affiliated with “Theatre of Absurd” and “Angry Young men” movement of “Kitchen Sink” playwrights. However, he managed to display strongly established distinguished features from existing literary movements of his time. Finally, he developed his differentiating style which was named “Pinteresque” due to its unlikeness to any mainstream of the time. His unique style full of menace, and dialogues which were full of silences and pauses brought him fame and success in the theatre worldwide.
- It is remarkable to observe how Harold Pinter wrote drama that mirrored a wide range of issues from existential fear to defenselessness of frustrated individuals who endured social as well as political suppressions. Pinter was often criticized for deliberate obfuscation of his plays since in the beginning the audience failed to explain what Pinter intended to infer. Spectators struggled to apply the “symbolic meaning” to Pinter’s new type of drama which was completely neither comic nor tragic but both. As a result, Pinter’s plays became known as “Comedy of menace” plays since his plays are neither tragic nor comic. He eliminated a line of demarcation between tragic and comic under the name “Comedy of menace”. He achieved success in presenting menace in a manner that it was funny and thrilling simultaneously. In “Comedy of menace” plays Pinter employs absurdist technique where existentialist terror accompanies characters permanently.
- The study illustrated that Pinter’s Jewish background as a child played a tremendous role in shaping his “Comedy of Menace” plays since the environment in which he lived was also full of terror, violence and threats. Frequent evacuations, childhood isolation and fascist threat following World War II left vivid impressions in Pinter’s mind later resulting in creating this menace in his plays.

- At an early stage, Pinter's plays depict contemporary English society, members of whom are constantly living under threat and terror. They live in a make-believe world of security which is permanently broken. They are physically as well as psychologically attacked by numerous experiences. Covert or overt violence that emerges persistently disturb their very existence. The violence may be psychological as in the play "Room", physical as in "The Birthday Party" or even obscure hidden and vague as in "The Dumb Waiter". In these plays, there is always a feeling of uncertainty and expectation of worst and at the end of the play, it is always sudden and unexpected shock of either death, devastation or violence that result in horrific consequences. The character collapses, dies or faces horrendous future.
- Plays typically start with minimum number of characters whose peace is disrupted by abrupt arrival of strangers. Characters undergo psychic instability and deterioration as they diverge into fears, suspicions, revulsions and uncertainties.
- Pinter's name is also affiliated with notions of "Silence" and "Pauses" in his plays. Dialogues are crucial in Pinter's unique style. Pinter's characters are constantly engaged in colloquial ("Pinteresque") dialogues which are incoherent and disorderly typically full of silences and pauses. These dialogues express alienation and distortion of their language that fails to communicate most basic ideas.
- Pinter was a true skeptic about communication. He never believed in it. At least, he was highly assured that successful communication was never achieved at the level of words or utterances. Accordingly, Pinter does not belong to the category of dramatists whose oeuvre could be properly conceived through texts or words. On the contrary, what is unsaid and implied carries an immense importance in understanding Pinter's plays. Words were a mere instrument for him to connote ideas beyond them and, as a rule, his words are followed by more silences and pauses. Speechlessness of Pinter's characters in his plays maddened the audience even more.
- Audience who was used to witnessing abundance of words with clear-cut messages in the stage now became perplexed by Pinter's new style when nothing was certain. Characters did not

have any past neither future. Their intentions were obscure and baffling. Audience was left alone in decision-making process as to what may come next and what all was about. Pinter's plays are full questions and vagueness, which was Pinterish style; Pinter rejected any resolutions in the play. Gradually, playgoers realized that they would never receive author's moral tag or any label what his plays were about therefore, they had to accept Pinter's theatrical terms. Pinter believed in his characters autonomy and never interfered in explaining their motifs or inclinations whatsoever. In the end, the audience dissatisfaction grew into contentment as they possessed now the responsibility of deciding. Pinter was fond of understatements, his characters were reticent and their small talks indicated to hidden implications that were beneath layers and required acute eyes.

- The research showed that even though Pinter did not wear the status of a political playwright, he had always been a rebellious playwright with an irreconcilable politics inside. His irreconcilability here implies his anger towards the establishment that exercises tyranny, oppressions, control and dictatorship over individuals. Therefore, in his political plays Pinter addressed such issues as: abuse of human rights, state oppression of the minority groups, tortures, etc.; Pinter started writing political plays at later phase in his life. He didn't gain a reputation of a political playwright until the late 1980s. He managed to distinguish art and politics from each other so that art strives to denounce politics. Pinter also denounced the language politicians use to veil the truth. He claimed he despised how politicians try to keep people in ignorance by a vast tapestry of lies through political language by using attempted to show how politicians try to keep people in ignorance.

Bibliography:

1. Baker William, "Harold Pinter, Writer's lives", Cantinuum International publishing group, New York. 2008.
2. Baker William, Stephan Ely Tabachnik. " A good chapter on Pinter's London background on the 1930s", Oliver and Boyd, Edinburg.1973
3. Bamber Gascoigne, "Twentieth Century Drama", University of Toronto Press, Toronto. 1962
4. Batty Mark Taylor, "Harold Pinter", Northcote House Publishers Ltd, Horndon, Tavistock, United Kingdom.2001
5. Byezkowska-Page, Eva,"The structure of Time-Space in Harold Pinter's Drama, 1957-1973". University of Wroclav Press,Wroclav. 1971
6. Billington Michael, "The Life and work of Harold Pinter", Faber and Faber Ltd., London. 1996
7. Billington Michael, "Harold Pinter", Mackays of Chatham plc, Chatham, kent. 2005
8. Billington Michael, "Harold Pinter",. Faber & Faber Inc., United Kingdom. 2009
9. Brook Peter, "Threads of time: Recollections".Penguin. A Cornelia and Michael. 1998
10. Burkman Ed. Katherine and KundertGibbs John L. "Pinter in Rehearsal: From The Birthday party to Mountain Language " . Pinter at Sixty. Indiana University Press, London. 1993
11. Cahn Victor, L. "Gender and Power in the plays of Harold Pinter", Macmillan, Houndmills. 1994
12. Diamond Elin, "Pinter's Comic Play", Pa:Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg. 1985
13. Dukore Bernard, "Where Laughter stops: Pinter's tragicomedy", University of Missouri Press, Columbus and London, 1976

14. Dukore Bernard, "Harold Pinter", Macmillan, London and New York.1982
15. Esslin Martin, "The Theatre of the Absurd", The Anchor Books Edition, New York. 1961
16. Esslin Martin. "The Theater of the Absurd", London: Eyer & Spottiswoode. 1964
17. Esslin Martin, "The Theatre of the Absurd", Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 1968
18. Esslin Martin, "The Theatre of The Absurd", London. Penguin Books. 1991
19. Esslin Martin, "Pinter the Playwright",Methuen Publishing Ltd , London. 2000
20. Etheridge,J. M. Ed. Contemporary Authors: A Bibliographical Guide to Current Authors and their Works, Gale Research Company, Michigan. 1964
21. Fackenheim, E."Metaphysics and Historicity", Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.1961
22. Free W.J, "Treatment of Character in Harold Pinter's "The Homecoming". South Atlantic Bulletin, 34, p. 1-5. 1969
23. Gabbard, L.P. "The Dram Structure of Pinter's Plays: A psycho-analytical Approach", N.J.,Fairleign Dickinson University Press, Rutherford, 1976
24. Gale Steven H, Butter's Going Up: "A Critical Analysis of Harold Pinter's Work", Duke University press, North Carolina. 1977
25. Gilleman Luke, "From Coward and Rattigan to Osborne: Or the Enduring Importance of Look Back in Anger", Modern Drama 51. 2008
26. Grimes Charles, "A Silence Beyond Echo: Harold Pinter's Political Theatre, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, Department of English Literature, New York. 1999
27. Guido Almansi, and Henderson Simon, "A fascinating study of "Games" in Pinter. Metuen. London and New York. 1983

28. Gussow M, "A Conversation with Pinter", Grove Press, New York. 1996
29. Hayman Ronald, "Harold Pinter", Heinemann, London, 1973
30. Heilpern John, "John Osborne: The Many Lives of the Angry Young Man", Vintage Books, Random House Inc., New York .2007
31. Hynes, J. "Pinter and Morality, The Virginia Quarterly Review, 68 (4) 740-751.1992
32. Hinchliffe Arnold P, "British Theater 1950-70", Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 1974
33. Hollis James, "Harold Pinter:The Poetics of Silence", Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, 1970
34. Hope-Wallace, P. "Feeling Cheated, In Michael Scott (Ed.). Harold Pinter: The Birthday Party, The Caretaker & The Homecoming, London: MacMillan.1986
35. Innes Christopher, "Modern British Drama: 1890-1990", Cambridge:University Press, Cambridge. 1992
36. Jung Carl, "Psychology and Alchemy", Princeton University Press, US.1968
37. Kay Dick, "Mr. Pinter and Fearful Matter", Texas Quarterly VII 3, 195
38. Kerr Walter, "Harold Pinter", Columbia University press, New York, 1967
39. Klein Joanne, "Making Pictures: The Pinter Screenplays", Ohio State University press, Columbus, 1985
40. Knowles Ronald, "The birthday Party" and "The Caretaker": Text and performance", Macmillan, Houndmills and London, 1988
41. Knowles Ronald, "Understanding Harold Pinter", Columbia, S.C. : University of South Carolina Press, Columbia. 1995

42. Korpimies Liisa, "A linguistic approach to the analysis of a dramatic text: A study in discourse Analysis and Cohesion with special Reference to "Birthday Party", University of Jyväskylä press, Jyväskylä, 1983
43. Merritt Susan Hollis, "Pinter in Play: Critical Strategies and the Plays of Harold Pinter", Duke University press, Durham and London, 1990
44. Pinter Harold, "A Faber critical guide; the birthday party, the caretaker, the homecoming", Faber and Faber, London. 2000
45. Pinter Harold, "The Room, in Harold Pinter: Complete Works One" Grove Press, New York. 1976
46. Pinter Harold, "Various voices: prose, poetry, politics, 1948-1998", Grove Press, New York, 1999
47. Pinter Harold, "Complete works: One" Grove Press, New York, 1990
48. Pinter Harold, Pinter H., "Complete works: Two" Grove Press, New York. 1990
49. Pinter Harold, "Complete works: Three" Grove Press, New York. 1990
50. Pinter Harold, "Birthday Party", Shore Book, London, United Kingdom. 1991
51. Pinter Harold, "Art, Truth & Politics: Excerpts from the 2005 Nobel Lecture. World Literature Today, 80, 3, p. 21-27
52. Pinter Harold, "Various voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics". Grove Press, New York: 1998
53. Perloff Carey, "Harold Pinter's Mountain Language", Crimes of War: August 2001.
54. Peter Hall to Catherine Itzin and Simon Trussler. Theatre Quarterly (Vol. 4, No. 16, , pp. 4-17). 1974/75
55. Rutherford Paul, "When Television Was Young". University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1990

56. Maschler Tom, "Declaration", MacGibbon & Kee, London.1957
57. Quigly Austen E., "The Pinter Problem", Princeton University press, Princeton, 1975
58. Sakellaridou Elizabeth, "Pinter's Female Portraits", N.J Macmillan, London and Totowa, 1988
59. Santucci Lino Falzon, "Harold Pinter: Exploration in Verbal and Non verbal Interaction ", Peloritana Editrice, Messina, 1981
60. Schroll Herman T., "Harold Pinter: A study of his reputation", N.J.; Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, 1971
61. Silverstein Marc, "Harold Pinter and the Language of Cultural Power", Pa.;Bucknell University Press, Lewisburg, 1993
62. Steven H. Gale. B 11.Cohn, R. "The World of Harold Pinter. Tulane Drama Review, 6, p. 55-59
63. Scot Michael, ed. "Harold Pinter: A Casebook", London: Macmillan Press Ltd, London.1986
64. Strunk Volker, "Harold Pinter: Towards a Poetics of his Plays", Peter Lang, New York, 1989
65. Sykes Alrene, "Harold Pinter", Humanities press, University of Queensland press, Queensland and New York, 1970
66. Taylor John Russell, "A Room and Some Views [The Technique of Casting Doubt]." Critical Essays on Harold Pinter. Ed. Steven H. Gale. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1990
67. Taylor John Russel, "Anger and After: A Guide to the New British Drama (London: Methuen. 1962.
68. Taylor John Russel, "English Drama", Penguin Books, London.1963
69. Taylor John Russel, "Harold Pinter", Longmans, Green & Co., London. 1969.
70. Thomson David T., "Pinter, the player's playwright ", Macmillan, London and New York, 1985

71. Trussler Simon, "The Plays of Harold Pinter: an Assessment", Victor Gollancz, London, 1973
72. Vinson James (ed.), "Contemporary Dramatists", published by St. James Press & St. Martin's Press, London and New York. 1973
73. Worth Katherine, "Pinter's Scenic Imagery ". Critical Essays on Pinter. Ed. 1962.
74. Wellwarth G. " The Theatre of Protest and Paradox: Developments in the Avant-Garde Drama", MacGibbon and Kee. London. (1964).

Internet Resources:

1. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harold_Pinter#cite_note-221
2. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/existentialism/>
3. https://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_existentialism.html
4. <https://www.bl.uk/20th-century-literature/articles/nonsense-talk-theatre-of-the-absurd>

The main concepts of the dissertation are presented in the following publications:

1. **D. Mskhaladze: “Analysis of Harold Pinter’s Political Beliefs on the basis on his Nobel Prize acceptance speech”**

International Black Sea University; The 8th International Conference on Education, Language and Literature; ISSN: 2298-0180

https://ircelt.ibsu.edu.ge/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/IRCEELT-2018_Proceedings.pdf

2. **D.Mskhaladze: ”Use of Pause and Silence in Harold Pinter’s Birthday Party”**

International Black Sea University; The 6th International Research Conference on Education, English Language Teaching and English Language and Literatures in English; ISSN: 2298-0180

https://ircelt.ibsu.edu.ge/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/IRCEELT-2016_Proceedings_Web.pdf

3. **D.Mskhaladze: “Politics and Harold Pinter’s plays”**

IJAS International Conference for Academic Disciplines; 1944-6934

<http://www.universitypublications.net/ijas/0904/pdf/R6ME362.pdf>

4. **D.Mskhaladze:” Truth in Harold Pinter’s Play”**

International Black Sea University; The 5th International Research Conference on Education, English Language Teaching and English Language and Literatures in English; ISSN 2298-0180

https://ircelt.ibsu.edu.ge/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/icelt-2015_Proceedings.pdf