T.C.

ORDU UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

AT THE THRESHOLD OF 'FEAR': A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EDWARD BOND'S *THE CHAIR PLAYS* AND HAROLD PINTER'S *THE ROOM* IN THE CONTEXT OF 'CULTURE OF FEAR'

GÜZİN ŞARMAN

ADVISOR
PROF. DR. ERDİNÇ PARLAK

MASTER'S THESIS

ORDU 2021

ETİK BEYANI

Enstitü tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırladığım bu çalışmada; bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda ilgili eserlere bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu, atıfta bulunduğum eserlerin tümünü kaynak olarak gösterdiğimi, kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı, bu çalışmanın herhangi bir bölümünü bu üniversite veya başka bir üniversitede başka bir bilimsel çalışma olarak sunmadığımı beyan ederim.

Güzin ŞARMAN

TEZ ONAY SAYFASI

Güzin ŞARMAN tarafından hazırlanan "**At The Threshold of 'Fear': A Comparative Analysis of Edward Bond's *The Chair Plays* and Harold Pinter's *The Room* in the context of 'Culture of Fear'**" başlıklı bu çalışma, **06.12.2021** tarihinde yapılan değerlendirme sonucunda başarılı bulunarak, **YÜKSEK LİSANS tezi** olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan	Prof. Dr. Erdinç PARLAK, Iğdır Üniversitesi / Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi	İmza
Üye	Doç. Dr. Turgay HAN, Ordu Üniversitesi / Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi	İmza
Üye	Doç. Dr. Ahmet KAYINTU, Bingöl Üniversitesi / Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi	İmza

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

AT THE THRESHOLD OF 'FEAR': A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EDWARD BOND'S *THE CHAIR PLAYS* AND HAROLD PINTER'S *THE ROOM* IN THE CONTEXT OF 'CULTURE OF FEAR'

This study aims to analyze *The Chair Plays* by Edward Bond and *The Room* by Harold Pinter in the context of culture of fear, which is a newly created concept in the contemporary world, by drawing similarities and contrasts between them. In the light of the valuable perspectives of the writers, thinkers and sociologists such as Frank Furedi and Zygmunt Bauman and the content analysis of the plays with an interpretive approach, it is also aimed to enable a deeper interpretation on the plays from a different standpoint. It is, likewise, of significance to compare Bond's *The Chair Plays,* which presents the final structure of culture of fear as a consequence of globalized and oppressive world order, and Pinter's *The Room* which points out the beginning of culture of fear through its implications on fear, insecurity, and uncertainty. However, regarded as post-war playwrights who severely witnessed the chaotic atmosphere in post-war British society and confronted fear spreading every layer of the society, Bond and Pinter are two significant figures to be compared with regard to their attitudes and perspectives towards the world order. The evaluations of the study are presented in the conclusion part.

Key Words: Culture of fear, Insecurity, Uncertainty, *The Chair Plays*, *The Room*

ÖZET

'KORKU''NUN EŞİĞİNDE: EDWARD BOND'UN *SANDALYE OYUNLARI* VE HAROLD PINTER'IN *ODA* OYUNUNUN 'KORKU KÜLTÜRÜ' BAĞLAMINDA KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ANALİZİ

Bu çalışma Edward Bond'un *Sandalye Oyunları* ve Harold Pinter'ın *Oda* oyununu çağdaş dünyada yeni bir kavram olan korku kültürü bağlamında benzerliklerini ve farklılıklarını göstererek analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, Frank Furedi ve Zygmunt Bauman gibi sosyolog, düşünür ve yazarların ışığında, yorumlayıcı yaklaşım ve oyunların içerik analiziyle, farklı bir bakış açısından oyunlar üzerine daha derin bir yorumlama sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bond'un küreselleşmiş ve baskıcı dünya düzeninin bir sonucu olan korku kültürünün geldiği son noktayı gözler önüne seren *Sandalye Oyunları* ve korku, güvensizlik ve belirsizlik üzerine imalarıyla korku kültürünün başlangıç noktasına işaret eden *Oda* oyununu karşılaştırmak önemlidir. Bununla birlikte, savaş sonrası İngiliz toplumundaki düzensiz ortama şahitlik eden ve savaş sonrası yazarları olarak tanınan Bond ve Pinter dünya düzenine olan bakış açıları ve yaklaşımları göz önünde bulundurulduğunda kıyaslanacak iki önemli figürdür. Çalışmanın değerlendirmeleri sonuç bölümünde sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Korku kültürü, Güvensizlik, Belirsizlik, *Sandalye Oyunları*, *Oda*

INTRODUCTION

Among one of the oldest emotions which has sustained its impact on human beings from the very beginning of human existence, the emotion of fear has ceaselessly grown in the modern world. As an intense emotion triggered by a perceived threat or danger, fear is severely motivated by emotional arousal against an unwanted object. It is also considered as an intense tension created by external or internal stimuli. Highly associated with the cognition, it can be separated as twofold dimensions; rational fear which is obtained through a certain feared entity or irrational fear obtained through abstract evil forces leading to the appearance of phobias. However, in the modern world, its meaning is reshaped or even reproduced. By means of its invasion towards daily lives, it no longer necessitates external stimuli while it creates energy and motivation to reproduce itself (Bauman, 2007, p.13). With the emergence of globalization and its inevitable outcomes, this ever-lasting emotion has founded a place for itself in all societies affecting the cultures which are built upon fear. In globalized world, which makes its individuals feel at risk all the time, 'culture of fear' spreads through every layer of the society. As a recent and widely studied concept in the modern world, culture of fear does the groundwork for the insecurity, uncertainty and alienation of modern man, which is agreed by Bauman and Donskis stating "fear speaks the language of uncertainty, unsafety and insecurity, which our epoch provides in large quantities and even in abundance" (2013, p.96). In the light of this, there are several perspectives on the emergence of fear in society and as its outcome, culture of fear.

In his book *Culture of Fear* (2002), to the view of Frank Furedi, a renowned sociologist and academician, culture of fear is an unchangeable social phenomenon of modern life in which safety and comfort are hardly obtained because of wars, crime and terror penetrating into the root of the society. The world of nonmeasurable risks paves the way for the suspicion of whether a daily experience is dangerous or not. In the face of risks and sense of insecurity, in his thought, individuals are forced to cope with uncertainty about their present and future.

Zygmunt Bauman (2007), widely regarded as one of the most influential sociologists, approaches to this concept by presenting a new term; 'liquid' times which are formed through 'negative globalization' and also increases the severity

of fear and uncertainty in the modern world. Bauman asserts that in a liquid society, fear is an emotion which affects and occupies daily human activities, thus reaching deep into the foundation of society and culture. Further, Bauman depicts society as vulnerable to threats outside and not protected by the state.

Lars Svendsen (2008) suggests in his book *The Philosophy of Fear* that a person lives in an insecure sphere where s/he can be deprived of his/her threatened existence. In his view, the world stands against human beings. The philosopher also draws attention to the political fear which is created and maintained by the power which renders its subjects as captives of a threatening political sphere.

In the book *On Fear* (2013), Jiddu Krishnamurti touches upon the interrelation between thought and time which are the basic source of fear in the society. These two interwoven concepts are of significance about the emergence of fear in that a thought brings fear with itself and is reshaped as the time passes. In this sense, the individual looking back to his/her past to scrutinize with fear is also inclined to look forward with suspicion and fear.

Carlo Bordoni, in his book *State of Fear in a Liquid World*, puts an emphasis on the lack of insecurity in the modern world, which leads individuals into uncertainty towards the happenings around themselves. The author also draws attention to the oppressive regimes which create a social fear through inquisitions, oppression, militarization, and violence as much as forcing their citizens to live in a constant terror (2017).

Concerning the mentioned thoughts above, modern man driven by fear is in need of trust and security which are hardly gained due to the globalization urging individuals into alienated, insecure and uncertain towards their existence. With the great aid of globalization and socio-political environment which affect the individuals in a society, fear penetrates into the lives, thereby providing a basis to an obvious clash in social interaction and reproducing itself in a culture. As an explicit consequence of culture of fear which harms social relations and infuses fear, the deterioration of communicative behaviors triggers the insecure atmosphere between them. Incapable of communicating with others, the individuals merely existing within culture of fear are stereotyped as living entities with eternal fear as well as devoid of any human interaction. The attitudes and behaviors of the

individuals growing up within culture of fear are stimulated by external factors such as punishment, oppression, and violence as threefold mediums to spread fear in a society. Constantly vulnerable to possible dangers outside, they are presented as unguarded and fearful in the globalized world. The way they feel and behave is mostly determined by the politics, especially by the political discourse of governments. As a dominant power which can create knowledge, a government can have the function to manipulate its citizens, driving them into anxiety and fear. The basic motive of a fear-based state is to make individuals obedient and unable to question its malfunctioned structure through oppression.

Of the foremost playwrights in British drama is Edward Bond who criticizes the problematic issues in the society. His characters are depicted as liable to violence and fear led by the politics and society. In his trilogy *The Chair Plays* the setting of which is in 2077, Bond presents a totalitarian regime which subjugates its individuals with fear, terror and oppression, which are some of the basic constituents of culture of fear. The playwright attracts attention to the oppressed and obedient individuals who internalize the unquestionable rules of the authority in these plays. However, while he depicts the insecurity and its inseparable concept, the uncertainty of sort of paranoid individuals directed by fear in the globalized society, he also points out the fear-based power paving way for a dangerous future which should be immediately changed in his opinion.

There have been a few studies carried out on *The Chair Plays* that are Bond's later plays in his playwriting career. Basically, they have been studied in terms of violence, insecurity and oppression (Billingham, 2014), dystopian imagination (Chen, 2016), power (Özata & Biçer, 2021). However, there have also been studies separately done on each play in the trilogy. Young (2009) discussed paranoid futurism and totalitarianism in *Chair* whereas Chen addressed freedom and justice (2018). While Chen studied stranger and hospitality in the globalized world (2018), Dehkordi studied post-panopticism, surveillance and totalitarian regime in terms of bio-politics in *The Under Room* (2019). Further, Chen discussed subjectivity in *Have I None* (2018). In the light of these studies, it could be propounded that there have not been any studies done on these plays in terms of culture of fear. This study, herewith, aims to fill this gap in literature.

Similar to Bond's stance in terms of using fear as an element in his plays, yet different from him in some ways, Harold Pinter is also one of the most significant playwrights in Britain. Basically, dealing with implicit political issues in his earlier plays, yet explicit ones in later plays, Pinter embodies his characters as anxious and fearful against the outer world as much as within their inner world. As with his other plays, his first play *The Room* signals the insecurity and fear in the post-war society no matter how the playwright manifests the underlying subject matters in an implicit manner. Severely feeling threatened by invisible forces outside, which can be an authoritarian power, the characters are fearful about the possible dangers, mostly resulting in their approach towards one another with suspicion and uncertainty which are prevalent in culture of fear.

Although several studies have been conducted on this play, they essentially discussed the fragmentation of working-class consciousness (Stone, 2003), the concept of menace (Petráž, 2011), menace, fear and absurdity (Yılmaz, 2011), alienation (Kohzadi, Azizmohammadi & Makki, 2012), the complexity of peace and violence (Chaudhari, 2013), fear (Ansari, 2016), existential anxiety (Gairola, 2017; Dinakaran & Pravind, 2018) and switch from modernism to postmodernism (Abdel-Aal, 2019). As can be inferred, there have been several issues addressed in the play; however, it is obvious that it has not been studied in terms of culture of fear so far. This study also aims to fill this gap in literature.

Regarding these two prominent playwrights, it can be alleged that whereas Bond puts forward a macro example of culture of fear on a societal level in *The Chair Plays*, Pinter applies for a minor example with which he goes deep into the minds and psychology of his characters on a personal level in *The Room*. It is, therefore, crucial to compare these plays to understand how the playwrights reflect culture of fear in different dimensions in their works.

In the light of the abovementioned statements and the backgrounds of two post-war playwrights, this study aims at analyzing *The Chair Plays* and *The Room* in terms of culture of fear and its manifestations, thus drawing similarities and differences, which has not been studied so far. However, it would be of use to study these plays with regard to culture of fear, a more contemporary concept, which has been studied in detail by a few writers so far. As inferred, the originality of this study lies at the root of its analysis based upon a recent subject matter; culture of

fear. In the analysis of the plays, some valuable insights and perspectives of thinkers and sociologists such as Frank Furedi and Zygmunt Bauman are referred through the content analysis of the plays with an interpretive approach.

In basic terms, in the first chapter, the representation and the impacts of culture of fear are presented in brief to offer a deeper insight in the course of the analysis of the plays while addressing the perspectives of abovementioned writers. In the second chapter, the plays are separately analyzed with regard to the indications of culture of fear in consideration of the background of both Bond and Pinter. The last chapter presents the similarities and differences between *The Chair Plays* trilogy and *The Room*, thereby discussing the plays from a more contemporary stance.

CHAPTER I: CULTURE OF FEAR

The emotion of fear has been depicted as a sort of natural response against a perceived or recognized threat throughout the history of mankind. Among one of the most common emotions of human beings, it is not only a response against a threat, but also in modern context it turns out to be a habit and perspective towards the world in general (Furedi, 2018, p.96). Normally, as an emotional condition emerging in the course of danger or threat, it is interrelated to mind which creates and even inholds fear. Its connection with mind the thinking pattern of which is shaped through fear is not easily detected in such a way as to lead human beings into despair as much as doing groundwork for a psychological crisis. Unable to cope with problems and to find a solution, they lose control towards recognized threat. For some, it is, nevertheless, possible to cope with it in that "overcoming fear means learning to live with it, to control it and use it as a means of defense" (Bordoni, 2017, p.2). As for others incapable of having a control over it, they are prone to escape from the object which is out of control and increases fear, highly an unpleasant emotional state. They fear what cannot be directed and controlled (Bauman, 2006, p.94). In common sense, stimulated by the perception of threat, the emotion of fear results in twofold reactions; escaping – avoidance from threat – and showing behavioral response which means direct confrontation with threat. In either way, it turns out to be a product of human consciousness in even daily activities. The nature of fear is well presented in Bauman's definition:

> Fear is at its most fearsome when it is diffuse, scattered, unclear, unattached, unanchored, free floating, with no clear address or cause; when it haunts us with no visible rhyme or reason, when the menace we should be afraid of can be glimpsed everywhere but is nowhere to be seen. 'Fear is the name we give to our *uncertainty*: to our *ignorance* of the threat and of what is to be *done* – what can and what can't be – to stop it in its tracks – or to fight it back if stopping it is beyond our power (Bauman, 2006, p.2).

Fear and anxiety, which are intermingled emotions, can be both considered as a response of emotional state directing at a perceived danger. Yet, while fear is a sort of reaction to external threat, anxiety is the reflection of internal conflict (Foucault, 1987, p.40). Fear directly targets at a certain feared object, showing an immediate reaction which possibly calls forth violence. Slightly different from it, anxiety is a long-lasting process as an inner motivated condition. Sigmund Freud draws contrast between these two emotions by alleging that "anxiety is used in

connection with a condition regardless of any objective while fear is essentially directed toward an object" (2015, p.317). Despite their distinctive features, they also show similarities within themselves in terms of their measurability of intensity and their persistence in behaviors to which they are related. Similar to the Freud's definition based on their difference and their mentioned common ground, they can also be identified as:

> Fear is the motivation associated with a number of behaviors that normally occur on exposure to clearly threatening stimuli. Anxiety is the motivation associated with behaviors that occur to potential, signaled, or ambiguous threat. Both anxiety and fear are often measured through the intensity or persistence of the behaviors with which they are associated, and may further be assessed by their ability to be conditioned to stimuli associated with these threats (Blanchard, Blanchard, Griebel & Nutt, 2008, p.3).

Through the globalization and modernization of the world, fear along with anxiety has become more penetrating than before. Individuals have started to maintain their existence in a risky society in which an insecure atmosphere is intentionally created. Not only do they live in an insecure social environment, but they also come up against the insecurity of domestic sphere. Continuously kept on the alert towards the external forces considered as threats surrounding them, they are more driven to their own so-called secure, yet indeed insecure, places where they can stay away from the dangers of the outside world. In a constant change, modern world draws a concrete distinction between secure individual and insecure one. In this sense, it would be of significance to note:

> The secure person lives in a reliable world – the word 'secure' means 'untroubled by feelings of fear, doubt or vulnerability' – while the insecure person lives in a world that at any time can turn against him, where the basis of existence at any time can be pulled out from under his feet (Svendsen, 2008, p.12).

The unpleasant atmosphere created through crime, terror, mass immigration, diseases and mass media in the contemporary world severely affects individuals. Under the great impact of these conditions, culture, which is the integrity of social and personal values to be transferred to next generations and created/reshaped within a process, is inclined to keep pace with the contemporary world, thus reshaping and reproducing itself. One of the most possible consequences of modern living is fear which saturates culture.

In the depiction of Bauman, modern world has a fluctuant structure which shows perpetual change due to its affecting and ongoing events creating a sense of insecurity in a "security obsessed and addicted society" (Bauman & Donskis, 2013, p.28). The globalized society, where individuals are trapped within the sense of insecurity and uncertainty, has undergone a rupture from the old understanding which approaches fear as a medium underlining moral and a passage to a new understanding putting forward fear as a medium of social oppression and vulnerability. As Bauman notes, "the kind of society that, retrospectively, came to be called modern, emerged out of the discovery that human order is vulnerable, contingent and devoid of reliable foundations" (1992, p.xi). Vulnerable to outside threats such as crime and terror, the individuals are always at risk in the society which itself creates a need for secure and reliable institutions.

Through the 'negative globalization' which is a critical term by Bauman, the world order is reshaped with the emergence of 'open societies' which gives birth to the negative globalization and in which global economy is aimed to be strengthened by means of market. In these kinds of societies, market networks are unmanageable and beyond the limits due to the insecurity led by openness, which causes an outbreak of fear built upon the spread of crime, terror, and information. Bauman, in this respect, discusses the drawbacks of open societies which have:

> …the unplanned and unanticipated side-effects of 'negative globalization'
> – that is, a selective globalization of trade and capital, surveillance and
> information, violence and weapons, crime and terrorism, all unanimous in
> their disdain of the principle of territorial sovereignty and their lack of
> respect for any state boundary (2007, p.12).

Over the course of globalization, which is identified as a post-devil period by Bauman, the modern world dispossesses individuals of human properties and values. While spreading the sense of insecurity, it tries to transform them into subjugated and devoid of feelings/emotions except for fear. The Devil, which shows itself in the most devastating forms of modernity, relieves individuals of the sense of belonging, home and memory (Bauman & Donskis, 2013, p.29). Eliminating all these human properties, the modern world establishes an environment in which individuals undergo alienation. Further, in a 'liquid' society which is another created concept by Bauman and where everything is open to change and nothing is permanent, fears and dangers come into existence as liquid-like since "no walls

have been invented yet to stop them, though many try to build them" (Bauman, 2006, p.97). Having changing structures, they always reshape and reproduce themselves in different forms.

In sharing the standpoint of Bauman on globalized world, Frank Furedi presents a recent concept – culture of fear – which can be adapted into the modern world. In its most basic sense, culture of fear is a sort of reproduced culture which forces individuals into acting with such particular emotional states like fear and anxiety. Furedi defines this term as "a relatively new concept back in the 1990s, but one that gave voice to a pre-existing and pervasive sensibility of anxiety and uncertainty" (2018, p.5). The individuals growing up within culture of fear are affected and directed by external factors that can be explained as social environment, oppressive states, crime, and terror. They, however, strongly feel themselves defenseless and vulnerable to threats. Driven by intense tension and anxiety, they are also presented as powerless to act freely. In this sense, it is vital to touch upon Furedi's statement on culture of fear:

> In everyday speech, the term culture of fear carries a diffuse connotation that can encompass a variety of feelings, from unease and discomfort towards unwanted remarks and pressure to an acute sense of insecurity, powerlessness, intimidation – as well as feeling threatened by crime or terror. The term culture of fear works as a rhetorical idiom rather than as a precise concept. Its meaning is often far from clear. It is used to describe people's emotional reactions and fears towards a wide variety of phenomena (2018, p.5).

Within liquid societies, where individuals are vulnerable to possible dangers, one can come across several social phenomena which affects, directs and even reshapes human life. This case is more catalyzed by culture of fear. Also, in drawing distinction between powerful and powerless, culture of fear provides a basis for the insecurity towards unfamiliar and/or unknown which infuses social fear. Apart from the fear of death, one of the oldest fears in the history of humankind, the 'unknown' keeps its position to intimidate individuals while creating disturbance. Lovecraft addresses the fear of unknown by stating "the oldest and strongest form of fear is the fear of the unknown" (1998, p.1). Culture of fear presents the unknown as the danger from which one should immediately avoid.

Also, it lays its foundations on the surveillance of behavior patterns in such a way as to create a sort of panoptic society. The surveillance mechanism, which is

deliberately founded and consolidated, enables the oppressive power to infuse fear that is used as a medium to subjugate individuals. Under the undeniable influence of culture of fear with its outcomes such as surveillance and oppression, freedom cannot be easily obtained in such a manner as to make itself fragile in the modern world. In need of security which cannot also be reached, individuals tend to stop their pursuit of freedom having been questioned in the recent years more than before. In other words, there is no room for the freedom of the individuals living within culture of fear.

The standardization of human beings as much as their living emerges as one of the most intended consequences of culture of fear endeavoring to eliminate individual differences which are supposed to be recognized as threats for oppressive totalitarian states. As it is obvious, not only do the individuals fear in the modern society, but also the states are insecure about how they keep their position and maintain their threatened existence. Through the aim of extricating itself from the sense of insecurity, it uses every means possible via using media as a weapon to terrorize individuals.

On the other hand, mass media plays a big role in creating culture of fear in that it has the capability of spreading news, either real or fabricated, the impact of which is observed as frightening on human mind. Furedi identifies the role of media in a similar way; "As an institution, the media plays a significant role in the cultivation of the landscape of fear" (2018, p.5). In the globalized world, its fundamental objective is to change individual into passive and unresponsive ones by means of manipulative language usage. The news of crime, terror, mass immigration and wars are intentionally apt to be exaggerated by the media itself, thus giving rise to pervasive fear.

Besides the considerable impact of mass media, culture of fear is nourished by mass immigration. Through the globalization of the world and open societies as its production, mass immigration led by wars and terrors or unsatisfying life standards has turned out to be a socio-political problem which can no longer be avoided. With its outbreak in the contemporary period, immigrants and refugees considered as aliens or strangers have started to be outside dangers threatening ordinary life after their unwanted arrival. A sense of growing hatred towards immigrants, which is linked with fear, comes to the forefront as something

inevitable since "fear nurtures hatred, and hatred nurtures fear" (Bauman & Donskis, 2013, p.96). In the context of culture of fear, besides hatred directing at immigrants, they are approached with suspicion of whether their presence is a threat to the fragile security of individuals in the globalized world.

Apart from the arrival of immigrants to the 'safe' lands, in the modern society, individuals have become more suspicious of everything around them, even of neighbors who can turn out to be outside dangers. Fueled by the increasing tension created by immigrants, crime, violence, and terror in the society, the sense of insecurity is more expanded to the degree of seeing familiar people as potential threats. Caused by the reactions against immigrants and unfamiliar people, individuals are more withdrawn to their safe places the only duty of which is to protect them from external world. As a consequence of this, "the destructive dynamic of individualism" (Furedi, 2002, p.139) developed by the global world displays its reflections in social context. In basic, it is possible to define individualism which:

> without a parallel process of reintegration into some new social network can contribute to the creation of an atmosphere of mistrust. In particular it has the effect of altering the interactions between people. Where once neighbors and colleagues might have been seen as friends and allies, today they are more likely to be perceived as competitors and as potential threats (Furedi, 2002, p.141).

In an atmosphere of mistrust and through the problematization of daily life, the dynamics of social interaction are entirely changed. However, this case leads individuals into a gradual process of alienation which has twofold indications; social alienation and self-alienation. Seemingly deprived of any social interaction, they become alienated from the society at first, and then from themselves. In a sense, their external stress and anxiety is transformed into an internal one, thereby being alienated from their true 'selves'.

A society under the effect of fear plants uncertainty along with insecurity in its root as well. In the course of globalization and within a stage of unawareness about the consequences of behaviors and actions, the fear-based society is governed through insecurity and uncertainty; twofold constituents of fear. Increasing uncertainty about human interaction intensifies the fear that anything bad can occur (Furedi, 2002, p.109). Individuals unwillingly resign their freedom while struggling to obtain security which is "about preventing adverse consequences from the

intentional and unwarranted actions of others" (Schneier, 2003, p.11). Yet, within a negatively globalized society, security comes forward as a rare sense which cannot be obtained (Bauman, 2007, p.11), thereby paving the way for its counterpart; insecurity. In modern societies where the sense of insecurity threatens human existence, there is, likewise, no room for certainty. The modern world pervaded by "unsafety, insecurity and uncertainty – this holy trinity of modernity" (Bauman & Donskis, 2013, p.176) opens its gates to multidimensional dangers which manifest itself in every segment of the society.

In a basic sense, terrorized by global problems such as wars, terrorism, crime and violence, the world order does the groundwork for the creation of culture of fear which brings unsafety, insecurity and uncertainty with itself as much as it shows its existence in both social and personal spheres.

CHAPTER II: CULTURE OF FEAR IN THE PLAYS

Showing similar perspectives towards the age in which they live, Edward Bond and Harold Pinter are considered as two remarkable playwrights of post-war Britain. They both reflect the flaws of the society and politics in their plays the basic constituent of which is formed through criticism directing at these flaws. However, Bond is more interested in making overt criticism of his time in his works from the very beginning of his playwriting career whereas Pinter shows implicit criticism in his early plays. The common point which gathers these playwrights is the fear, anxiety and insecurity of their characters. In this chapter, *The Chair Plays* (*Chair, The Under Room* and *Have I None*) by Edward Bond and *The Room* by Harold Pinter are separately analyzed in terms of culture of fear and its tokens in the plays.

2.1. Edward Bond and *The Chair Plays*

Born in 1934 in London as a child of a working-class family, Edward Bond experienced the terrifying period led by the outbreak of World War II during his childhood. Following his debut on drama with *The Pope's Wedding* in 1962, he left his mark on British stage by means of his widely criticized work, *Saved* (1965) in which a baby is stoned to death. By taking his background into consideration, the main cause of writing such disturbing scenes in his plays is the fact that he could not remain unresponsive against the bombings, wars, death of civil people and destructive memories related to the chaotic environment in Britain during the pre-/post-war. As a consequence, these issues formed the basis of his influential works. Acknowledged as a post-war playwright who harshly criticizes the problematic issues appearing in British society during the wartime, he uncovers his anger and criticism through drama where he attempts to face his audience/readers with the realities of his time, thus raising their consciousness. In the light of his tough past, Bond explicates the severity of war with such words in the book *The Hidden Plot: Notes on Theatre and The State* in this manner:

> I was first bombed when I was five. The bombing went on till I was eleven. Later the army taught me ten ways to kill my enemy. And the community taught me a hundred ways to kill my neighbour. I saw there was no justice between one part of the community and another. An injustice is like a pebble, dropped in the centre of the ocean (2000b, p.2).

As can be inferred from his background, widely reputed for his political stance, which is clearly reflected in his dramatic works, Edward Bond approaches

deeply-rooted social problems in an aggressive manner. His concern about the social problems such as violence, corruption, capitalism, wars, injustice, and dehumanization of modern man is skillfully presented in his shocking plays. While he uses his works like weapons pointing at the diseased society, his "remorseless questioning of human existence and human society has been pursued through a new language of political drama that centers upon the human and our responsibility to create 'humanness'" (Billingham, 2014, p.17). Among the problems with which he explicitly deals, violence as a "release of aggression created by the dehumanizing restrictions and of an industrialized society" (Scharine, 1976, p.67) and its source, which is widely prevalent in culture of fear, is the most studied subject matter. Rather than searching for the cause of these problems in the nature of humankind, he intends to find the source of them in the root of spoiled society which should be reformed and cured in its essence. In a sense, he examines the catastrophic present day laden with many problems, thus benefiting from the past. Under the very influence of some significant playwrights such as Bertolt Brecht, Samuel Beckett and Harold Pinter, he blends political elements with absurd ones in his drama. Also, in pursuing the understanding of 'Angry Young Men' that is a kind of literary movement criticizing the post-war consequences in the society and is given a start with the play *Look Back in Anger* (1956) by John Osborne, the playwright seeks for a reformation or even revolution on British stage.

When his later plays are analyzed in detail, it can be observed that he shows an obvious departure from the mainstream of British theatre. He points the modern society and its ideological structures as a target in the globalized world in a more sophisticated sense than before. His newly-created characters become the embodiment of the chaotic modern British society. In other words, he urges hic characters to exist in harsh conditions and moral contradictions, thus adapting himself into the dark European history in the twentieth century through the end of Enlightenment (Chen, 2018, p.19). Distancing himself from the dramaturgy of his previous successful works and introducing a different setting and plot, he directs his attention to the possible future of humankind in *The Chair Plays*. In this Orwellian trilogy the setting of which is in 2077, the common and chief subject matter to be addressed is both a dystopic and apocalyptic future of fearful human beings. In connecting the 'past' with the 'future', Bond calls attention to the

'present' as a cornerstone to evaluate the past and create the future with the purpose of making way of a better world rather than a dystopia in which fear reigns. Basically, Bond presents an aggressive trilogy with *The Chair Plays* in which dystopic elements are scattered through the scenes and a totalitarian state exerts dominance over both internal and external sphere of the individuals. Likewise, it may be crucial to note upon the plays that:

> In *The Chair Plays*, where fear and disaster created by the power in the minds and bodies of the characters are presented in a striking way, the latent forces holding the government come to the fore as a suppressive, restrictive, and authoritarian structure (Özata & Biçer, 2021, p.230).

From the very beginning of modernity, people have become more fearful about and suspicious of their uncertain future to the degree of forgetting their past and being unable to live in the present with fear and terror, which is the basic groundwork of culture of fear. In addition to be fearful about future, they have started to question the novel creation of 'future of fear'. There hereby starts a smooth transition "from fear of the future and to a future of fear" (Furedi, 2018, p.66). On the other hand, culture of fear is nourished by past experiences and memories. Its accumulative structure leads individuals to an internal fear about the future. In basic, culture of fear in the present day, which has already designed future, is enhanced and promoted by its bleak version of the past (Furedi, 2018, p.210). With regard to this, Bond's interrelation of times also finds a place for itself in the statements of Furedi; "The relationship between the present and the future depends on how society feels about itself today. Fears about the future are linked anxieties about problems today" (2002, p.18). Similarly, drawing attention to the dystopic nature of the trilogy, Chen (2016) remarks that "the futuristic imagination is closely related to the understanding of our present crisis, the roots of which are in the past" (p.33). In addition to Bond's connection between three-time lines in the trilogy, as quite a skilled dramatist at making an insightful observation towards his age, he draws a picture of a totalitarian, yet indeed an invisible, state which spreads terror and fear throughout the society in these plays produced in the early years of twenty-first century.

Along with an intention to shed light on the realities of the present day as well as pointing out the future, the dramatist portrays a society which is in a violent war with itself as all human beings live in a modern society where "the exercise of

power is typically invisible, but it controls its objects by making them highly visible" (Gutting, 2005, p.86). In Bondian dystopic world of *The Chair Plays*, all human beings are dehumanized, all houses are standardized according to the enforcement of the authority, consumerism is eliminated while the living standards of individuals are minimalized and family life is destroyed. Lacking any human contact in social context, they are kept far away from socialization. In line with this, detached from their past, alienated to one another and constantly in the mood of anxiety and fear, the characters in *The Chair Plays* are presented as the embodiment of insecure and uncertain individuals in the contemporary period. All the characters in the plays are insecure within their current conditions and uncertain about their future. In this aspect, Bauman emphasizes:

> Fear is arguably the most sinister of the demons nesting in the open societies of our time. But it is the insecurity of the present and uncertainty about the future that hatch and breed the most awesome and the least bearable of our fears (Bauman, 2007, pp.25-26).

In Bondian context, playing a sort of role as a mirror to the dark future, this trilogy puts forward a world defeated by insecurity as well as uncertainty and a culture defeated by fear itself. Likewise, the playwright delineates a post-panoptic society the purpose of which is to control, supervise and punish its individuals in these plays. In this regard, it is useful to touch upon the definition of 'Panopticism' made by Foucault who adapts this concept into the modern society:

> Panopticism is one of the characteristic traits of our society. It's a type of power that is applied to individuals in the form of continuous individual supervision, in the form of control, punishment, and compensation, and in the form of correction, that is the molding and transformation of individuals in terms of certain norms. This threefold aspect of panopticism – supervision, control, correction – seems to be a fundamental and characteristic dimension of the power relations that exist in our society (2001, p.70).

As distinguished from the design of panopticon by Jeremy Bentham, which is depicted as a kind of utopia where every segment of society is well organized and practiced, Bond's panoptic world in the play is more of dystopian in which individuals are deprived of social security and vulnerable to dangers outside.

2.1.1. Culture of Fear in *Chair*

Broadcasted on BBC Radio 4 in 2000 for the first time, *Chair*, the first stage production of which is at the Avignon Festival in 2006 by Alain Françon, is one of

the futuristic plays in the trilogy. The play is basically "concerned with the portrayal of the tragedies of inactive characters forced to live a sort of life imposed on them, not as they would like" (Özata & Biçer, 2021, p.230). It bears direct implications about a futuristic dystopia in which a totalitarian state, which renders its people fearful and manifests itself in every layer of society, paves the way for the abolishment of the past, violence, trauma, strict control mechanisms like 'soldiers', and collapse of domestic life. Under a considerable impact of all these happenings in the play, fear penetrates through the streets, inside the houses and even the inner sides of the characters who have already been accustomed to live in culture of fear.

Before the analysis of the play in the context of culture of fear, it is useful to summarize it in brief. The opening scene of the play starts with a presentation of a closed room with a single window covered with heavy curtains in such a way as to protect the room from any external danger (Bond, 2006). In an alert condition, Alice, the main character in the play, shuttles between the window and the inside whereas Billy, a grown-up man yet behaves in a childish manner, draws pictures. As obviously seen in the conversation of these two characters, Billy is kept hidden from the authority for any reason by Alice who finds him in the street. In the small room, succumbed to her curiosity towards the outside world, Alice sees a soldier and an old woman as a prisoner waiting in the bus stop in the street when she looks out of the window. As Marilyn Stasio states in *Daily Variety Gotham*, "Alice appears to be a withdrawn and properly downtrodden citizen of the Orwellian world outside her window" (2008, p.25). The moment when she sees the old exhausted woman in the clothes of a prisoner, she feels an instant feeling of acquaintance and pity for her and a drive to take a chair in the room to meet and help her in some sort. No matter how Billy tries to dissuade her from going down there in spite of his first persistence to Alice in going and asking the name of Prisoner, she rushes out the street with the chair, thereby approaching to the old woman and Soldier who escorts her. There appears a strange encounter with Prisoner as if these two women met before and there was a familial bond between them, which is not specifically clarified by the playwright.

As demonstrated in the play, Soldier as an agent of the authority does not welcome Alice for her kind behavior, thus threatening and questioning her about the real motive behind this unusual behavior. Meanwhile, Prisoner bites Alice

shocked by the unexpected move, which is most probably the only way she knows to communicate with others. The incident occurring beyond the control of the Soldier, who is either confused or terrified, leads to the death of Prisoner at the end. Soon after Prisoner's sudden death, the secure shelter of Alice is visited by a 'Welfare' Officer who makes inquiries about the incident. Frightened and anxious about the possibility of her secret - hiding Billy from the authority - to be exposed, she keeps Billy in another room until the end of inquiry. In the meantime, Welfare Officer carries out a disturbing inquiry in which Alice's testimony is all recorded to be kept as evidence. Once the inquiry ends in suspense, Alice takes an action to get rid of Billy's drawings, which may be either a kind of reminiscent for the past or a kind of mirror to the frightening future, and hangs herself. Moreover, she guides him to a car park to scatter the dust, which will be delivered to him by unknown men and is possibly the ashes of her after she dies. Even though Billy is not satisfied with Alice's leaving, he fulfills his given mission, which calls forth his being shot and dead in the car park at last (Bond, 2006).

Culture of fear with which violence intertwines within the society makes itself evident in *Chair* where a dystopian atmosphere prevails. All the characters including the Soldier are fearful, uncertain and insecure about the way they live, feel, and exist as well. The external world is accepted utterly dangerous, fearsome and threatening in terms of the agents of oppressive power and strangers wandering around the streets. There are no reliable ties between people, all of whom are in the pursuit of self-interest and their own security. That is to say, all people are in danger and they are counted as possible dangers to one another while adopting three roles; victimized, victimizer and collateral casualties (Bauman, 2006, p.98). Bond, therefore, draws a picture of a society, the root of which is based on fear and that renders its individuals as slaves of fear by means of this play. The first implication on fear rooting from the oppressive but unseen authority is much felt in the conversation between Alice and Billy about his insistent request to look out of the window:

> **Billy** Shant! I cant look out of the window. You never let me look out when
> I want. I shant let you see my drawing. It's a good one.
> **Alice** You must be seen –
> **Billy** I'd be careful
> **Alice** – then there'd be trouble (Bond, 2006, p.113).

A normal act in a domestic life such as one's looking out of his/her window is threatening in the world of the characters due to some dangers like an unexpected interference by the authority, crimes and uninvited visitors. As Svendsen agrees, "dangers threaten us everywhere: in dark streets and inside our homes, with strangers and with those closest to us, in nature as well as in technology, inside our bodies as well as in external forces" (2008, p.12). In response to this, in culture of fear, human beings are always on the alert as if there could be a bad thing on a sudden behind locked doors and they are directed by fear, which may be inferred from the statements of Alice to Billy; "…Lock the door. Dont open it to anyone" (Bond, 2006, p.117). Isolated from the outer world, yet indeed watchful, Alice sets her house with two rooms as a secure shelter for both Billy and herself since all the actions of citizens in public places are continuously monitored and investigated. From the aspect of culture of fear, everything is controlled by the unseen authority and is bound up with its the allowance in the play. However, the totalitarian state the chief goal of which is to intimidate its citizens with fear seems succeeding in its mission with the aid of the Soldier of which is frightened in the conversation of Alice and Billy:

> **Alice** I'm just taking a chair for the soldier
> **Billy** No no! Don't go! If you go I'll get lost!
> **Alice** You cant get lost in two little rooms
> **Billy** I can! I can! I get lost in my head! You dont understand! Dont go! O dear! (*Sobs.*) I'm naughty! It's my fault! I shouldnt have said about the chair. (*Wail.*) The soldier wont let you come back! He frightens me! (Bond, 2006, p.116).

For Billy, to step outside from their own safe and so-called comfortable zone is a dangerous act in that it may possibly lead to any fatal consequences in aspect of their sense of security. Rather than involving in a case taking place in an insecure street, Billy prefers to keep silent and just observant against it, thereby making Alice stay out of the outside world. Highly overwhelmed by her curiosity towards Prisoner which revives her distracted memories about her mother, Alice cannot resist herself to meet her. Stuck between difficult choices, she tries to continue her existence in a dangerous political sphere. This point is clarified in the depiction of Alice:

> Alice is an example of the many women in Bond's work, stretching back across his entire output, who are troubled, complex and facing problematic choices. She and they are caught in a tangled, complex web of social,

cultural conditions and often forced to exist within harshly oppressive political environments (Billingham, 2014, p.147).

With the dangerous choice of Alice, the secure shell is shattered and laid open to the dangerous world. Despite her living led by fear itself, she shows unexpected courage to enter into an insecure sphere. Her real motive is most probably her longing for a real conversation with real people outside. Like the character Alice in the play, in the modern age under the influence of culture of fear, the individuals are just 'wanderers' who have already forgotten how to contact with others. Chen interprets the attitude of Alice in a similar way:

> She knows what the authority demands for the common good, but she never regards her action as an overt violation of the rule. Instead, she tries to secure a space in which the authority might cease to operate, the rule fails to apply, and authentic human relations are possible (2016, p.44).

Putting her life at risk, she reveals herself in front of the oppressive authority the chief goal is to deprive her of security and to surveil her. Related to the condition of Alice, it is a need to touch upon the issue in aspect of security/insecurity in such way:

> Insecurity can also lead to observing the world without being involved in it. When fear is stronger than the desire to move, to take risks, to get involved, the individual prefers to observe unseen, from a place that seems privileged, but that really has no appeal: from a safe place where nothing can happen, where nothing can reach, because it is deprived of any direct contact (Bordoni, 2017, p.10).

In the pursuit of establishing a kind of bond with Prisoner, Alice becomes the target of Soldier, the exerciser of repressive power. The agents of the authority are expected to be fearless in that they are the constitutive parts of the system. Yet, within a culture of fear, they also turn into uncertain and fearful individuals who are constantly alienated from both outer and inner sphere. They are not in the position of a protector for citizens, but of an executioner of ultimate power. Herewith, in a place where there is no protection and security, each individual is considered as a threat to one another. This circumstance is even valid between Soldier as an authoritarian agent and Alice as a normal citizen, which is clarified in Soldier's remarks; "…Stay there. No closer" (Bond, 2006, p.117) or in his statements while looking at the windows of the buildings to see who watches "…Take yer chair – take yer chair 'n go" (Bond, 2006, p.119). He seems quite uneasy over against the possibility to be seen by other citizens who can endanger

his position since Alice's courageous act is considered as unexpected and unwanted for the authority. In a similar way, Billingham notes that:

> The Soldier and his actions are driven and dominated by the ideological demands and constraints placed upon him. This engenders a fear that if the incidents with Alice and the Prisoner become public knowledge, he will be severely punished (2017, p.149).

Within a culture of fear where violence and terror penetrate into every segment of society, an individual is not familiar to any humane feeling and emotion except for fear. There is no room for humanness. In other words, one loses all features and values what make him/her a human being. This becomes more apparent in the response of Alice to Welfare Officer; "She'd forgotten what pity was. She wasnt used to it. I was the only person who didnt hit her. She took that for a sign of kindness. It was the kindness that frightened her" (Bond, 2006, p.136). Thus, it is not shocking that Alice's kindness seen as unusual by others is highly confusing in the eyes of Soldier who has never encountered such situation before. With a thought that there is another hidden motive under her visible kindness, Soldier is both terrified and confused in the face of a good deed. Directing his confusion and anger towards other citizens living in the same neighborhood, he starts to spread terror while shouting, waving his rifle around and threatening them.

On the other hand, ones living in a culture of fear are always kept under surveillance, discipline and oppression by the authoritarian power. Its basic objective is to render its subjects inactive and insecure even in their safe places in such a manner as to eradicate the possibility of any threatening attempt from individuals for the functioning of the system. This case is clearly seen in the words of Soldier who is in panic:

> No! No! (*Struggling*.) Give me the chair! Or - ! (*Sees faces in Windows*.) I tol' yer t' – (*Goes towards houses. Waves rifle*.) Git! I tol' yer! I got yer numbers! – I know 'oo yer - ! I'll - ! (*He has frightened them from the windows*.) Yeh! Thass it! Stay there! – out a' sight! (*Sees someone at a window*.) An yer! I know yer be in that curtain! Believe me, the less yer see the better. (*Looks along the houses*.) All a' yer! (Bond, 2006, p.121).

According to the quote above, annoyed Soldier transforms into an embodiment of external threat, which is common in culture of fear, rather than a moral practitioner of the power maintaining system. In contrast with the practice of authoritarian power in the play, a reliable system is supposed to set human beings free from dangers and from situations having great control over them (Foucault,

2001, p.366). Yet, the system is obliged to change due to the arrival of modernity which accelerates culture of fear. Bauman also points out the expected function of the power in such manner; "Modern power was first and foremost about the entitlement to manage people, to command, to set the rules, to conduct and extort obedience to the rules" (2001, p.40). Compared to its real function, the power in culture of fear chooses to infuse uncertainty, insecurity and fear pervading through social structures to make individuals be on alert all the time. The only thing about which one is certain is a strong likelihood of occurrence of a bad thing, which can be seen in the sureness of Alice after the incident with Prisoner and Soldier; "Someone will come. Be sent. There'll be an inquiry" (Bond, 2006, p.125). Being continuously controlled and surveilled by a totalitarian state, individuals experience existential crisis which provokes insecurity and fear. Since "surveillance is the central dimension of modernity" (Bauman & Lyon, 2013, p.9), one is forced to act and live with anxiety and fear according to the enforcement of authority in the modern era.

Also, every single action one takes in public is supposed to be monitored to eliminate the danger for the authority. This circumstance is well detailed in the conversation between Alice and Welfare Officer during the inspection. In addition to the unseen but highly felt authority in the play, the mechanisms of surveillance including the soldiers and officers are also informational technology such as recording devices and laptops which contains personal information about the individuals. Because it is easy to recognize them with the inquiry "recorded in documents that provide detailed information about the individuals examined and allow power systems to control them" (Gutting, 2005, p.86). Despite the emotion of fear as an outcome of this process, everything should be organized and in order. The function of inspection is everlasting and monitoring is available everywhere (Foucault, 1995, p.195). Being inspected and monitored by Welfare Officer with these devices increases the severity of fear and Alice is surrendered by high tension in the room. The statements of Welfare Officer on the incident contributes to this tension to rise:

> …The soldier states that you observed him from – it would be this window – for three hours two minutes. (Switches off the recorder.) At a time of unrest when all movements must be monitored three hours forty-seven minutes is not overlong to wait for a bus but (She switches on the recorder.)

three hours two minutes is a long time to keep watch from a window on a
quiet street. You would agree. (Bond, 2006, p.131).

As deduced from the quotation above, a simply innocent act is counted as a
danger in the eyes of the authority. The 'observer' and the 'observed' changes their
places, which is an unwanted and undesirable case for the ones who hold power "in
our modern post-Devil era" (Bauman & Donskis, 2013, p.21). Only the authority
itself can monitor its subjects. Through culture of fear, an individual is always
confronted with devastating events such as crime, terrorism, and totalitarian regime
in the modern world, but s/he is the one who should feel insecure, fearful, monitored
and uncertain.

In Bondian dystopia, as an outcome of culture of fear, the concept of
alienation is handled in detail by way of his characters in *Chair*. The act of
alienating oneself, transforming into another, being unable to recognize oneself and
to be recognized is both a mental disorder and a triggered existential crisis, which
is considerably prevalent in the globalized world (Bordoni, 2017, p.56).
Surveillance mechanism also has a great impact on the alienation of the individuals,
thus harming the social relationship between them. Driven by fear, one first
becomes alienated from his/her acquaintances and then from him/herself within a
gradual process. In line with this, the statements of Los are such as to support this
idea; "Surveillance and globalization have contributed to detraditionalization,
desocialization and atomization of society and a displacement of the Self" (2006,
p.71). The dynamics of social relations in a fear-infusing society changes and gives
its place to loneliness, isolation and alienation at last.

In the play, Billy, the adopted son of Alice, is portrayed as unaware of his
own mind and body whereas he cannot connect his past with present. Although he
is a grown-up man, he thinks like a child and behaves in a childish manner,
distancing himself from his true self. Incapable of recognizing himself as an
individual, he is driven to be a 'stranger' towards his inner and outer world because
of the oppressive external forces. The main reason of his alienation is that the
individual turns into more isolated and lonelier when s/he is caught by powerful
outside forces, making him/herself a real 'individual' but a puzzled and an insecure
one (Fromm, 2001, p.104). Disconnected with the 'self' as a consequence of the

fear-spreading society, one no longer recognizes oneself as a human entity. In this sense, it might be useful to mention:

> In popular parlance, 'alienation' is typically associated with feelings of isolation, hopelessness, powerlessness, loss, anxiety, frustration, despair, and/or loneliness. These sensations arise because the individual explicitly perceives and experiences some sort of disconnection between his perception of what/who he is and what/who he thinks he should be (Rae, 2011, p.1).

In the condition of Bill, the split between who he should be and how he should behave impels him into experiencing a severe confusion. Further, not only does his alienation occur against himself, but also against the society. Trying to exist in a four-walls closed area which has already been the prison of his existence, he gradually becomes alienated from the outside world as it is inferred in his instant death by unknown person when he goes out to fulfill the duty given by Alice. As soon as he leaves his secure place, he cannot comply with the newly created social order where fear makes its presence felt. Bordoni notes upon this circumstance in this way:

> …*Isolation* from the outside world often results in a separation from the home community, in an existential loneliness that can lead to mental alienation. Because the increased risk incurred by this insecure society is exasperated individualization, unhealthy loneliness, the breakdown of informal social relations and a net loss of social capital, that is, of that precious cultural heritage that develops thanks to personal interrelation processes and is based on mutual trust (2017, p.50).

However, he is not the only one who is forcibly alienated from himself within a society governed by culture of fear. Prisoner, who is most probably the mother of Alice, cannot identify social relations anymore. In experiencing a psychological breakdown and existential crisis, she is unable to communicate with others to the extent that she forgets how to speak and bites Alice. As alienated from her own nature, the only way to express herself is a sort of attack the motive of which is left unknown, which brings the ambiguity of her past and crime she has committed to mind. Obviously, fear can direct and motivate attacks (Svendsen, 2008, p.30), which may provide some relief by giving a chance to escape from it for the attacker.

Just like Prisoner, Alice is depicted as an alienated figure, which comes into view in her suicide provoked by the unwanted, but expected, visit of the authority. In an age of alienation that claims self-harm (Bloom & Hobby, 2009, p.xvi), Alice

challenges the authority with her decision to take the chair to the Prisoner and/or to commit suicide by overcoming her fear in some way in contrast to the other characters in the play. She has a lasting inner conflict between her fear and her attempt to act against fear (Chen, 2018, p.144). Although she no longer seems a captive of fear, she dies as an alienated individual due to her self-harming act. This case becomes more apparent in her last words; "I was never here. I was never anywhere. I never was. I was nothing. Not even a piece of dust" (Bond, 2006, p.141). Absence of belongingness to somewhere is one of the possible outcomes of culture of fear. When culture of fear is taken into consideration, her suicide signals the overcoming of fear and gaining free will and freedom that is limited on a large scale; however, she is incapable of regaining feeling of belongingness. From the perspective of an authoritarian power, this situation is clearly unwelcomed. The individuality of the individual and the freedom of the free are under threat by power-holders (Bauman, 1997, p.249) as much as they are seen as the threat for power itself. Regarding this, it is significant to state that the factor which continuously provokes power and inheres in it is the insubordination of will and the determination of freedom (Foucault, 2014, p.76)[1]. As Foucault indicates, one's request for freedom and free will belongs to the judgment of power.

With regard to crime which produces fear in society, it may be alleged that it is a highly debatable issue in *Chair*. Whether an act is crime or not depends on the provision of the totalitarian regime in the play. Any act driven by humane feelings can be regarded as a crime as illustrated in Welfare Officer's accusation directed at Alice for taking the chair to Prisoner; "Unauthorised communication with escortees is strictly forbidden" (Bond, 2006, p.132). In the process of treating an innocent act in itself as a crime, Prisoner's being named as 'escortee', not 'prisoner' has an aim to decrease the tension in the room as well as to draw a sympathetic picture of the authority which "welcomes frank expression of public opinion" (Bond, 2006, p.132). However, Welfare Officer emphasizes once more that Alice has committed a crime against the authority by communicating with Prisoner:

> Criminals are public enemies. They cannot be tolerated. You would agree
> if you knew the harm and suffering they cause. Pity for them is an insult to
> the law. It is a conspiracy with the criminal to aid and abet the crime. You

---

[1] This sentence is translated to English from the book written in Turkish.

see what I am suggesting. You took the chair down to the prisoner out of pity (Bond, 2006, p.134).

With a reference to Foucault who states "the criminal is the social enemy" (2001, p.54), Welfare Officer underlines the strict rules of the authority. During the oppressive inquiry, Alice is forced to admit what she has done is a crime against society. In this context, Foucault defines the concept of crime in such a way that "A crime is not something related to sin and transgression; it is something that harms society; it a social injury, a trouble, a disturbance for the whole of society" (2001, p.53). Even if Alice's motiveless act brings about the death of the Prisoner, she is considered as a public enemy since she creates 'social unrest'. But in the eyes of the authority, this unrest is more of a political one targeting at the authority itself.

The violation of the legal order by individuals like Alice creates a kind of distrust within the authority which approaches with caution to its subjects. Not only do the individuals feel insecure and fearful, but also the authority maintains its existence in uncertainty and insecurity towards the characters in the play. In a modern age where technology takes the lead and can have harmful effects on people's lives as much as it has advantages, even daily conversations of people, who are allegedly suspects in the eyes of the authority, can be threatening for the system as referred in the statements of Welfare Officer in the pursuit of understanding the content of the conversation between Alice and Prisoner:

> Could you say what sort of noise? Noises have meaning. Was the escortee communicating by suggestion? Even code? The idea will seem risible to a member of the public. It should not. Even eyelids have been used on occasion. The number of blinks is enciphered. Messages of fatal consequence had been passed in even more recherche forms. (*No answer.*) Could you help me by imitating the noise made? I'm trained in ciphering (Bond, 2006, p.133).

Highly suspicious of its citizens who wish for freedom and free will, a totalitarian regime applies for strict rules to keep them in control and order. It essentially aims at preventing potential dangers against the system such as 'kindness', a good characteristic feature which the authority wants to eradicate. This ordinary act triggers the intrusion of the authority into the secluded place of Alice and Billy, which calls forth their deaths at last (Young, 2009, p.55). In fact, all the characters are victimized by the system by being killed without any legal trial, which provokes the emotion of fear in the society and decreases trust for the

authority. As Chen suggests, "without any standard legal procedures, Prisoner and Billy are deprived of their lives by the sovereign power" (2016, p.38). Not only are these two figures victimized by the system, but also the character Alice is forced to deprive of her existence by the oppression of the system.

In broad terms, in *Chair*, Bond presents fearful, insecure and uncertain characters within a totalitarian world which is governed by fear. They are portrayed as oppressed and alienated from themselves and society. Unable to sustain their life with unendurable feelings and emotions such as fear as much as to recall their past, they are pictured as stuck within a culture and a society of fear.

2.1.2. Culture of Fear in *The Under Room*

First staged by Chris Cooper in Northampton in 2005, *The Under Room* is one of the dystopic plays in the trilogy. It is set in a cellar with a chair and a tin box in 2077 when a totalitarian regime exercises power over its citizens in the society. The characters are as follow; Joan, Dummy Actor (Dummy) and Jack. The play by which Bond investigates the questionable hospitality in an insecure society, threatening outside world, conditions of immigrants as 'strangers' or 'others', and oppressive power introduces fearful individuals seeking for a shelter for themselves. The playwright displays a micro example of individuals who live in fear under totalitarian oppression whereas he places the problems of the characters victimized by totalitarianism in the core of the play, thus referring to refugee crisis (Özata & Biçer, 2021, p.235)[2] that is prevalent in the modern world. It would be vital to note upon the play:

> Bond stages a dystopia within which surveillance and capitalistic administrations have devastated the social communication, and terrorism has impinged on the citizens' lives. In this dystopia, panopticism and surveillance are conveyed by informational technologies and data control (Dehkordi, 2019, p.38).

The most attention-grabbing character in the play is most probably 'Dummy' who is a basic human effigy made up of trunk, arms, legs, and head and whose words are spoken by Dummy Actor animating this lifeless object (Bond, 2005). In a secluded area, all these characters reveal their existential anxiety and miseries led by the era to which they do not belong whereas they are gradually

---

[2] This sentence is translated to English from the article written in Turkish.

dehumanized "in a foreseeable but futuristic Britain of 2077" (Billingham, 2014, p.131). The authority catalyzes this case by way of the abolishment of the past, thus transforming its subjects into inactive and obedient ones.

To summarize the play in brief, it begins with a closed cellar which has only one entrance through the stairs. Joan, the owner of the cellar, pushes Dummy - not Dummy Actor – down the stairs while charging him with housebreaking. He sits on the single chair under which there is a box. The Dummy Actor is not acknowledged by Joan as though he was not existed on the stage. Dummy is depicted as a kind of intruder considered as an outside threat. Dummy Actor who speaks the words of Dummy tries to convince Joan about his real intention that is hiding from soldiers, not stealing anything from her. When he finally persuades her about his identity as a 'shoplifter', he reveals his past filled with violence and pain as an illegal immigrant without 'official papers' in a wholly strange place. He also declares that he has killed his mother with a knife which he still carries and "represents the violence required to resist the rules imposed by the authorities; it is also a reminder of how he was forced to kill his mother by the soldiers" (Chen, 2018, p.203). As soon as Joan believes in him, she decides to help him with the aid of legal documents she intends to obtain from the authority legally or illegally. Only with these documents Dummy can go back to his country safely. However, it is not easy to have an access to the documents legitimately. Jack, both a criminal and a state official, appears in the cellar, thus accepting to hand over the documents in exchange for money. But it is clear that Dummy and Joan does not have enough money to gain freedom and to flee to a safe country. As corrupted by the system and a greedy man in a mercenary society, Jack loses his temper, stating that he will not help them and goes out. Confronted with Jack's anger, Dummy and Joan become helpless. In fear that authority can come to the cellar upon the possibility of Jack's spying on them, Joan suggests escaping from the authoritarian forces as well as from Jack who is an immoral individual. Yet, Dummy does not want to go out no matter how she tries to persuade him. At the end of the play, Joan experiences a kind of hysteria and tears Dummy to pieces, which means she kills him. Her consuming fear from the authority and lack of sense of belongingness to somewhere leads her into a violent act (Bond, 2006).

As with *Chair*, there are also soldiers wandering around the street, spreading terror and supervising the citizens to inform the authority about their acts in the play. That is to say, they are a kind of 'puppet' which serves the enforcements of the power (Özata & Biçer, 2021, p.236)[3]. The totalitarian regime tries to keep its citizens under control to prevent any unwanted act against its sustainability by means of soldiers, not 'police'. As understood from the play, the main factor or agent that drags the individuals into living in a society of fear which creates a culture of fear is the presence of soldiers. With a duty to control the streets, they also have right to interfere domestic sphere where there can be conspiracy against the regime. The fear of the soldiers and their interference is explicit in the dialogue between Joan and Dummy who sneaks over the hidden place of Joan:

> **Dummy** You are going to fetch the soldiers?
> **Joan** You can get out. There's only one door. It's too strong to break
> (Bond, 2006, p.171).

As can be ascertained from the abovementioned quote, the soldiers represent either protective officials or supervising agents of the authority. But it is clear that they are the representation of the authority agents of who are deeply feared. In addition to the emotion of fear, Joan firstly appears as internalizing the unquestionable rules of the authority and seeming to rely upon it, which becomes evident in her words; "if you hide from the soldiers you were up to no good" (Bond, 2005, p.172). This situation is reversed through the end of the play though, which is understood in Joan's naming soldiers as 'terrorists' who keep her hostage (Bond, 2005, p.201). On the other hand, Dummy seen as a criminal, who intrudes Joan's house, symbolizes danger and threat in the outside world. The door is apparently the only preventive way to keep out the dangers like Dummy. Joan's reference to the strength of the door indicates that she is fearful about any recurrent interference and intrusion coming from outside. Dividing two separate words with a strong door, she is in the search for security in the dangerous society, as with the condition of Alice who lives in a sheltered place of one window covered with heavy curtains in *Chair*. The cellar which protects the characters from outside and the chaotic atmosphere in the society is well described in the remarks of Billingham:

> The cellar has one flight of steps rising out of it up to an unseen 'over-ground' of a society in a state of cataclysmic unrest and chaos. Crime and

---

[3] This sentence is translated to English from the article written in Turkish.

civil disorder are rampant, and a repressive government regime employs the army and state terror to try and enforce political and social order (2014, p.132).

In the globalized world, individuals like Joan in the play are highly overwhelmed by the lack of security that is barely obtained within culture of fear. Their search for security is not only the move against the outside threats, but also a counter maneuver against the inner chaos related to existential insecurity (Furedi 2018, p.183). To suppress this inner chaos, they take precautions such as strong doors, hidden places hard to break in, and an attempt to keep a low profile. As Krishnamurti signifies, there is danger and anxiety in this life. Nothing is certain and concrete. What future brings is unknown. Individuals always search for security either consciously or unconsciously, starting from their inner world and then external world (2006, p.69)[4]. However, the escaping of Dummy from the authority manifests his inner fear of punishment. Both of the characters endeavor to put a kind of barrier between themselves and the feared entity – which is the authority – thus hiding behind the locked door. Svendsen interprets this condition in such manner:

> The person who fears will normally attempt to escape or avoid what he believes is threatening his life, health or interests. The typical pattern of action for fear is thus flight, to attempt to create the greatest possible distance from the feared object, to get outside the range of danger. Flight need not be understood spatially, that is, it is not necessarily a question of running away; it can just as well consist of creating a barrier between oneself and the object, such as protecting oneself with one's arms or hiding behind a door (2008, p.31).

In addition to keep its citizens captive in closed rooms, the authority uses language as a weapon to orientate them, making some alterations in it. Newly produced or changed language has a remarkable impact on the conception of individuals towards subject matters. For the authority which holds power, it would be easy to abolish their past as much as to change their perceptions about the socio-political issues and to create 'knowledge', thereby benefiting from a new language. In line with this, power creates knowledge by means of language (Foucault, 2001). As a consequence, a new culture comes into existence with the formation of new language since "culture is the general sphere of knowledge and of representations of lived experiences within historical societies divided into classes" (Debord, 2002,

---

[4] This paragraph is translated to English from the book written in Turkish.

p.25). The formation of a new language and culture is presented in the conversation of Joan and Dummy:

> **Joan** Why did you say shoplifting?
> **Dummy** It is the truth.
> **Joan** It isnt called shoplifting any more. That's what our parents called it.
> It's shoplooting (Bond, 2006, p.172).

Similar to the quote above, Joan's correcting Dummy about her place which should be called 'cellar', not 'under room' (Bond, 2006) signifies the formation of a new language that can create a new culture based upon fear. In the social domain which is altered by the use of language and operated by fear, as both puzzled and helpless, Dummy tries to comply with the new order. This becomes more apparent in the quote below:

> When I have more money I buy papers. Next I pay for guide to take me on underground route to North. There it is safe. It is a racket of course. Run by gangs. It is expensive. If you try to cross on your own they shoot you. In the North life is more easy. They do not shoot you for shoplifting. They could not shoot you for shoplifting here. It was nice. They change the name. They shoot you for shoplooting… (Bond, 2006, p.174).

Apparently, language evolves into a means which fits into the interests of power-holders. Whether an act is crime or not is determined by way of fluctuant nature of language in the hands of power. In this context, it turns into a danger or a constituent of which is feared. Recognizing the power of language, Dummy is also conscious about the threatening outside for himself. With an aim to find a place in which he feels safe, he tries to exist in somewhere apart from his own country. But, nowhere is secure in the age of fear when all the actions are recorded, documented and supervised. He emphasizes the constant supervision of the authority:

> I do not have to run. I wear bright clothes. Then no one suspect me. My disguise make me vanish. My grandmother say you cannot see the bit of dust in your eye. Maybe camera see me steal (Bond, 2006, p.173).

Through the medium of constantly developing technology which is seen as both a great progress in the modern era and a means contributing to culture of fear, human beings have become more unguarded to external dangers. With the undeniable effects of technological devices, they are devoid of freedom since they realize that their every act is supervised wherever they go. This realization makes them disturbed and fearful, fueling their existential anxiety. In Bondian context, Dummy believes he finds the way to misguide the authority in disguising, thereby

abstaining from being identified by camera which is supposed to be the feared object. As widely known, camera, a technological device to keep someone in order, is an indispensable medium in Panoptic surveillance associated with monitoring people (Haggerty, 2006, p.30). In the abstract Panoptic prison of *The Under Room*, the emotion of fear is internalized and seen as a way of living by the characters. Rather than being anxious about the camera, the sense of vulnerability and exposure to outside dangers puts safety at risk. Within this context, it would be of use to point out:

> We feel exposed and unsafe. It is this experience, rather than any fear of technology running out of control, which makes us so preoccupied with personal safety today. As a result, being at risk itself comes to be portrayed and accepted as a way of life (Furedi, 2002, p.69).

No matter how Joan and Dummy seem to internalize fear at first, they start to unearth their inner turmoil about the changing world order as the play proceeds, which is expressed by Joan talking to Dummy; "…I have nightmares about the changes. The new laws. Soldiers instead of police" (Bond, 2006, p.178). Besides Joan's nightmarish living, Dummy is also haunted by his past memories in which he kills his mother by force. In his characterization, Bond embodies Dummy as a dehumanized being liable to violence in the modern era. Facing with the brutal sides of the world, one can be indifferent to violence, even turn into a perpetrator. In this respect, violence, indifference, numbness and dehumanization can be given as concrete examples to the outcomes of modern era which also creates a culture led by fear, which is given in the statements of Dummy who describes the experience of killing his mother; "…I do not feel I am killing. I feel nothing – then why am I crying? It is not tears on my cheeks. It has been splashed – I am crying my parent's blood" (Bond, 2006, p.178).

In addition to the concept of dehumanization, Dummy and Joan are alienated from the society as much as from themselves, as in the characters in *The Chair*. Appearing as a human effigy, Dummy is the representation of alienated self which is divided into two; Dummy and Dummy Actor. Bond's using a different technique on the stage to show the alienation of a human being is explicated by Billingham; "This dramatic and staging device is used by Bond in order to explore ideas of alienation and identity and the dialectic between the absence and creation

of humanness" (2014, p.132). The alienated and dehumanized nature of Dummy is mentioned in the statements of Joan:

> …This is the knife you killed your parent with. The wound hasnt healed in you. You sleep but you dont rest. Your coffin is inside you. You sleep in it. In the morning you get up. But you dont wake up (Bond, 2006, p.193).

Not satisfied with her living, Joan is also alienated in both internal and external sphere. She articulates how she feels; "I don't understand the world. These things have been going on round me all these years and I didnt see them. The streets arent real any more. I'm helpless. I feel like an immigrant" (Bond, 2006, p.181). As given in the words of Joan, Bond also deals with the issue of immigrants in the modern world in *The Under Room*. Within a society terrorized by army forces, immigrants are considered as threats which should be avoided and eliminated. The state which aims to consolidate its power and position approaches immigrants or refugees as threats against its existence. The preliminary act of any state which is worried about its threatened survival is to detain foreigners and to seal the borders (Bigo, 2006, p.51). Especially, in the condition of Dummy as a forced criminal without official documents, it would seem to be dangerous to live in a society governed by a totalitarian regime that limits or even suppress every human acts.

As a 'stranger' in a strange place, the individual like Dummy is not welcomed in social domain. When one encounters a stranger in the modern world, this is not a pleasant encounter, but more of an indescribable sign of danger. Strangers are not just the ones who are not known, but also the ones who are not trusted (Furedi, 2002, p.115). In basic, the stranger is the enemy of modernity. His/her existence is not transparent, but more of concrete. However, s/he must take on the responsibility to be a stranger whereas the identification of stranger is either criminal or humiliated (Bauman, 2003). In modern society, an immigrant as a stranger is the feared subject which provokes mistrust and/or insecurity between individuals. In the context of culture of fear, Furedi touches upon the living with a stranger in the modern world as:

> In a world of risky strangers, it is difficult to trust. Indeed, the fear of strangers and of risks is proportional to the decline of trust. Increasingly, relationships between people, even those who live in the same neighbourhood or community, are characterized by a lack of clarity about the expected form of behaviour (2002, p.127).

From a more specific point, Bond's basic objective is to attract attention to the alienation and social exclusion of immigrants by means of creating such a character like Dummy in his play. Rather than designating Dummy as a danger, Bond depicts him as a helpless and an alienated person no matter how he is accepted as a danger in the eyes of the authority. Regarding this, even though Joan comes into stage with the aim of supporting him at first, she changes her mind about the previous identification of Dummy as innocent. The welcoming and protective attitude of Joan towards Dummy is changed into accusive one when he rejects her offer to flee from the army and Jack together. With the power of the authority to manipulate its subjects, she sees him as an immigrant who poses danger in terms of Joan's existence and properties, as indicated in her words; "…Immigrants…That's why they come here. Aliens. They want to take my house. Take our land. Loot the food from our stores" (Bond, 2006, p.200). Obviously, power has the ability to affect the way of thinking of its subjects, manipulating them through a certain process. As a consequence of this, Dummy as the archenemy of totalitarian regime is transformed into an unwanted entity in the eyes of Joan.

Related to his condition as an immigrant, Dummy's statement that "you live in the before. I live in the after. Nothing is comfortable there or normal" (Bond, 2006, p.176) shows his entrapment between his past and future and his existential crisis through the process of alienation. It would be useful to note that:

> The dialectic of of 'before' and 'after' informs and colours the narrative and thematic structure of the play. This is the process in which the past as thesis interacts with the future as its antithesis. This interaction is not solely theoritical but existential for the characters Joan and the Dummy Actor. The traumatic confrontation between the past and the future embodies an alienated space of internalised, psychological fracture (Billingham, 2014, p.134).

Apart from his confusion about the time he lives in, he is also confused about the place to which he belongs. His lack of sense of insecurity and belongingness to somewhere makes its presence highly felt within culture of fear. Much as Dummy seems the victim of culture of fear, Joan comes in sight as 'immigrant' as him. After Dummy's appearance, she becomes aware of the fact that she transforms into a stranger to the outside world as much as to herself by way of the repressed emotion of fear. As Chen suggests:

Joan's fear is twofold: she feels the real foreignness embodied by the Dummy, but also she fears the foreignness within herself – her desires and anxieties repressed within the process of being civilized as a law-abiding citizen who must follow the legal regulations on immigration (2018, p.203).

Their past filled with violent experiences makes them go through a trauma while urging them to fear about the present and future where security is no longer obtained. As stated by Joan "we're afraid" (Bond, 2006, p.193), they cannot be freed from the prison of fear in which they are desperately stuck. Further, their perception of prison does not pertain to their own country. Nowhere is secure and they are permanently 'immigrants' wherever they go. This circumstance is understood from Joan's remarks about the insecurity around the whole world:

> If you got to the North it wouldnt be different. The North will become what we are. Everywhere will. I know that now. When you're not free you lose everything. I'm an immigrant in my own country. This house is my prison… - Yet I was afraid to read the papers that passed through my hands. The things you told me haunt me. I cant get the pictures out of my head…- (Bond, 2006, p.191).

The sense of insecurity, which leads to social fear, is accelerated by the considerable impact of media. As a fear-infusing medium within culture of fear, media is used to create a kind of atmosphere nourishing from fear to control and subdue individuals. By way of media, fear can easily disintegrate societies and manipulate people. What an oppressive power like in *The Under Room* pursues to create is the constant feeling to be at risk. This is revealed in the conversation between Joan and Jack whose identity as either criminal or law officer is questionable:

> **Jack** …I am the army.
> **Joan** You're what?
> **Jack** The army. A modest part. They pay me. They supplied the pass. They sent me 'ere t'day. (Takes out mobile.) Report in every 'our when I'm on a job. They kill t' know I'm safe. (Taps in code. Puts mobile away.) I could 'ave a squad round 'ere in ten minutes. Yer can forget the army. They ain bother us. Worry about me. Yer both in me pocket. There ain no couriers. No underground. No route. 'S all spin. The army shut it down years ago. The newspaper photos a' refugees caught crossin the border – fake. They put 'em out t' cause panic. Panic is good for public moral… (Bond, 2006, p.189).

Given the above, the totalitarian regime utilizes the impact of mass media as a medium of altering the truth to spread fear and to keep its subjects under control and passivity. In creating 'panic', it aims at keeping individuals alert all the time,

thus restraining them into both a mental and physical inactivity. Its effective use of rhetoric is such as to make masses believe in everything which they watch on TV or read in the newspapers. Namely, "the idea of truth belongs to the rhetoric of power" (Bauman, 1997, p.139). Similar to the view of Bauman, Schmitt (2003) notes that; "the power of government to distort the truth can be used to seduce citizens into doing what they do not want to do" (p.116). While the totalitarian regime seems to struggle for the refugee problem and to create a safe land, its genuine motive is to dispossess the individuals of their capability of rational thinking. Under the effect of distorted truth, they are easily misguided and manipulated as in the situation of Joan and Dummy. It is the authority who classifies an immigrant as friend or enemy; however, the excessive control mechanism over the immigrants influences the perspective of Joan on them on a personal level (Chen, 2018, pp.205-206). On the other side, Jack, who is completely conscious of the manipulation of mass media and introduced as an illegal 'courier' at first, is embodied as the defender of totalitarian regime to the end of the play. Coming back to cellar with a different identity, Jack is in the position of the triggering agent of Joan's psychological breakdown accompanied with her manifestation of fear. It follows that:

> The traumatic interloper in Joan's life is Jack, an embodiment and instrument of the human-created violence in the world above and beyond the doors of both her cellar and her former potential. It is those forms and forces of violence, state-authorised and criminalised, that rule her world (Billingham, 2014, p.138).

Violence as a manifestation of repressed feelings and emotions in an aggressive era is one of the basic constituents of culture of fear. Bond's approach towards the term 'violence' is quite distinctive when compared to many other perspectives. In Bondian term, born with 'radical innocence'[5], a human being turns into a violent entity which is slowly created by the irrational nature of society governed by wrong policies. In his view, it is not the human being evil, it is the essence of society which should be cured, starting from its corrupted institutions (Bond, 2000b). Specifically, the formation of a violence-driven society comes into view as a result of injustice and fear which is a common emotion forcing a person to take a violent action. In the play, Jack, a corrupted man by the authority,

---

[5] It is a term coined by Edward Bond, meaning that a human being is innately good.

stimulates Joan's repressed fear about the outside world, about the strangers in particular. He leads her in some way to tear inanimate Dummy into pieces just after Dummy articulates meaningless words in his native language through the end of the play. During the alienation process of Dummy, Joan can no longer suppress her uncertainty and fear against the immigrants. Her image of hospitality disappears once she becomes the perpetrator of violence. Correspondingly, Chen sets forth:

> Joan's morality of hospitality is revealed to be based on the suppression of her fear and uncertainty, and, once undone, it turns into brutality. In other words, not only those who are endowed with the executive power can exercise violence, but normal citizens can also internalize the fear and resort to violence (2018, p.203).

Joan's use of violence is externalized as a release of her hidden emotions. She can no longer hides her hatred and fear imposed by the authority or its agents towards the immigrants as foreigners. As socially distant, but physically close (Bauman, 2011, p.181)[6], strangers must not be tolerated for the sake of the society in the depiction of Bond in *The Under Room* in which he addresses many problematic issues in the 'liquid' society filled with fear.

2.1.3. Culture of Fear in *Have I None*

First directed by Chris Cooper and presented by Big Brum in 2000 in Birmingham, *Have I None* appears as another dystopian play which is framed similar to the other plays in the trilogy. Originally written for Big Brum Trilogy, two of which are *At the Inland Sea* (1995) and *Eleven Vests* (1997), *Have I None* is included later in *The Chair Plays* trilogy. Set in an unknown place in 2077, the play basically revolves around three characters; Sara, Jams and Grit, all of whom are the victimized individuals of the oppressive totalitarian regime abolishing their pasts, eliminating consumerism, and spreading fear in the society. Forced to live in a standardized houses with minimal furniture, Sara and her husband Jams are introduced as 'prisoners' of the globalized society whereas Grit appears as a 'stranger' unwelcomed by the married couple. Özata and Biçer make a mention of the play in such manner:

> In the final link of the trilogy, *Have I None*, Bond reveals the existence of an exhausted nature in addition to the refugee problem of the globalizing world. The pressures of power, a biopolitical reality that encompasses people and nature all around, is the subject of study. Biopolitical powers,

---

[6] This expression is translated to English from its Turkish translation.

which aim to eliminate the masses contrary to their goals through epidemics and similar diseases, prevent the formation of any bonds of individuals throughout the play and lead them to the idea of a collective destruction (2021, p.231).

In the opening scene of the play, Sara depicted as married unhappy woman sits on the chair in silence and the door is knocked. Hesitating for a while, she approaches to the door while inclining her ears anxiously to hear what happens behind it. After she opens the door, she sees nobody outside. This awkward situation repeats itself until Jams, who works in security service, arrives. He starts to talk about an incident taken place while patrolling around the city whereas Sara seems indifferent towards his conversations. Feeling threatened by the door knocking, she puts her anxiety and fear into words to Jams who does not believe in her at first, but gets angry later when he learns this situation continues for weeks. One day, Sara and Jams' sheltered place, which should be defended against any external danger, is threatened by the arrival of Grit who alleges to be the brother of Sara. As an 'intruder', he is not welcomed by the married couple. Especially, he is regarded as 'threat' in the eyes of Sara whose memory is disturbed by his instant intrusion. Plotting against Grit to kill him, Sara and Jams plan to prepare soup in which they intend to put poison. The play ends with a scene where by mistake or on purpose, Sara drinks the poisonous soup and dies, which triggers the existential crisis of Jams who is even frightened of carrying the dead body of her wife to the outside where everything is monitored and controlled by the invisible power (Bond, 2000a).

Have I None, where Bond presents oppressed and fearful characters living in a society of fear as with the other plays of the trilogy, lays stress on the abolishment of past seen as danger for the control mechanism of the unnamed authority called 'the service' over its subjects in the globalized world. By abolishing their past memories, the service intends to turn individuals into inactive, unresponsive and senseless ones towards the happenings around the society. In the play, everything is operated by fear from which the service benefits with the news of crime, terror and mass suicide. In a similar vein, it would be useful to remark that:

> In *Have I None* consisting of three scenes, Bond presents the psychological breakdown of the characters the memories of which are erased under the influence of disasters such as destruction and epidemics created by the authority itself in a domain where globalization reaches to its peak (Özata & Biçer, 2021, p.247).

Consolidating its power with fear in the society, the service aims to eradicate any individuals whose memory is the greatest danger against its permanence. In the same way, Jams' mention about the old woman wandering around the ruins and trying to hang a painting on a wall of ruined building in the first scene is a direct implication on the renewed memory of an individual. Even the personal papers such as photos or pictures leading individuals to recall their lost memories are tried to be eliminated as expressed by Jams; "They cleared those houses since thirty years back. They weren't allowed to take their old stuff with them. Where's she hid a picture all them years?" (Bond, 2000a, p.60). On the function of photos activating human imagination from which is abstained due to control human beings, Chen notes; "Pictures are forbidden because, as the product of human imagination, they represent not only an alternative reality to the authoritarian state but also a useless fictional world that refuses to be incorporated into instrumental utilitarianism" (2016, p.39). With an intention to make its subjects live within culture of fear, the service attempts to end the 'history' by dispelling human imagination, thus creating a 'present' of fear.

As with the other plays in the trilogy, in addition to the abolishment of past, the standardization of individuals and their ways of living enable the service to enforce its power. In the face of any contradictory situation, the service is capable of separating the 'standardized' from 'non-standardized'. However, this enforcement of the service is completely internalized by the characters in the play, which is revealed in the statements of Jams; "The service expects us to keep to standards!" (Bond, 2000a, p.61). As both in *Chair* and *The Under Room*, even the houses and its furniture are designed according to the request of the service as obvious in 'blocking the windows' of the service, which signifies the very interference of the authority to the domestic sphere of individuals whose personal spaces are violated. Grit, similarly, supports this thought by stating; "Authority discourages furniture" (Bond, 2000a, p.64). The internalization of the rules determined by the service makes their existence more endurable. It can be apparently seen in the defensive statements of Jams who is the agent of the service and sides with it:

> Authority was right to abolish the past. Get shot of it. Videos – tapes –
> discos – dressing up – raves – dot com dot – junk. People were sick with
> it. It was a hobby to buy a new car, drive away from the salesroom and

crash it into a wall. What do people do when they've got everything? One day they beg you to take it away. They want peace instead. That's why they grab at resettlement – why it's easy to forget. Everyone with the same walls – same issue furniture – same issue clothes – same issue food. It takes time – but we must… (Bond, 2000a, p.79).

As understood from abovementioned quote, known as a critique of consumerist culture, Bond places a slight of criticism of consumerism in *Have I None* like in the other plays of the trilogy. No matter how it seems a good step to end consumerism in Bondian terms, the playwright, however, presents a depiction of an oppressive act by power which transforms its subjects into some sort of mechanized individuals resembling 'robots' despite its pretension of creating a 'collective sentiment'. Whereas Bond also draws attention to the bad impact of technology, a fear-infusing medium in culture of fear, he portrays the service as a power which brings the age of technology to an end. By doing so, the service pursues to create a new alternative to spread fear instead; altering technology with strict control over individuals.

With the abolishment of past and the standardization of individuals as much as their living, the service also sees family life as a target which should be immediately ended. The bonds between individuals put the existence of the service at risk in that there can be a possibility to create a collective sentiment from which it avoids. In carrying out this mission, it uses the emotion of 'fear' as a weapon to surveil and oppress its subjects. When the past is abolished, it is easy to shatter the familial bonds, as claimed by Sara who unexpectedly faces her alleged brother; "I haven't got a brother. No one has. They did away with all that" (Bond, 2000a, p.65). Devoid of any familial ties, the characters are presented as disconnected with their past and fearful about the uncertain future as well as caught in a trap of 'present'. In Bondian dystopia, to keep the past under control means to intervene the present and to create the future according to the self-interests of the service.

Crime which plays a significant role in cultivating culture of fear in the modern world also plays a part in the play. As pervasive through the society, mass murders are turned into 'mass suicides' which is named as 'suicide outbreak' in 2077 in *Have I None*. Within this context, Bond signals a design of a future which is operated through fear and indifference towards human psychology. In the play with which Bond "reimagines the mass manufacture of death in the camp by

constructing an indifferent world of mass suicide" (Chen, 2016, p.40), the playwright presents traumatic characters losing their sense and hope about the future. In addition, Furedi touches upon the chaotic image of the future in this way; "Such perceptions of the future reflect contemporary anxieties – indeed, they project into the future the collective insecurities of society today" (2002, p.61). Detached from their pasts, oppressed by the service, insecure in their environment, and alienated from themselves, the individuals, whom Jams mention, commit suicide, thereby suffering their miserable lives and being overwhelmed under the burden of their existence. Further, as a kind of indication of trauma pervading through the society, mass suicide is approached like an 'epidemic' in the play. In this sense, it would be vital to refer to the dialogue between Grit and Jams when Grit first appears at the door:

> **Grit** I live – I lived – at the other end of the country…Walked down
> **Jams** Walked?
> **Grit** No travel document.
> **Jams** Why?
> **Grit** Office wasn't functioning. Official came out and told the queue no more documents issued. The staff were throwing themselves off the roof. Couldn't use transport without a document.
> **Jams** …You've got a suicide outbreak
> **Grit** Nothing worked. No jobs. No electricity. Water comes out with lumps. On the way to work I had to cross a bridge. Crowd on it. Sitting and standing both sides on the parapets. Done up in overcoats. Looked like rows of pigeons – roosting or walking up and down looking for a place. Then one of them'd throw theirself in the river. That started it. Splash – splash – splash. Five or six throw themselves in. Others climb up to fill the gaps they left. The ones in the river float off. Their overcoats are blown out on top of the water like bladders or big blisters. When I got to work it had reached there – it was closed.
> **Jams** …The faces are the give-away. They all jumped? No one used a rope or anything fancy?
> **Grit** No.
> **Jams** They all do the same – whatever its is. One of the symptoms. Know Reading?
> **Grit** No.
> **Jams** Place down this end. Suburb before it was resettled. They had an outbreak. I was sent because of the job. They walked the streets carrying a knife in front of them – like this…Point up. Hundreds of 'em. Streets were chocker. Going up and down. Like sleepwalkers holding a candle out. Dead quiet. No one spoke. No one bumped into anyone. All of a sudden one of 'em'd stab theirself. Stab stab stab. Hacking and ripping. Arms and legs. Chest. Neck. As if they wanted to stab themselves as many times a they could before the knife fell out of their hand. Never stabbed anyone else. Rest didn't turn round. Saw one on the pavement. Trying to reach the knife he'd dropped. Scrabbled round for it for half an hour. When he got it all he could do was scratch the pavement. Rest step over him. They all

wore scarves – like yours wore overcoats. The symptoms are always the same. That's why I asked if you saw their faces. Blanks.
Grit Yes.
Jams If you'd been resettled it wouldn't've happened. Reading wasn't resettled either. No outbreak afters (Bond, 2000a, p. 62-63).

The dialogue above draws forth that the individuals who are not allowed to remember their past and who live under oppression of the service cannot sustain their existence, which leads to their self-destruction at the end. Instead of harming one another, they transform into a suicidal. What urges them into committing suicide is the fact that they try to exist within a society of oppression along with their namely meaningless lives. Driven by hopelessness and despair about their future and detached from the social life which is eliminated by the service, they are depicted as the manifestation of psychological disorders in the society governed by oppression and fear. However, the portrayal of these traumatic individuals by Bond serves his purpose of making presentation of a social problem, not a personal problem in the play. Rather than observing the psychology of individuals, he inclines to observe them from a more social aspect,

On the other side, the service applies for an intentional manipulation by means of language change while making its subjects experience incurable psychological breakdown. To exemplify, 'resettlement' instead of 'ruin' or naming a suburb as 'Reading' has the aim of changing the perceptions of individuals towards the new way of living as well. As can be inferred from the name of the place, Reading may be a kind of hint to the fact that all individuals in that suburb are more aware of the brutal realities in the society than the ones living in another places since they may 'read' and see what happens in the world at first hand.

Similar to the other plays of the trilogy, surveillance which is enforced by the service is another control mechanism apart from abolishment of past or language change. Bond's futuristic depiction of the service as a tyrannical power oppressing and surveilling its obedient subjects is a kind of projection to the present day governed by fear. In parallel, Furedi propounds that "The subjugation of the troubles of contemporary life to the tyranny of future threats is a prominent feature of the twenty-first century culture of fear" (2018, p.66). Hiding from the outside world and the tyrannical authority, Sara and Jam try not to attract notice of the service capable of detecting any unwanted act in both external and internal domain.

The oppression she considerably feels and internalizes towards surveillance is voiced by Sara who states; "…I live under surveillance" (Bond, 2000a, p.70). Even though she displays a sort of embracement of this strict control and internalized obedience, Bond pictures her as a traumatic character who hears voices outside and highly fearful about the strangers. Alienated from the external sphere, which is led by the service with its surveillance, she is unable to go outside. However, like Alice in *Chair*, Sara cannot resist her curiosity about Jams' talking about the old woman carrying a painting between the ruined buildings and goes out by disappearing for few days:

> **Jams** Where've you been?
> **Sara** Lost
> **Jams** For four days?
> **Sara** I couldn't find the way out of the ruins.
> **Jams** The ruins?
> **Sara** I wanted to see them for myself (Bond, 2000a, p.79-80).

Sara's memory returning, which is considerably an unwanted act by the service, puts her in the position of 'non-standardized'. Keeping her distance with the outside world for a while behind her so-called secure house, she becomes a captive of her prison. However, when her memories slowly spring to her mind and she confronts with the ruined outside world, her anxiety turns into fear targeting at the specific object, that is, ruins. The act of remembering may be dangerous in such a manner as to slow down the human actions generating fear and hesitation (Bordoni, 2017, p.21). Her representation of the outside that revives her suppressed memories makes it much clear:

> There are so many bricks. Broken walls. Why are bricks red? I saw the tyre marks made by the trucks. I saw the footprints of people who'd lived there. They were in the houses. Turning to stone in the dust. Even the footprints of mice who'd stolen their scraps. They were in the cupboards. They'd been there for sixty generations of mice. But the generations weren't born. They were fumigated away. The time in the cupboards is mice generation 'o' (Bond, 2000a, p.80).

Bond, further, puts emphasis on the questioning of freedom, the capability to behave without restraint. As a term strongly tied with the concept of 'free will', it points out a sort of escape from enslavement. The actions, attitudes, and choices of the ones called 'free' are not supposed to be prevented or intervened by outside forces. However, the service's viewpoint towards freedom, which loses its meaning, is slightly different in the play. When Sara utters "Freedom" in their

conversation, Jams replies by uttering "Discipline" (Bond, 2000a, p.73), which means that freedom is discipline and it is only obtained through it. An individual can be free as long as s/he is obedient to the rules of the service and disciplined.

Alike the other plays of the trilogy, social relations depend on mistrust in this play in such a way as to keep individuals alert in the course of interaction within culture of fear in the globalized world. An unknown person in a social environment is called 'stranger' which is treated like danger from which people try to stay away. The fragility of social interaction between individuals in an insecure environment is a social fact continued by the globalized world, thus creating panic and mistrust, inseparable parts of insecurity in the modern era. In other words, "the disposition to panic, the remarkable dread of strangers and the feebleness of relations of trust have all had important implications for everyday life. These trends have also altered the way in which people regard each other" (Furedi, 2002, p.147). Obviously, the concept of trust is functionless in culture of fear. Fear has an offensive impact on trust and when trust decreases, fear increases interrelatedly. The increase of fear is the reason, the consequence, and the loss of trust (Svendsen, 2008, p.101). Within the framework of the play, described as a stranger coming from the insecure world, Grit incites the sense of mistrust and the existential anxiety of the married couple. His unwelcomed arrival jeopardizes the so-called secure and comfortable living of Sara and Jams, as suggested in Grit's image created by Jams; "You're a ghost in this house. A sick ghost with a disease" (Bond, 2000a, p.79). He is the danger which must be immediately eliminated while he is also the representation of the past which must be abolished. Billingham comments on the attempt of Sara and Jams to poison Grit in this manner:

> In a society where the past has been abolished, the present must be controlled into some semblance of purpose and coherence through violence, fear and intimidation. This drives Jams, and seemingly Sara too, to conspire to poison Grit with the portion of soup she has made for him. If Grit, the intruder from and as the past, can be destroyed, then the nightmarish version of a present reality can surely be resurrected and sustained by dysfunctional couple (2014, p.116-117).

Disturbed by the past evoked by Grit whose existence threatens the married couple, Sara and Jams experiences psychological breakdown provoked by fear and anxiety towards the intruder. Bond brings this point to light with the conversation of Sara and Jams offering to kill Grit with poison:

Jams We'll have to kill him. He'd get out of a settlement. Look how he walked here. There's no stopping him. I can't see the future anymore, what's in it for us. Sometimes your shoelace is undone, you can't bother to stoop to tie it… it's easier to end it. I saw a warning at Reading. In broad daylight. People walking the streets holding a knife before them – as if they were holding a candle. He stands there breathing quietly – his breath's like a storm blowing the roof off the house.

Sara We'll give him poison. That's convenient. We'll use the best stuff. It's like thick water. You wouldn't know it's in the spoon if the light didn't shine on it. We'll invite him to a meal to celebrate the Reunion. Put it in his food. I'll go to the chemist (Bond, 2000a, p.75-76).

Demonstrated in the dialogue above, the fear led by a stranger penetrating into their secure houses is also accompanied by the fear towards the entrance of the past. It can be obviously understood from the statements of Jams that their fear about the past intermingles with the fear about the future which is uncertain and insecure. Through the existential anxiety and fear heightened by the intrusion of Grit, not only does Sara experience psychological breakdown, but also Jams does. Although he is expected to be a fearless individual in that he has already been involved in the authority as a worker in the security service, he cannot ensure security even for himself. As with Sara and Jams, Grit is captured by the anxious and traumatic atmosphere of the house, which is apparently manifested in his repetitive act to go to the knocking door just like Sara. Succumbed to fear about the outside world from which a security officer can come to ask for his official documents of which he is deprived, Grit is also affected by the 'contagious disease' of hearing the door knocking. To the end of the play, the traumatic crisis of all the characters is fueled by Sara's drinking poisonous soup prepared for Grit indeed. Because of the entrance of the past and threatening outside world with Grit into their safe sphere, she no longer desires to continue her life, which psychologically torments her, and to restrain herself behind locked doors. This is clearly suggested in the scene of her suicide:

Jams (*pointing*) His! – poisoned.
Sara *cleans the inside of the bowl with her finger and licks it.*
Jams You drank his deliberately!
Sara *drops the bowl.*
Grit Poisoned?
Sara Take me outside. I don't want to die in the house.
Grit you tried to poison me!
Jams (*to* **Sara**) Deliberately! Why? Chriss how can I explain this to the CO? The mess! What d'you want me to do!
Sara I want to die outside – not shut in – help me.

> **Jams** *and* **Grit** *stare at her. Suddenly* **Jams** *goes to the door and throws it open.*
> **Jams** Go! Get out! Get out! Get out of my house!
> **Sara** (*bent on the table*) I can't – get there on my – you don't need to take me far to – leave me at the corner –
> **Jams** Be seen in the street walking a dying woman on my arm? I won't! I can't! It's conduct unbecoming! I'd be courtmartialled! Chopped! And she's my wife! (Bond, 2000a, p.87-88).

In the light of the dialogue above, Sara's act based on her free will to end her own life is not approved by the service. Attaining her freedom as much as making her own choice, which has been prevented by the service so far, she extricates herself from the possession of the authority. Chen interprets this point in a similar way; "Determining one's death as the resistance to being 'possessed' turns out to be the only possible way of acting out of self-lawgiving freedom against the totalising legal sphere" (2016, p.44). On the other hand, her suicide attempt is received with fear about its inevitable outcomes by Jams. Bond is such as to illustrate that Sara's death does not have a value in the eyes of Jams as a husband, which indicates that the service has succeeded in stamping out the concept of 'family'. His real fear, indeed, takes its root from the service which punishes an act beyond its knowledge, not from the sorrow about his dying wife.

As obvious, Bond lays bare the psychological breakdown of fearful individuals living within culture of fear whereas he explicitly criticizes the globalized world which oppresses and terrorizes people by means of a sign of warning to a dystopian world. His portrayal of a futuristic dystopia points out "fearful futures where chaos and ruin prevail" (Claeys, 2017, p.16) in *Have I None*.

2.2.   Harold Pinter and *The Room*

Acknowledged as one of the most influential playwrights on British stage in the post-war years, Harold Pinter also makes his contributions to drama through his identity of poet, actor and scenarist. Born in London as a son of Jewish family in 1930 when World War II already made itself evident in the society, he mostly passed his childhood years in an environment surrounded by working class members. In the harsh times led by the outbreak of the war, he went to Castle of Cornwall to hide, leaving his family behind. After a difficult experience he underwent there, when he returned London, the first thing he encountered was the bombing of the city which gave him a deep shock. In the light of his background,

traumatized by the chaotic atmosphere in his hometown during the war, he reflects his thoughts and feelings by way of his dramatic works. Following his poems that he wrote in the childhood years, his first play entered into British stage; *The Room* (1956) which was written in four days. After his debut with his first play, Pinter's career as a playwright continued with *The Birthday Party* (1958) which got harsh reactions by theatre critiques and *Dumb Waiter* (1959). With the aid of these three plays which made him rank among many renowned playwrights, he started to appear in the world of British drama.

Firstly, showing some elements associated with the theatrical movement of 'Theatre of Absurd' coined by Martin Esslin and which is opposed by the playwright, Pinter blends his plays with absurd elements through which he criticizes social ills and more specifically their impacts on human beings. His characters are basically portrayed as silent, numb, and passive. Despite the seemingly comic nature of his plays filled with silence, pauses, and repetitions which are the constituent parts of Theatre of Absurd, Pinter makes implications on the criticism of post-war era when corruption, capitalism and individualism penetrated into the society. What he endeavors to do in his works is to warn his audience against the severe impacts of his time on human beings, thereby displaying this intention by means of his characters on a personal level rather than a social one.

In addition to his significant contribution to British drama, he plays a role in creating a new dramatical style which is attributed with Pinter by leading him to be widely recognized. 'Pinteresque', a term defined as the style of Pinter and the characteristics of his works, has been adopted and used in English language for many years. His Pinteresque drama is characterized by absurdity accompanied by closed rooms, sign of threat, lasting silence or pause, and colloquial language. His minimalized setting and plot contribute the simple flow of his plays. Considerably affected by the works of Franz Kafka and Anton Çehov, he adapts their style into his works. In his Pinteresque drama which is not originally labelled by himself, he goes deep into the psychology of his characters undergoing existential crisis, isolation and loneliness, which is basically caused by the living in the traumatic post-war era. In general, the focal point in his works is that the relation between his characters is based on the obtainment of dominance in small setting in which there is a question about who possesses the power. His tragicomic characters compete

with one another to take the control as well as to repress the other. The power possessed by the dominant character, however, does not allow the questioning of the authority which the power-holder establishes. Showing no humane feelings or emotions, his characters are also pictured as lacking the ability of empathy. Excessively deprived of any social communication, they are withdrawn to their own mind prison built by the absurd nature of their existence. Pinter's technique with which he seems inclined to Theatre of Absurd to create long silences, pauses, and disconnection of conversations underlines the lack of communication between his characters.

As a significant playwright holding political leanings with which he has not been directly labelled so far, Pinter indeed stands up against the false politics of the countries to gain power and superiority due to the severe times he experienced in British post-war society. This case becomes more precise in his Nobel Prize speech where he criticizes US policy and other governments using oppression as a weapon to gain dominance and power against small countries. His political thoughts which become more precise in the 1980s are similarly mentioned:

> In the early 1980s, Pinter found himself in a creative stagnation as a result of increased thinking about injustice, lies of state officials, and massive closing of eyes to human rights. Suspicion of authoritarian regimes around the world influenced his works, as early as in his first play *The Room* (Sitarica, 2020, p.89).

However, although he does not show direct criticism in his early plays such as *The Room*, *The Birthday Party* and *The Homecoming* (1964), he implicitly gives shape to his characters who are the victims and suffering individuals in consequence of socio-political ills around the world. The implicit style of Pinter in his earlier works is specified in similar manner; "At the beginning of Pinter's career one can hardly notice any political implications in his plays and despite the fact that Pinter's early plays – are considered apolitical, there still remain political elements one can apprehend" (Mskhaladze, 2017, p.390). His political perspectives towards the world and its deficits are projected into his characters and setting on a personal level. They act as the mirror to the ruined society and even the outcome of socio-political problems.

In his early plays seeming apolitical, Pinter comes in sight with a new sense, thus drawing apart from Theatre of Absurd; Comedy of Menace which is not

originally coined by Pinter himself, though. In spite of his objection to the categorization of his drama, the term 'menace' which is propounded by Pinter himself makes ground in his works. In this novel concept being adapted into his plays built upon the emotion of fear which subjugates and oppress the characters in closed rooms, outside world is drawn as dangerous, threatening and insecure in such a manner as to captivate the characters who gradually turn into alienated beings against the society and themselves at last. The world of his plays consists of the portrayal of closed doors and windows and of human beings hiding in sheltered places in the pursuit of mental survival (Regal, 1995, p.9). Indicating that "menace lurks outside, but it also has psychological roots" (Dukore, 1988, p.26), Pinter keeps his characters in his closed rooms till the end of his plays of menace. However, Pinter's real menace can be evaluated with many points:

> …which lies behind the struggles for expression and communication, behind the closed doors which might swing open to reveal a frightening intruder, behind the sinister gunmen and terrorists, behind the violence, the menace behind all these menacing images is the opaqueness, the uncertainty and precariousness of the human condition itself (Esslin, 1976, pp.51-52).

Driven by fear and anxiety, which intermingle with uncertainty and insecurity, in an enclosed space, Pinter's characters are embodied as 'prisoners' being frightened of going outside, confronting any external interference and threats such as strangers. His characters can be defined as well; "his characters are sad citizens of intimacy, fear, the horrific nature of which unmasks itself in claustrophobic rooms they are entrapped in, where power games, domination and the struggle for liberation originate" (Pagadala, 2015, p.27). On the other hand, in this new sensibility, the characters always confront with fear, crime, insecurity, strangers, unknown outside forces and threats. Incapable of gaining self-autonomy, they solely exist in such a way as to be dependent on the factors mentioned above. No matter how they struggle to be self-autonomous, they are defeated by an invisible and unknown fear-spreading situations. Besides their anxious and fearful nature, they do not display any motives in their actions, which urges them into purposelessness they remarkably display throughout the plays. All these Pinteresque features of his Comedy of Menace are uncovered in *The Room*.

2.2.1. Culture of Fear in *The Room*

First written in 1957 and presented at the Hamstead Theatre Club in 1960, *The Room* was directed by Pinter himself. It is the first and one of the great examples of his plays included in Comedy of Menace. Pinter, as a post-war playwright and highly affected by Auschwitz, the largest Nazi concentration camp, reflects his thoughts and criticism of world politics through his characters. Rather than directing overt criticism, he implies his underlying motive, thus shaping his characters as the embodiments of modern world slaves of fear due to the post-catastrophic environment established by wars and terror. *The Room* with which he aims to present a microcosm of post-war era contains implications on how individuals feel insecure, uncertain and threatened. In the portrayal of the characters disconnected from the outer world, Pinter signals the alienation and insecurity of modern man. No matter how it seems apolitical in many ways, it bears implications on its allusive criticism of political issues. In a similar vein, one can state:

> Pinter's earliest plays – The Room, The Dumb Waiter, The Birthday Party and The Hothouse (…) - clearly driven by political questions about the relationship of the individual and the state, or power structures that would compromise and constrain the individual voice (Taylor-Batty, 2009, p.206).

In the first scene of the play, Rose, a woman of sixty, and Bert, a man of fifty, who are seemingly working-class members, are seen onstage in a closed room which has minimal furniture with one door opening to outside. While Rose tries to have a conversation with Bert, seemingly indifferent towards his wife, he does not give any response, which is the indicator of Pinter's usage of long silence to create an absurd atmosphere in his plays. Emphasizing that the room in which they live, or most basically are trapped, is comfortable and secure, Rose talks to herself for a long time. Her nonreciprocal speech with Bert is interrupted by the landlord of the house, Mr. Kidd whom Rose continues to talk about the coziness of the room. After the leaving of Mr. Kidd, Bert goes out to work. No sooner he leaves the room, a young couple named Mr. Sands and Mrs. Sands, who searches for a room for rent, knocks the door.

First disturbed by the intrusion of two unknown people, Rose approaches them with caution. Their intention of arrival turns out to ask for the room in a moment. According to the statements of the couple, someone referring himself as

the landlord of the house and living in the basement tells that the room is vacant. Stimulated by the possible threat, Rose underlines that the room has already been occupied. Upon their leaving, the room is disturbed by a black man named Riley who is blind and brings her the word of his father. However, as deduced from the conversation between them, Riley is the father of Rose who cannot recognize him in such a manner as to be unable to recall her past. Intimidated by the seemingly disturbing existence of Riley, Rose goes into panic. The intense atmosphere in the room is accelerated by the entrance of Bert who is in the pursuit of eliminating the danger in his safe place. At the end of the play, Riley is killed by Bert who resorts to violence in contrast to his first image as a calm man and Rose loses her sight (Pinter, 1996).

As inferred from the brief summary of the play, 'room' is portrayed as a secure shelter which can protect one from the menace outside. It is supposed to be preserved against threats embodied as strangers and outside interference. In the fear of the fact that her cozy and secure room can be invaded by some external forces, Rose behaves cautiously in a suspicious manner towards the strangers who provoke her anxiety and fear. In Pinteresque sense, the room can be identified as "suggestive of the encapsulated environment of modern man, but may also suggest something of his regressive aversion to the hostile world outside" (Hollis, 1970, p.19). Within a society and a culture increasing fear, individuals start to hide behind locked doors – that is, barriers between the 'secure' and the 'insecure' as in the condition of Rose continuously articulating her safety in the room through such statements; "I must say this is a very nice room. It is a very comfortable room" (Pinter, 1996, p.42). Portrayed as a kind of neurotic individual who experiences existential anxiety, she unconsciously tries to convince herself about her domestic safety which is fragile and threatened. The last thing she wants is the intrusion of someone into her so-called secure room in which she thinks she is not vulnerable to dangerous external sphere through a process of self-delusion. In this sense, it would be vital to address her speech delivered to silent and unresponsive Bert:

> If they ever ask you, Bert, I'm quite happy where I am. We're quiet, we're all right. You're happy up here. It's not for up either, when you come in from outside. And we're not bothered. And nobody bothers us (Pinter, 1996, p.40).

In comparison with the function of a secure place, the evil facts of the globalized world such as crime, terror and violence are not explicitly presented throughout the play. But somehow, Rose indicates her fear and anxiety the sources of which are not exactly known since "humanity's fear of the unknown has been a constant feature of its history" (Furedi, 2018, p.66). Her most disturbing fear is the fear of outside from which she stays away, as implied by Rose who tells; "Just now I looked out of the window. It was enough for me. There wasn't a soul about" (Pinter, 1996, p.40). By doing so, Pinter is such as to hint the chaotic environment which creates fear and insecurity through a micro example in the post-war years. In Pinteresque context, the outer world riddled with unknown and undetectable threats is depicted as something of menace which can endanger human existence. Rose's fear directing at a specific object – outside – is signaled in her conversation with Mrs. and Mr. Sands:

> **Rose** What's it like out?
> **Mrs. Sands** It's very dark out.
> **Mr. Sands** No darker than in.
> **Mrs. Sands** He's right there.
> **Mr. Sands** It's darker in than out, for my money.
> **Mrs. Sands** There's not much light in this place, is there, Mrs. Hudd? Do you know this is the first bit of light we've seen since we came in?
> **Mr. Sands** The first crack.
> **Rose** I never go out at night. We stay in (Pinter, 1996, p.44).

Even though she is curious about what happens and what is like to be outside, Rose's biggest fear is mostly derived from the obscurity and unknown nature of the outside world which is depicted as 'cold' in contrast to the 'warm' room. The darkness of the outside world is a symbolic expression in that it points out the possible dangers there. However, besides the emphasis on the darkness of outer sphere, the darkness in the room may be as much symbolic as the one of the outside world apart from its literal meaning. Bearing implications on the alienation of Rose who is an outsider – that is, insider – to the outside and has no capability in social interaction, Pinter paves the way for the fact that as the characters communicate with one another, the dark and isolated room becomes more like a place in which the social interaction between them becomes easier as well. In this sense, Pinter highlights the severe outcomes of the terrorized post-war period driving individuals into alienation, thereby placing his characters, mostly Rose, in

a society shadowed by fear which also provides a basis for alienation in consequence of insecurity and uncertainty.

Through the disappearance of social life, which is catalyzed by fragile human relations based upon insecurity and uncertainty, every daily act having been regarded as normal starts to be questioned. In other words, "social life, with all of its complications and tensions, is increasingly having to cope with the continuous reformulation of ordinary experience as dangerous" (Furedi, 2002, p.113). Fragmented relations between individuals are put forward by Pinter who gives indication to the disconnectedness and rareness of human interaction mostly rooting from the insecure environment in Pinter's times. Each person is regarded as a possible danger to others. This case is clarified by Rose's remarks on the fact that she does not know the landlord the young couple mentions:

> As a matter of fact, I don't know him at all. We're very quiet. We keep ourselves to ourselves. I never interfere. I mean, why should I? We've got our room. We don't bother anyone else. That's the way it should be (Pinter, 1996, p.45).

In alienating herself from the outer sphere, Rose is more withdrawn into her inner sphere, which incites her existential anxiety in a fear-based society. Considerably insecure and uncertain towards the outer sphere, she approaches everything coming from the dangerous world as if it was a destructive threat for her meaningless existence. However, not only is the outside considered as dangerous, but also the room is not safe due to any possible sudden intrusion. In *The Room*, Pinter also underlines Bert's intention to establish dominance over Rose. In this context, it would be of note to address the definition of dominance by Jean Baudrillard:

> Domination is characterized by the master /slave relation, which is still a dual relation with potential alienation, a relationship of force and conflicts. It has a violent history of oppression and liberation. There are the dominators and the dominated --- it remains symbolic relationship. Everything changes with the emancipation of the slave and the internalization of the master by the emancipated slave (2010, p.33).

Bert as the dominator in the room exercises power over Rose who is unconsciously dominated. Therefore, pictured as an obedient wife figure oppressed by her silent husband, she is the mirror of complete subservience to wifely duties within a house of oppression. Obviously, her husband is also a fear-infusing agent

and threat from which she should abstain for her alleged comfortable living. Domestic sphere in which culture of fear starts to manifest itself is not so secure that an individual can live through constant fear and anxiety as in the condition of Rose. Bert, an oppressive and dominant husband figure, can be given as a micro example to the authoritarian power the basic objective of which is to lead to the spread of fear. Within Pinteresque canon, his investigations are based on the power relations of his characters and power is the constant theme in his works (Baldwin, 2009, p.25) as with *The Room*. Besides Bert's function to oppress Rose, there is another power which is not mentioned and keeps itself invisible. Life in the room is shaped according to the design of an unknown and invisible power which can be a reference to the state of politics in the post-war era and Rose hides from something unknown in the outside (Pravindh & Dinakaran, 2018, p.168).

Even in Pinter's times when culture of fear is slowly formed due to the global alterations led by wars, the insecure atmosphere between people already makes itself felt in the society, leading to the fear of neighbors and acquaintances. Unfamiliar to their neighbors and the person who lives in the damp basement and is seen as a threat, Rose feels her secure room is open to be invaded. Her anxiety or fear is materialized with the sudden arrival of Riley, a black man who is the person in the basement and most probably the father of Rose. Stepping inside from a threatening outside world, Riley is presented as an immigrant and a stranger who poses threat and triggers Rose's racist hatred. His black identity is given as another reason of Rose's mistrust. Through the fragmented awareness within a racist society, strangers simultaneously appear and disappear, paving the way for fear and violence with their absent presence (Stokes, 2009, p.35-36). In Pinteresque context, a stranger, as a kind of menace and an unknown person coming from nowhere, creates an atmosphere of insecurity and uncertainty in the society of fear. Bauman, similarly, states that "strangers tend to appear ever more frightening as they become increasingly alien, un-familiar and incomprehensible" (2003, p.33). Further, upon the unexpected arrival of a stranger, Pinter portrays Rose as detached from her past to the degree of being incapable of recalling her memories which have been suppressed for a long time probably by the dominant power in the room; Bert.

Violence, a medium and product of culture of fear, is also presented By Pinter in the final representation of Bert's perpetrating violence to Riley, the only

threat to be eliminated in the room. Bert's insecure inner side comes into existence in his sudden aggression as a perpetrator of violence. It can be alleged on the condition of Bert that "insecure people tend to be irritable; they are also intolerant of anything that stands in the way of their desires" (Bauman, 2000, p.164). In a struggle and fear to hold the dominant power in the room in his hands, Bert does not hesitate to kill Riley. With the removal of threat, he overcomes his fear of losing his dominance in the room. His instant impulse to kill Riley derives its root from fear. As Bauman notes, "fears prompt us to take defensive action. When it is taken, defensive action gives immediacy and tangibility to fear" (2007, p.13).

The Room in which Pinter reveals his thematic style of Comedy of Menace with all its features is a sort of micro reflection to the post-war world where fear, insecurity and uncertainty pervade through the society. Pinter signals the impacts of the dystopian atmosphere after the devastating war while his "working class turn in their post-war dystopian graves" (Stone, 2003, p.9). Although the playwright does not give an explicit representation, he shows implications on the outcomes of chaotic era reigned by fear on a personal level.

CHAPTER III: THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF *THE CHAIR PLAYS* AND *THE ROOM* IN THE CONTEXT OF CULTURE OF FEAR

3.1. Similarities Between the Plays

3.1.1. Threatening Outside World

Through the process of globalization, outside world is pictured as dangerous and insecure in that it inholds the 'unknown' and possible dangers in contrast with the fragile safety of domestic sphere. Within the context of culture of fear, in both *The Chair Plays* and *The Room*, the playwrights present a threatening outside world where unknown dangers wander around to threaten the existence of the characters who are highly frightened of being disturbed. That kind of fear is obviously dominant in the plays. In *Chair*, Alice and Billy are frightened to step outside where nobody is secure due to the oppressive regime. No matter how Alice, who seems disobedient and rather courageous when compared to Billy, dares to go out to confront Prisoner, her unwanted act to step into the threatening outside world results in her inquisition. In *The Under Room*, Joan and her uninvited guest, Dummy take shelter in a secure room, highly anxious about the outside world. In the final part of the trilogy, *Have I None* reveals that Sara turns into a neurotic person, undergoing a psychological breakdown because of the knocking door which is represented as the barrier between the secure and the insecure. Similar to the Bond's exposition of the outside world, Pinter draws the picture of the outside as a threatening object for the characters, especially for Rose who even cannot look out of the windows.

However, whereas the outside in *The Chair Plays* is invaded by soldiers, criminals and cameras to surveil the characters, the outside depicted as menacing in *The Room* keeps its obscurity and darkness, thus totally remaining unknown to the characters, especially to Rose. Both of the playwrights, who severely suffered from the devastating consequences of post-war era, offer a depiction of threatening outside world in which fear takes the power and pervades itself through the streets, even through the domestic sphere.

3.1.2. Sheltered Place

A need for secure places with locked doors has become inevitable in the globalized world because of its multidimensional threats for human existence. In

fearing to step outside from their secure places, the characters in all plays build sheltered places which can protect them from outside threats and dangers. All the characters in each play try to make themselves feel secure, eliminating possible risks which can endanger their sheltered places. Specifically, Alice, Joan and Sara in *The Chair Plays* create their shelters with one door and closed windows to not to draw attention of the authority. Similarly, Rose in *The Room* is highly obsessed with her security in her secure place, a protective barrier between so-called peaceful inside and threatening outside. Whereas the sheltered places of Bondian characters are invaded by immigrants, soldiers, officers of the oppressive state and unknown fears, the sheltered place of Pinteresque characters is visited by strangers and unknown forces.

3.1.3. Sense of Insecurity and Uncertainty

As possible outcomes and integral parts of culture of fear, the sense of insecurity and uncertainty captures the mind and soul of the characters. Due to being inseparable constituents of fear, their severe impacts are observed in each character in the plays. To illustrate, while Alice in *Chair*, Joan in *The Under Room* and Sara in *Have I None* are considerably cautious about their security, as understood from their approach towards the outside world and any intrusion to their safe places, Rose in *The Room* is quite obsessed with her security in the same way. Besides their lack of security which cannot be ensured by a dominant power visible in *The Chair Plays* and invisible in *The Room*, they all are uncertain about the way they exist. The future is so ambiguous in the eyes of the characters that they are presented as trapped in a kind of prison of uncertainty which fuels their existential crisis.

3.1.4. Strangers

As the world is globalized, it becomes more vulnerable to outside threats. Immigrants, who are considered as the unwanted human beings putting individuals at risk, are strangers to new environment where they arrive. Regarding this, strangers whose identity is not exactly detected are the ones of which individuals are constantly afraid in culture of fear. With their arrival to the secure sphere of insecure individuals, they are counted as the most fearsome threat.

Both Bond and Pinter include the fear of stranger in their plays. Dummy in *The Under Room*, Grit in *Have I None*, and Riley in *The Room* equally pose threat

for the characters. The moment when Dummy appears in the cellar of Joan lays bare that he fuels the anxiety and fear of Joan about her threatened security. Although she tries to help him escape from the authority at first, she turns into a cruel being towards the immigrant on which she puts the blame of insecurity in the society. Grit, as another immigrant portrayed by Bond, is an outside danger threatening the so-called comfortable living of Sara and Jams who plots against him with the aim of eliminating the danger. In Pinteresque context, Riley is the 'unknown' and a kind of intruder who arouses the racist leanings of Rose and Bert who beats him to death.

In all the plays, because of their unknown history and nature, strangers are portrayed as aliens coming from nowhere. Accelerated tension and insecurity they create in the secure place which is 'invaded' by them leads the characters into anxiety and fear.

3.1.5. Detachment from Past

No matter how it is certain, past is as much frightening as future in culture of fear since it reminds individuals of their bad memories, thus evoking their fear of present and future. In *Chair*, Alice comes to stage as detached from her past, as clearly presented in her encounter with Prisoner with whom she desires to establish a bond. Similar to the unknown past and family life of Alice, Billy's background is not exactly and explicitly revealed. In *The Under Room*, Dummy sometimes has difficulty in recalling his past memories mostly because he is agonized by forcibly killing his family. On this point, *Have I None* and *The Room* shows more similarities than the other plays do. In *Have I None*, the instant arrival of Grit, who alleges that he is Sara's brother, triggers the existential anxiety of Sara disconnected from her past. Similarly, Riley, most probably Rose's father, comes from the suppressed past of Rose completely detached from the past which seems rather disturbing. Yet, there is a slight difference between these two plays; whereas past is forcibly abolished by a totalitarian regime in *Have I None*, the detachment from past originates from the alienation of Rose, which is one of the outcomes of culture of fear consolidated by the globalized world.

3.1.6. Violence

The modern world paves the way for violence, a means applied mostly by fearful individuals who cannot sustain their existence without resorting to violent

act. Accelerated by some factors such as wars, terrors, media and the globalization of the world, which enable drastic changes on a way of living, violence becomes more pervasive throughout all the societies. In each play, it is used as a form of behavior of the characters who fear and who does not express themselves without involving in a violent act.

Soldier in *Chair*, who is frightened of his unknown future in the hands of the authority, kills Prisoner. Even though he is the agent of the absolute power, he is also as much oppressed as the other characters in the play. In the aim of overcoming his fear, he acts violently and shoots the Prisoner. In *The Under Room*, Joan kills Dummy by tearing him into pieces in the moment when she shows her existential crisis provoked by the fear against strangers. Sara and Jams, in *Have I None*, resort to violence to attempt to kill Grit with poison, either due to fear of the service which constantly surveils its subjects in the course of his threatening visit or due to the evocation of the past led by him. In *The Room*, embarking on a kind of conflict because of his hegemonic nature, Bert kills Riley for his threatened power in the room upon his arrival. As can be obvious, all of the plays contain violence as both a cause and an outcome of culture of fear.

3.2.   Differences Between the Plays
3.2.1. Authoritarian Power

An authoritarian power which can create a society of fear with its politics is one of the most crucial factors in the formation of culture of fear. Capable of using power and creating knowledge, it penetrates into the lives, oppressing the individuals, subverting the thoughts, creating an insecure atmosphere in the society, and rendering them into uncertain about their past, present and future.

In *The Chair Plays*, Bond indicates its severe impact on the characters despite the fact that the authority is not exactly identified but somehow it makes itself visible in the lives of the characters and spreads fear by way of its agents such as soldiers patrolling in the streets in the aim of consolidating the power. In contrast with the highly visible authority figure in Bondian context, Pinter presents oppressed characters in his play yet leaves the interpretation of whether there is an oppressive authority or not. It is, therefore, clear that the characters in *The Room* fear something outside which affects and threatens their ways of living. Yet, it can

be deduced that Bert is portrayed as the authority the rules of which should be obeyed for Rose. Her submissive attitudes towards her husband demonstrates the existence of authoritarian figure at home whereas there is a concrete authority – totalitarian state – of which the characters are frightened in *The Chair Plays*. Either by an invisible authority or visible one, the characters in all plays try to maintain their living through an external oppressive power.

3.2.2. Surveillance

Surveillance, a method used to oppress and intimidate human beings, is widely applied by totalitarian regimes to create a fear-based society. Continuously surveilled by a system, one lives with fear and acts in caution. His/her every move is directed and restricted by the system itself. Individuals governed by a totalitarian regime are imprisoned in a kind of society structured as panopticon where fear reigns and directs them.

Concerning the concept of surveillance, whereas Bond frequently mentions surveillance mechanisms such as cameras and soldiers in his trilogy, Pinter does not show any implications on the surveillance of his characters by a visible system even though they are completely oppressed by an unknown force.

3.2.3. Media

Having a severe impact on people's lives in the globalized world, media is another medium to spread fear since it has the ability to reveal frightening events on screens or papers and/or to fabricate false news, thus resulting in the emotion of fear in both ways. Bond scatters the impacts of media into his trilogy, thus mentioning news and newspapers in which characters learn the chaotic and dystopic incidents in the society while being possessed by fear. In contrast with Bondian exposition, Pinter does not include its impact in *The Room* without referring to any media tools.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This thesis aims to analyze *The Chair Plays* by Edward Bond and *The Room* by Harold Pinter and to compare them in the context of culture of fear through the content analysis of the plays and in the light of the background of the playwrights. As can be indicated, these plays have not been studied in terms of culture of fear so far. This study, therefore, aims to analyze the plays from a more contemporary perspective, filling the gap in literature.

In basic, the world shaken by wars, crime, violence and terror provides a basis for the formation of culture of fear. The society governed through fear is not secure and uncertain due to the chaotic atmosphere in the world. Culture of fear, which is nourished after the events such as World War II, Auschwitz, Holocaust and epidemic diseases, reshapes itself with the globalization of the world which is more vulnerable to terror, violence, abuse of mass media and advanced technology. The constant feeling of being at risk is one of the major impacts of fear-based culture. An individual living in the modern world is continuously kept insecure about his/her life and uncertain about his/her future which can be filled with unknown threats. Oppressed by external forces – totalitarian authority, immigrants, and terror – which are considered as the biggest threats in the modern living, individuals live on their nerves. However, domestic sphere, which is expected to be safe for individuals, is not as much secure as outside world since domestic violence becomes more prevalent in the modern world.

Further, the great impact of mass media on individuals and their lives is an undeniable fact. Its capability of creating a culture of fear by means of its manipulative language as well as its putting fear scenes on TV screens is much felt in the globalized sphere no matter how it is exaggerated. Cultivating fear within a society and reproducing a fear-based culture, mass media generates inevitable changes within a social process. Specifically, in totalitarian states, it can be used as a manipulative force to oppress individuals and infuse fear in social domain.

Another fear-infusing factor in the globalized world is mass immigration that cannot be obviated. An immigrant as a stranger in a strange world is the one who brings fear with him/herself in the eyes of many. Their identity as an outsider is threatening for the existence of individuals whose territory is slowly invaded. Living in a dangerous sphere formed by the sense of insecurity brought with

immigrants, individuals start to act cautiously in social interactions based upon mistrust.

Posing threat to the same degree, the advancement of technology render individuals more vulnerable to external threats. No sooner one steps outside, his/her every move is regularly watched by street cameras which limits the freedom of individuals by spreading anxiety and fear. It is obvious that this kind of surveillance is catalyzed by totalitarian authorities that are one of the most significant agents of fear-based societies. However, the excessive usage of and easy access to internet in the modern world constantly puts individuals at risk as much as making them feel insecure since it has the function to obtain every personal information, which may be threatening.

Edward Bond and Harold Pinter, two significant playwrights of post-war era, mirror the chaotic environment of Britain in their works. Affected by their past laden with violence of post-war era, they incline to reflect their thoughts and perspectives towards the era in which they live in harsh conditions. Both have political leanings which they project into their plays. The separating feature of these playwrights is the fact that whereas Bond highlights socio-political ills around the world in broad terms, Pinter deals with them on a more personal level. However, there is another mutual point which brings Bond and Pinter together; fear manifested in the representations of their characters.

This study concludes that *The Chair Plays* with which Bond aims at pointing out the possibility of a dystopian future contains several themes such as totalitarian regime, oppression, surveillance, violence, insecurity, and uncertainty. All of the characters in the trilogy are constantly oppressed and surveilled by a totalitarian regime which enables violence along with insecurity and uncertainty in the society in which human beings are vulnerable to instant dangers. Threatened by a totalitarian regime the basic motive of which is to spread fear through the society with the aid of soldiers, newspapers, and street cameras, the characters are forced to live in closed rooms which are supposed to be secure, but somehow turn into insecure ones due to the direct interference of the authority. Their living ways are standardized to remove their differences that should be immediately eliminated in that they lead to the formation of different thoughts which are seen as a great danger for the existence of the authority and are not easily directed. The instant and unwelcomed arrival of the immigrants such as the characters Dummy and Grit

provokes the existential crisis of other characters feeling threatened and insecure in the plays, which ends in violence to eliminate the danger. This insecure atmosphere created by the totalitarian regime and immigrants shatters the bond between the characters, thereby damaging the social interaction and paving the way for a new social domain predicated on mistrust. Accompanied and provoked by the sense of insecurity, uncertainty penetrates into the minds of the characters in the play, leading to the fact that they are uncertain about their past, present and future. Their past is already abolished to the extent that they are uncertain about their present condition while an unknown and frightening future waits for them.

Pinter, however, presents a micro example of fear-based society stuck within a room when compared to Bond's exposition of fear-based culture. In *The Room*, everything coming from outside is counted as a possible danger and the characters are shaped or oppressed by an invisible power. Rose, as a submissive wifely figure, comes to the forefront as the one who is more oppressed and fearful about the outside world. Even though there is no visible authority in the play, Bert, as a dominant power in the room, tries to establish a hegemonic structure while deeply infusing fear. However, the arrival of Riley, most probably the father of Rose, is regarded as an intrusion and a threat for the hegemonic power of Bert. As a stranger coming from the darkness of outside, Riley brings the condition of immigrants and racial hatred to light. His sudden appearance triggers Bert's racial hatred and Rose's uncontrolled sense of insecurity and suppressed uncertainty about her past. However, similar to *The Chair Plays*, *The Room* reflects the fragile nature of social interaction. There are no reliable ties between characters in that they all seem dangers to one another. Violence, as both a cause and an outcome of fear-based society, is perpetrated by Bert against Riley who is unknown to him and threatens his absolute power in the room. Pinter, in creating such plot and characters in his first play, presents a fear-based world stuck in a room.

With regard to their similarities and differences, it can be concluded that they share similarities in terms of thematic elements such as oppression, threatening outside world, the sheltered place, the issue of immigrants, insecurity/uncertainty, violence and detachment from past. Yet, they differ in the matter of authority, surveillance and the impact of media. Whereas Bond makes authority highly visible and threatening in *The Chair Plays*, Pinter does not present a visible authority figure except for Bert, dominant power in domestic setting, throughout his play. Also, the

characters are surveilled by cameras in the street in *The Chair Plays* while cameras or any implications on surveillance mechanism in *The Room* are not mentioned. Media from which they learn brutal realities in society is seen as a determining factor on characters' lives in *The Chair Plays*. However, there is no hint to media from the very beginning to the end of the play in *The Room*. To conclude, while Bond presents a macrocosm of culture of fear in his trilogy, Pinter creates a microcosm of culture of fear which is stuck in a room.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdel-Aal, D. B. (2019). Harold Pinter's progress from modernism to postmodernism with special emphasis on three selected plays. Qassim University, *8*(1), 177-206.

Ansari, A. A. (2016). Fear and death in Harold Pinter's play "The Room". *Global English-Oriented Research Journal*. *2*(3), 90-103.

Baldwin, V. M. (2009). 'Look for the Truth and Tell it': Politics and Harold Pinter. Thesis, University of Birmingham.

Baudrillard, J. (2010). *The Agony of Power*. Semiotext(e).

Bauman, Z. (1992). *Intimations of Postmodernity*. Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (1997). *Postmodernity and its Discontents*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2003). City of fears, city of hopes. Goldsmiths College, University of London, 2-39.

Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid Fear*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2011). *Postmodern Etik* (Çev.Alev Türker). Ayrıntı Yayınları, 2. Basım.

Bauman, Z. & Donskis, L. (2013). *Moral Blindness: The Loss of Sensitivity in Liquid Modernity*. Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid Surveillance*. Polity Press.

Bigo, D. (2006). Security, exception, ban and surveillance. *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond* (Ed. David Lyon). Willan Publishing.

Billingham, P. (2014). *Edward Bond: A Critical Study*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Blanchard, R. J., Blanchard, D. C., Griebel, G. & Nutt, D. J. (2008). *Handbook of Anxiety and Fear*. Vol. 17, Elsevier.

Bloom, H. & Hobby, B. (2009). *Alienation*. Bloom's Literary Criticism, Infobase Publishing.

Bond, E. (2000a). *Two Plays: The Children & Have I None*. Methuen Drama.

Bond, E. (2000b). *The Hidden Plot: Notes on Theatre and the State*. Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.

Bond, E. (2006). *Plays 8: Born, People, Chair, Existence, The Under Room.* Methuen Drama.

Bordoni, C. (2017). *State of Fear in a Liquid World*. Routledge.

Chaudhari, V. Z. (2013). A complex journey of peace and violence in the plays of Harold Pinter (*The Birthday Party*, *The Caretaker*, *The Room*, *The Dumb Waiter*). *Labyrinth*. *4*(3), 120-125.

Chen, C. (2016). On Edward Bond's dramaturgy of crisis in *The Chair Plays*: the dystopian imagination and the imagination in dystopia. *Theatre and Crisis*, *10*(2), pp. 32-50.

Chen, C. (2018). The Later Edward Bond: Subjectivity, Dramaturgy, and Performance. Doctoral thesis, University of London.

Claeys, G. (2017). *Dystopia: A Natural History*. Oxford University Press.

Debord, G. (2002). *The Society of the Spectacle*. Zone Books.

Dehkordi, J. F. (2019). Terrorism against biopower: the study of post-panopticism and liquid surveillance in Edward Bond's *The Under Room. Research in Contemporary World Literature*. *24*(1), pp.37-40.

Dinakaran, P. & Pravindh, R. (2018). Exordium of anxiety in Harold Pinter's *The Room*. *Language in India*. *18*(10), 166-170.

Dukore, B. F. (1988). *Macmillan Modern Dramatists: Harold Pinter* (Eds. Bruce King & Adele King). Macmillan Education, Second Edition.

Esslin, M. (1976). *Pinter: A Study of His Plays*. The Norton Library.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Trans. Alan Sheridan). Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1987). *Mental Illness and Psychology* (Trans. Alan Sheridan). University of California Press.

Foucault, M. (2014). *Özne ve İktidar*. Seçme Yazıları 4. Ayrıntı Yayınları, 3. Basım.

Freud, S. (2015). *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. Dodo Collections.

Fromm, E. (2001). *The Fear of Freedom*, Routledge.

Furedi, F. (2002). *Culture of Fear: Risk-taking and the Morality of Low Expectation*. Bloomsbury Continuum.

Furedi, F. (2018). *How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the 21st Century*. Bloomsbury Continuum.

Gairola, I. (2017). Depiction of existential anxiety in Harold Pinter's *The Room*. *International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*. *6*(5), 15-18.

Gutting, G. (2005). *Foucault: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Haggerty, K. D. (2006). Tear down the walls: on demolishing the panopticon. *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond* (Ed. David Lyon). Willan Publishing.

Hollis, J. R. (1970). *Harold Pinter: The Poetics of Silence.* Southern Illinois University Press.

Kohzadi, H. & Azizmohammadi, F. & Makki, S. A. (2012). Alienation in Harold Pinter's *The Room*. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*. *2*(2), 1690-1695.

Krishnamurti, J. (2006). *Bilinmeyene Açık Olmak, Korku Sorunu, Güvenlik Diye Bir Sey Var mı?* (Çev. Seda Toksoy). Sistem Yayınları, 1. Basım.

Krishnamurti, J. (2013). *On Fear*. Harper Collins.

Los, M. (2006). Looking into the future: surveillance, globalization and totalitarian potential. *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond*. (Ed. David Lyon). Willan Publishing.

Lovecraft, H. P. (1998). Supernatural horror in literature. Retrieved on 15th September from **https://www.hplovecraft.com/writings/texts/essays/shil.aspx**

Mskhaladze, D. (2017). Politics and Harold Pinter's plays. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*. *9*(4), pp.389-392.

Özata, C. & Biçer, A. G. (2021). Edward Bond'un *Sandalye Oyunları*'nda iktidar. *Litera: Dil, Edebiyat ve Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi*. *31*(1), pp.229-254.

Pagadala, A. M. (2015). The world of anxiety in the early plays of Harold Pinter. *International Journal of English: Literature, Language & Skills*. *4*(3), pp.32-37.

Petráž, D. (2011). Menace in *The Dumb Waiter* and *The Room*. Bachelor Paper, University of Pardubice.

Pinter, H. (1996). *Plays 1: The Birthday Party, The Room, The Dumb Waiter, A Slight Ache, The Hot House, A Night Out, The Black and White, The Examination*. Faber and Faber.

Pravindh, R. & Dinakaran, P. (2018). Exordium of anxiety in Harold Pinter's *The Room*. *Language in India*. *18*, pp.166-170.

Rae, G. (2011). *Realizing Freedom: Hegel, Sartre, and the Alienation of Human Being*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Regal, M. S. (1995). *Harold Pinter: A Question of Timing*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Scharine, R. (1976). *The Plays of Edward Bond*. London: Associated University Press.

Schneier, B. (2003). *Beyond Fear: Thinking Sensibly About Security in an Uncertain World*. Copernicus Books.

Sitarica, A. (2020). Verbal violence in overtly political plays by Harold Pinter. University of Belgrade, 89-106. Retrieved on 3rd September from http://doi.fil.bg.ac.rs/volume.php?pt=eb_ser&issue=bells90-2020-2&i=7

Stasio, M. (2008). *Chair* (Review). Daily Variety Gotham, p.7.

Stokes, J. (2009). Pinter and the 1950s. *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter* (Ed. Peter Raby). pp.27-42.

Stone, L. A. (2003). Harold Pinter and fragmentation of working-class consciousness. *Cultural Logic*, pp.1-10.

Svendsen, L. (2008). *A Philosophy of Fear* (Trans. John Irons). Reaktion Books.

Taylor-Batty, M. (2009). Harold Pinter: 1930-2008. Contemporary Theatre Review, *19*(2), pp.204-207.

Yılmaz, K. Ç. (2011). Harold Pinter'ın *The Room*, *The Birthday Party* ve *The Dumb Waiter* Adlı Oyunlarında Tehdit, Korku ve Komedi Öğeleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi.

Young, P. D. (2009). Paranoid futurism or totalitarian realism? (Review). *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*. *32*(1), pp.53-59).

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Adı Soyadı	Güzin ŞARMAN
ORCİD Numarası	0000-0001-6306-0324
Lisans Mezuniyet	
Üniversite	Gazi Üniversitesi
Fakülte	Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi
Bölümü	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Yüksek Lisans Mezuniyet	
Üniversite	Ordu Üniversitesi
Enstitü Adı	Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Anabilim Dalı	İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans
Doktora Mezuniyet	
Üniversite	
Enstitü Adı	
Anabilim Dalı	
Programı	
Akademik Çalışmaları	
1	
2	