Abstract - By borrowing insights from Michael Foucault and Antony Gramsci's theoretical constructs on the concept of power, this paper attempts to study the working of power dynamics in Harold Pinter's *The Hothouse*. Power is present in all human relationships, and it determines the interactions among them as well. Such a view is central to the theories of Foucault and Gramsci which is being investigated in the present study. Through text and context analysis, it has been demonstrated that there has been an inevitable interrelation between the events happening in the play and some socio-political events of the modern world. Accordingly, the researchers have analyzed the text of the play under discussion, and have examined the contextual information with respect to the theories of power and hegemony. Given the theories of power, it was observed that only traditional theories of power could be applied to *The Hothouse*, because the power institution is exerting the most severe form of power to control, subjugate and suppress its subjects. As an overall conclusion, the researchers came up with the idea that modern theories of power and Gramsci's hegemonic theories cannot be applied to the selected play.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The abuse of power, preoccupation with authority and corruption are major themes that may be traced in almost all of Pinter's plays. His plays are fictional statements of brutal facts of the modern world. An overall survey of his plays reveals that Pinter has always been fascinated with man's fear, anxiety and the abuse of power. In his dramatic work, Pinter has attempted to depict man in a world controlled by those who hold power by which they try to dominate individuals. While Pinter's early plays deal with the problem of identity, communication, verification and existential anxiety, his later plays are overtly political and are concerned with the abuse of power, violence and suppression.

For Foucault, power is not something held and used by individuals or groups of people but a “complex flow and a network of relations between different groups and areas of society which changes with circumstances and time… is not solely negative but highly productive… produces what we are and what we can do” (Danaher xiv).

Power has 'traditionally' been regarded as a means of punishment and destruction. As such, it has often been viewed a negative force that suppresses people. Power was always understood through its endeavour to be centralized because it was in the possession of an individual or a certain group of people. Thus most of the people were seen as powerless or marginalized. In this sense, power was also understood in terms of its repressiveness. But for Foucault, power is not merely a negative force suppressing people, but on the contrary, it can be productive. Power, through discipline and instruction can analyze, regulate, control, explain and define human subject, its body and behavior. It can be applied to disciplinary institutions and practices as well. He believes that power is not only held and utilized by individuals or groups but it is a complex flow and a set of relations between groups of people and areas of society that change with time and events. Power overshadows everything actively and commutes in an institution or society because it circulates and it is not localized. For Foucault, as it is for Antonio Gramsci, power can be productive to discipline and regulate people. Regarding the purpose of power, Foucault states, “The classical age discovered the body, as object and target of power. It is easy enough to find signs
of the attention then paid to the body-to-the-body that is manipulated, shaped, trained, which obeys, responds, becomes skilful and increases its forces" (Foucault 136). In most societies, power is allied with violence but as Hannah Arendt claims, “power and violence are seen as antithetical … there is recognition that, where violence is used, power has become inoperative” (quoted in Wartenberg 35).

2. HAROLD PINTER: LIFE AND WORKS

Recipient of the Nobel Prize for Literature, Harold Pinter (1930-2008) was one of the most influential dramatists among the young generation of playwrights. His social background was neither middle class nor upper class. His early age was spent in a dark dingy working class area with his Jewish parents. His family life was disrupted by war. He experienced the insecurity and fear of war and these disturbing experiences of childhood and the sense of insecurity by his removal from his family can be easily seen in his various plays, sketches and the poems. Pinter was much influenced by Beckett and Kafka. Most of his contemporary political playwrights were impressed with Pinter's works and his political standpoints. Pinter was awarded the Nobel Prize in 2005. Pinter always wrote against the abuse of power whether it was against the Jewish people or the US led invasion of Iraq. His plays are dominated by various aspects of power. It can be said that power has played a dominant role in his work. His plays such as The Hothouse, The Room and The Dumb Waiter, One for the Road, The Birthday Party, New World Order and others are perfect examples of the manipulation of power. Critics believe that Pinter's fascination with the concept of power, corruption, violence, and totalitarianism emerge out of his experiences before and after World War II. He says, as Esslin quotes, “I am aware of the sufferings and the horror of war and by no means was I going to subscribe to keeping it going…” (Theatre of the Absurd 16). With respect to the above recurring themes of his plays, many critics have focused both on his work and life with the intention of depicting the source of power and so many other pertinent concepts. As Penelope Prentice notes, “His early war experiences, coupled with his early confrontation and exploration of violence in literature and film, provided the nexus of aesthetic and ethical concerns that later developed in his plays” (Prentice xxxii).

3. DISCUSSION

Austin Quigley, Michael Billington, Martin Esslin, John Russel Taylor, James Hollis and Steven Gale are prominent critics of Pinter who have critiqued Pinter's drama from various aspects. Their perceptive analyses have guided the readers in the better appreciation of Pinter's works and life. Interestingly, with the exception of Penelope Prentice, none of them has discussed the concept of power in their works. Prentice, however, in our view is the only critic who has attempted to examine power in her appreciation of Pinter's work. The entire book by Penelope Prentice, Pinter's Ethic: The Erotic Aesthetic, is about a power struggle at different levels between two individuals, state/institution and individuals or it may take place at global level. Prentice pictures the power struggle as “Pinter's dominant/subservient conflict” (Prentice xix). Prentice, however, has not discussed the concept from the view points of Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci; neither has she tracked theories of social power and the ideas of discipline, regulation, punishment, subjugation, and adjustment.

4. AIMS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The main objective of this study is to depict how Pinter has attempted to envisage the abuse of power by those who hold it in order to dominate and subjugate the people. Also, the researchers attempt to portray the form of power used in The Hothouse to control and suppress the subjects. Further, this paper seeks to reveal whether the
kind of power exercised in the play is a traditional or a modern form of power. Finally, this study discloses reasons behind Pinter's preoccupation with the idea of power and its overshadowing implications in The Hothouse.

Although most of Pinter's plays portray the shadows of power exerted over individuals, The Hothouse is unique in rendering the distinctive features of power as well as for the way people are treated by those in power. The researchers think such themes as state power, abuse of power, dominance, violence and repression may be more dominant in The Hothouse than in any other play by Pinter. This study will help provide the readers with more knowledge about the relationship between Pinter's work and the socio-historical events of the time. Also, the way Pinter unfolds the appalling shadow and nature of power being practiced in society will be elaborated upon. Therefore, this study targets those readers interested in Pinter's work and his world.

5. RESEARCH APPROACH

This research is derived from considerable reading in the following areas: the concept of power, the representation of the abuse of power in Pinter's The Hothouse, and the impact of the Holocaust and the disastrous events before and after World War II on his life and political activities. For a critical reader of Pinter's work, some of his plays reflect analogies to Michel Foucault's social vision. Hence, theories of power by Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony are taken into consideration to carry out the present research. This study also attempts to show how those who are in power treat the individuals in an institution or society; how even the victimizer becomes a victim in an authoritarian system. This approach also tends to examine how power leads to bureaucracy and corruption. In that light, The Hothouse will be examined in terms of Pinter's biographical background and traces of the socio-historical and cultural implications of the time. The abuse of power and power struggles which have obsessed Pinter for his entire life are of prime importance to the discussion in this paper. Through this approach, the research will show how power creeps in everywhere in society and how it tries to subjugate and control those who do not comply with the power system.

6. DISCUSSION

The Hothouse was written in 1958 but Pinter put it aside for some deliberation until up early 1980's and he made no attempts to have it produced because he thought it was inappropriate for the time. Pinter, however, later decided to present it on the stage. He made a few changes and directed it for rehearsal. In an interview in 1967 with M. Bensky, Pinter discloses why he had put the play aside for some time. In fact, he had thought of writing a satirical play and that was The Hothouse. He says it was about an institution in which patients were kept: all that was presented was the hierarchy, the people who ran the institution. One never knew what happened to the patients or what they were there for or who they were. It was heavily satirical and it was quite useless... So I discarded the play at once" (qtd. in Ganz 27).

Set in a sanatorium (mental hospital) where the patients are enclosed, The Hothouse, relates mainly the tale of the symbolic mental asylum managed by a maniac totalitarian and forgetful Roote, a pompous ex-colonel. He is abetted by two lackeys: the ruthless, sinister Gibbs and the seedy, the aptly-named alcoholic Lush. There is also the sexy Miss Cutts, whose favours seem to be shared with most of the staff members. Here, the patients are referred to not by their name but by numbers. Recently, one of the inmates has died and another has given birth by an unknown father. Gibbs has been ordered to find out the identity of the child’s father (the mode of interrogation is reminiscent of Kafkaesque world). Though no official report is filed against the person who has fathered the child, Lamb, a low-ranking staff member is victimized in this respect. Finally, the play ends as ominously as it
began, with an outbreak of deadly violence which leaves only one survivor to search for answer and, perhaps, to accept responsibility for the disorder which follows and that may be Roote, the manager.

The appointment of Roote as the offender to inquire into the murder and the pregnancy in the mental hospital is a stark reminder of the present 'facts-are-stranger-than-the-fictional world'. The fact that both his assistant, Gibbs, and his lieutenant, Lush, trying secretly to topple Roote from his position is yet another instance of the world of conspiracy and opportunism that we inhabit. As Pinter reveals, one department of the institution is engaged in conducting tests to determine the reactions of the nervous system to different stimuli. For this, the subjects of the scientific tests are chosen from the volunteers who are paid for the services, in the 'interests of science'. Compared to some other plays, The Hothouse has tried to focus more on the staff members than the inmates. By this, Pinter wants to mirror the staff as the victims of the totalitarian and bureaucratic system. A female patient is found to be pregnant and then she gives birth to a child. They lay blame on the helpless Lamb but during the play it is understood that Roote, the manager, has fathered the child of the patient 6459 and also murdered 6457. As David Trennery writes in UK National Theatre Review-Arts Hub, “It is clear that one or more of the staff - perhaps even the Colonel himself - are to blame. Murder and rape are discussed with wonderful and horrific humour by Roote and his razor sharp lieutenant, Mr. Gibbs (Trennery 1). But Pinter implicitly conveys that anyone who tolerates repression and injustice is to blame.

At the end of the play Roote is replaced by Lobb. Here, Pinter tries to show the insecurity of the staff and that staff members in a system are operating as the agents of that system and they are safe and secure as long as they are fully committed to their duties. The event recalls a similar setting in The Dumb Waiter where Gus is punished or probably murdered due to his disobedience of the organisation he is working for. For this reason, the play under discussion envisages a mental institution where the management of it has absolute control over the patients' lives. This attitude toward corruption is characterized by Pinter in many of his plays.

Concerning Pinter's Political views, John Peter wrote in an article in the Sunday Times on 22nd of May 1994 that, “To me, Pinter's plays have always been political, in the sense that Ibsen's plays are political; they explore the private root of power, the need to dominate and to mislead, the terror of being excluded or enclosed…” (qtd. in Peacock 139). Peacock himself believes that The Hothouse “introduces us to an institutional application of violence” (Peacock 140). The purpose of the institution is to incarcerate political dissidents for certain reasons. Pinter's reference to the psychiatric hospitals of the Soviet Union (as quoted in BBC Omnibus Interview) supports the above political views. The play is seen as “powerful translation of the Nazi extermination system” (Burkman 37).

The Hothouse can be read as a parable of totalitarian regimes elsewhere. It is a microcosm of the whole world where those who hold power exercise authoritarian and oppressive practices over powerless people. The play satirizes social and political attitudes to dominate the others in a very strong and lucid way. Therefore, a tone of satirical implication overshadows the whole play. As regards satirical aspects of the play, Pinter is seen to be thinking of political ineffectiveness of the satire for some time but when it comes to the Thatcherite England, he finds it the right time for the play to come out of hiding.

The Hothouse is, indeed, an angry play which tries to reveal Pinter's satirical fury against inhumanity and injustice. Like any satire, the play employs exaggerations in an effort to reveal the appalling reality happening in mental
hospitals. Roote, the manager of the hospital says, “It's unbelievable, isn't it, Lush, the things that go on?” (95). Roote later asserts that he is more than he seems, “You think I am past my job”? To prove his claim he states, “I am as quick as a python” (95). Further, he notes, “…some people think I'm old, but oh no, not by a long chalk. I've got second sight. I can see through walls” (128). Similarly, Nicolas, the brutal manager, interrogator, and torturer in One for the Road, uses exaggeration saying, “God speaks through me” (30). In reality, both Roote and Nicolas feel they are matchless and want to enjoy their superiority and authority over the others. Such manipulation of authority and power against human beings made Pinter express his indignation to politicians and those who were in power.

It is in this sense that Pinter's popularity for the last thirty years of his life relied much on his reputation as a political voice of the left as on his dramatic production. Pinter's plays, however, do not convey any special ideological message. His work is no longer a propaganda machine or part of State's apparatus in favour of any ideological 'ism' such as Marxism because a work of art goes beyond such ideological stances. Yet, he vigorously and incessantly protested against all types of oppressions and the abuse of power. By the same token, he has been regarded the most outspoken speaker in the United Kingdom for victims of oppression and atrocities. As such, on learning on October 13, 2005 that he was to be awarded the Nobel Prize, Pinter was surprised and said, “they must have taken my political activities into consideration since my political views are very much part of my work, and are interwoven into many of my plays” (Billington, The Guardian. 15 Oct. 2005). But the Nobel committee offered him the award only because they believed his work “uncovers closed rooms”. In the same article in The Guardian, Billington notes, “I think whoever wrote that has got the precise point.”

Pinter's strong position against the British and American governments angered politicians to the extent that no single party leader congratulated him on his winning of the Nobel Prize. This hostile aggression from politicians against Pinter even disturbed the contemporary playwright David Hare. Such unjust attitudes toward Pinter by politicians were not exactly surprising as he repeatedly offended party leaders by his outspoken criticism of the abuse of power. Pinter's attitude was one of outrage at the hypocrisy of Western governments which were exercising the most brutal cruelties while propagating moral superiority. Yet, the aggression of politicians and power holders did not undermine his critical stand toward atrocities. Instead, he constantly reiterated that it was his responsibility to pursue his role as a citizen of the world in which he lived and insisted upon taking that responsibility. From this standpoint, in his Nobel Prize speech, he once again expressed his indignation of British and American policies worldwide.

Pinter's The Hothouse is a less political play but it is the root of an inclination which resulted in his later overtly political plays such as Mountain Language, One for the Road and The New World Order. The play deals with a number of themes such as state power, systematic mental and physical abuse of the prisoners. Such authoritarian system tends to classify its subjects in terms of one criterion or another in order to justify atrocities against those categorized as the 'others'. The aim of the institution, as Roote claims, is to supply aid and protection for the patients who are not 'criminals' but are people “especially recommended by the Ministry” (9). In fact, as Roote says, “These people are in need of help, which we give, in one way or the other, to the best of our discretion, to the best of our judgment, to help them regain their confidence, confidence in others,” (9). The play not only reveals the incompetence and corruption of the staff members, but also their follies and foolishness. The opening dialogue, for example,
between Roote and Gibbs illustrates the problem of incompetence. Here, Roote asks about 6457, one of the inmates, but his assistant Gibbs says that this inmate has died two days earlier. Roote rejects the news about 6457 and says he met with the same inmate the day before. In view of this, an odd conversation that comes immediately after the opening dialogue shows the inefficiency of the staff, especially Roote, who has no idea about time. Roote: “Dead?” “He died on Thursday, sir.” replies Gibbs… [14]). In order to justify himself and refute Gibbs about the inmate 6457, Roote sits at his office desk and refers to the diary and then their conversation continues as:

Roote. Wait … here we are. Got it. Conversation with 6457 ten o'clock Friday morning. That was yesterday. Well what do you make of that?

Gibbs. I'm afraid there seems to be a discrepancy, sir.

Roote. Discrepancy! I'm damn sure there's a discrepancy!....

Gibbs. I mean… about the dates, sir.

Roote. Dates? What dates?

Gibbs. In your diary, sir… (15).

As the play proceeds, we come across the seeds of corruption and the abuse of power. Taking this into account, when the news of the birth of a baby is disclosed, Roote reacts more gravely to it than to the death of an inmate. This attitude implies that death has become an ordinary and frequent thing in their institution. Another point reflecting the abuse of power and corruption is that obeying 'rules' is compulsory and unquestionable. Accordingly, all of the staff and the inmates have to follow the rules and traditions obediently. This is quite evident when Roote says, “I am dumbstruck… This has never happened before. Never! In all the years I've been here, in all the years my predecessor was here. And I'm quite certain never before him” (37). As a result, nobody is allowed to challenge the rules and power system, nor is anybody allowed to try to change the system of the institution or to undermine the authority handed down to them from their forefathers. Every staff member, even the manager, is watched and 'gazed at' by the others in the system. When Roote, for instance, argues about the use of numbers instead of the names of the inmates saying, “We shouldn't use these stupid numbers at all. Only confuses things. Why don't we use their names, for God's sake? They've got their names, haven't they?” (19). Then, Gibbs reminds him or perhaps warns him that “It was your predecessor who instituted the use of numbers, sir” (19). As regards the staff of the system and whatever their position, they must obey the rules of the institution, and they are privileged only through their absolute obedience. This is, in fact, the real nature of a power system that tends to subjugate not only its subjects but also its staff and top senior managers. Roote, in his conversation with his assistant Gibbs, maintains that his promotion came out of his obedience, only because he kept saying “yes sir, no sir and certainly sir. Just as you are now” (20). Similarly, Gibbs tries to show that he obeys his boss, Roote, only because he knows that promotion is reserved as long as the rules are followed. Significantly, judging from the interactions and exchanges between the staff, it is concluded that Roote, though he is the manager of the institution, cannot be excluded before the laws and rules. Roote is equally insecure and his position may be undermined any moment. Keeping this in mind, all the staff members are, in fact, scapegoats of the bureaucratic system for which they are working. In spite of the fact that the patients are not seen at all and the play also zooms in on the ruthless tormentors, we acquire a lot of information about the patients through the exchanges between the staff. The patients, in reality, are recommended by the 'Ministry' to be held in the facility and it is the role of Roote and the staff to discipline them as they adjust to the power system. To do this, the staff is completely free to use any tactics to make them change and conform to the institution. Therefore, the patients
are kept in their cells and the staff members are granted unrestricted authority and power to control their subjects. Extreme power brings the staff to the peak of corruption. The patients, on the contrary, are subjected to abuse of power, rape and systematic tortures to the extent that they are changed and granted a new identity. Depending on the nature of the power system, the procedure of changing the subjects usually occurs through disciplining, educating the inmates, while force and torture are exercised in case of incompatibility and non-conformity of the inmates. In the process of the disciplining, the patients lose their identity and names and they are given new names, that is, numbers, which grant them credibility in the eyes of the institution.

Pinter's plays are the best evidence of his obsession with power. Most of these plays are portrayals of the methods of torture, corruption and the abuse of power. He attempts to illustrate the ability of power to corrupt. Just as Roote becomes corrupt by the power that he wields over his victims, so it is in the case of Nicolas in *One for the Road*. The fully equipped offices of Roote and Nicolas associate the audience to the torture and the abuse of power. These characters reveal that they are real people, like everyone else. Pinter's characters, unlike those of many other contemporary playwrights, act on the edge of reality, never try to go beyond it. He never wants his characters and their operations to represent mere symbols and become objects. Pinter maintains, “I am interested primarily in people: I want to present living people to the audience, worthy of their interest because they are, they exist, not because of any moral the author may draw from them” (Hollis 122). In this light, Pinter tends to say that they are not villains but anyone who is in a powerful position can be aggressive and try to dominate the others, be it Roote or Nicolas or any Nazi officer. In this sense, the audience may fear being in a powerful position and becoming a torturer and aggressor to fellow human beings. All through his life, Pinter was fascinated with the concept of extreme power that leads to corruption. For this reason, he envisages a mental institution where the management of it has absolute control over the patients' lives. This attitude toward corruption is characterized by Pinter in many of his plays. Given the idea of corruption, Pinter says, “The Birthday Party which I wrote in 1957, again has a central authoritarian forces; and The Hothouse which actually followed quite soon, I think is essentially about the abuse of authority” (Merritt 137).

The Hothouse is open to different interpretations. It may be a demystification of Pinter's preoccupation with Soviet mental hospitals as depository for the social dissidents. After World War II, the Soviet Union was condemned for keeping political dissidents in psychiatric hospitals. Taking this into consideration, Pinter wrote a letter to *The Times* of London to condemn the incarceration of Vladimir Bukovsky, an author and political dissident. The play may also be the manifestation of Pinter's indignation of the American use of political prisoners in Central and Latin America, or imprisonment and interrogation practised by British intelligence services in Belfast's prisons, and the murders of British dissidents in prisons. Therefore, the oppressions appear to be as Billington states, “a fable about what can happen when the rights of the individual are subordinated to the power of the state” (The Life 355). Though The Hothouse reflects some historical realities, Pinter has tried to extend the idea of repression and torture to almost all of his work. He believes himself that 'torture' is applied at least in 180 countries. While admiring Pinter's The Hothouse, Rudolf Stamm calls the play “a vigorous protest against a hierarchical bureaucratic and inhuman institution of a society” (“English Studies” 290-298). The play can also be taken as Pinter's condemnation of the incentives of any organization to deprive individuals of their individuality. The denial of the victims' identity and individuality is
suggestive of dehumanization by a state power or an institution. Thus, the play, in the meantime, mirrors the confrontation of individuals and all institutions in a society. Pinter, in his interview with Mel Gussow, states he “would say that The Hothouse is essentially about abuse of authority” (56). Pinter's awareness of the psychological repression of the individuals is also a criticism of Western countries where bureaucracy is even of high importance for the democratic governments. He also wants to show how individuality of citizens in such a bureaucratic system repressed and reduced to a less than human state as they are presented as nameless, numbered patients. The play also reflects many references to the Holocaust; it is set in a mental hospital where the authorities maintain absolute control over the patients. The hospital reminds us of Nazi's concentration or extermination camps. In relation to the idea of the Holocaust, Francis Gillen argues this in her article “'Nowhere to Go': Society and the Individual in Harold Pinter's The Hothouse”. It is as Rosette Lamont states, “a parable of the systematic annihilation of "inferior" races by a nation bent on mass death” (38). Gillen observes that, “In its broadest implications, The Hothouse represents far more than a single asylum. It is any institution which demands sacrifice of individuals or parts of individuals so that order may be maintained. Perhaps it is society itself” (qtd. in Gale 164-74). The play

As we perceive from Foucault's theory of power, it is not only a single institution that tries to subjugate the individuals but a network of institutions that function to discipline people to adjust and become docile in the dominant system. Foucault believes that power is not located in some specific place. It is everywhere and all institutions such as schools, churches, barracks, and universities are involved here in exercising power that can be very effective in the subjugation of people to make them ideal citizens. According to Foucault power means relations of dominations of forces under political technology organized by strategy. The controlling and the gazing of the patients in the hospital remind us of the idea of Panopticon offered by Bentham as a comprehensive and economical way of controlling the prisoners. Consequently, a proper technology is needed to manipulate power. This idea can be exercised through Bentham's Panopticon which is usually thought of a prison. Panopticism refers to Bentham's model of the panopticon, which was a tower placed in a central position within the prison. From this tower, the guards would observe every cell and the prisoners inside them, but it was designed in such a way that the prisoners would never know whether they were being observed. Prisoners would assume that they could be observed at any moment and would adjust their behavior accordingly. Bentham believes that the principle of Panopticon could be extended beyond prisons. Metaphorically, the panopticon stands for the whole society and this method can be applied to a larger group of people or a nation. Bentham opened his Panopticon Letters with claim, “Moral reformed - health preserved - industry invigorated - instruction defused - public burdens lightened - economy seated,.... all by simple idea of architecture” (Pan, Preface 39). Hobbes and Bentham define power to reform and serve; however, Foucault traces out how power touches the individuals and how it affects them. He elaborates that the individual is suppressed by the privileged political body. The individual's rights are never properly integrated by those who possess power. The rights of a human being are not dependent upon his biological existence but upon his place and power within the body politics. Sometimes in the name of preserving life, power is used to manipulate with incredible cruelty.

By and large, we perceive through a close reading of The Hothouse that the inmates have not conformed to the rules and traditions of the organization and they are not disciplined to obey what is dictated by the power system. Therefore, they are no longer good citizens who benefit from
the system. As far as Michel Foucault's theory of 'discipline and punish' and Antonio Gramsci's theory of 'hegemony' are concerned, the inmates' non-conformity to discipline and rules lead to their punishment. Apparently, there is no force or punishment offered by Gramsci in disciplining people. As regards the definition of hegemony, it is a form of socio-political power which is not based individually rather it causes an effect on a larger group of people or the whole state. Western countries usually practice this form of power as they are against the direct application of power. Hegemony is the exercise of power over the weaker section of society. Hegemony refers to the way in which states and state institutions work to 'win' popular consent for their authority through a variety of processes which disguise their position of dominance, and without the use of any force or punishment. Gramsci believes that powerful groups do not need to impose their ideals by direct force upon the less powerful because this latter group will naturally come to accept and consent to the rule of the powerful. That is to say, hegemony works at the levels of people's minds, because they come to believe that the operation of power in society is natural and just, rather than being forced to accept social relations. With this in mind, we can come up with the idea that Gramsci's hegemonic theory is far from being applied to the method of the power system in The Hothouse. To prove the above mentioned analysis, we can say that punishment, rape and other atrocities which are being practiced by the staff members in the play do not play any role in hegemonic system. Thus, hegemony, in its narrow meaning, refers to cultural and non-military dominance, but in its wider meaning it can refer to any kind of dominance to indicate certain policies in order to dominate or defeat others. In any case, those who are in power try to maintain their hegemony.

Given the educational and cultural treatment of people by both Gramsci's hegemonic system and Foucault's modern form of power, one may figure out a lot of similarities between the two methods in controlling and disciplining the citizens. With reference to the events and developments happening in The Hothouse, we come up with this notion that we cannot include these two methods of power to apply to the play under discussion. Therefore, as Foucault distinguishes between traditional and modern methods of exercising power over individuals or a nation, traditional methods tend to use power to control in its most severe way, whether it leads to disciplining or to the deaths of the subjects. The theories offered by the traditional method are more compatible and applicable to the events and the outcomes of the interactions in the play. The traditional method of power tries to exert severe punishment, systematic torture and even the death penalty to dissidents and those who do not comply with the system. This, exactly, is being practiced by staff members of the authoritative system in The Hothouse. In effect, all such social theories are orchestrated to control citizens of a society to the extent that the authorities can maintain dominance over their people. In such systems, People are kept under vigorous surveillance by the power agents. Pinter's characters react differently to the exposure to power. Stanley in The Birthday Party, for example, has adjusted to the system in the end and bears a new identity which matches the one an ideal citizen of a society should acquire. Gus in The Dumb Waiter is treated with absolute imposition of power-a traditional application of power only because he rejects the rules handed down by the main figures of an organization. The inmates in The Hothouse do not apparently undergo the kind of change the staff was 'hoping' and this 'non-conformity' leads to their destruction and deaths only because they are not changed in the process of disciplining.

7. CONCLUSION

Though the world is centrally concerned with the question of authority, abuse of power, dominance and subservience, Pinter implicitly states that “the social violence of our time must be eradicated from the psyche of the individuals”
While trying to reject all intolerant and coercive power structures operating in the name of the state, culture or religion, this study has attempted to be objective, truthful in its criticism of text, The Hothouse, and the systems of power. Edward Said believes that the first step to obtain truthfulness is to admit that all 'representations' are planted first in the language and then in the culture, political and institutional contexts of the 'representer'. He further adds that we must “admit the fact that a representation is … interwoven with a great many other factors besides the truth which is itself a truth” (Orientalism: 272). Consequently, this study has tried to track dominant implications of social and political ambience of The Hothouse. Because “Cultural critics see themselves as 'oppositional', not only within their own disciplines but to many of the power structures of society at large” (Guerin and et al. 277). They try to reconstruct social relationships among the dominant and the minority or subaltern by questioning the inequalities within power structures. Hence, the research has endeavoured to expose oppressive practices committed in the name of culture, tradition, rules, national welfare. Most of the Pinter's critics have considered the abuse of power in a very simple way and they have never attempted to analyze the concept of power in Pinter's work from the view points of Michel Foucault and Gramsci. Yet it is worth mentioning that Penelope Prentice has tried to track the theme of power in most of Pinter's plays more than any other critic. Following the existing deficiency in interpretation of Pinter's drama, the present study focused on the text in close connection with cultural and historical context beyond the text aiming at depicting the nature of extreme power and corruption. For this reason, the paper acknowledged significant references to Pinter's Jewishness, the Holocaust, and manipulation of power by some institutions. The Hothouse, alongside with many other Pinter's plays, suggests that all forms of systems tend to use force to make people conform. In the light of this, all the individuals, be the inmates or the staff members, are all the same before 'the law' and the rules. As Foucault (1977:195) states, “The gaze of the surveillance is alert everywhere” (Bertens 149). In fact, we observe general suspicion and surveillance and as Bertens emphasizes, “We suspect others just like they suspect us: all of us are subject to the gaze of surveillance” (151). The Hothouse can work as a political commentary which demonstrates how power corrupts people? As Esslin, in his Pinter: A Study of His Plays maintains, “Behind the highly private world of his plays, there also lurk what are, after all, the basic political problems: the use and abuse of power, the fight for living-space, cruelty, and terror” (Esslin 32).

One claim made by the present researchers and is perhaps ignored by the others is the application of Michael Foucalut's and Antonio Gramsci's theories of power to The Hothouse. This study also illustrated the sources of corruption and manipulation of power, and why Pinter has tried to envisage such themes in almost all of his plays, more especially in the selected play. Based on the method of power exercised upon the inmates, it may be concluded that the traditional way of wielding power is more applicable to the concerned play than the modern method or hegemonic approach. This claim can be supported by the views stated by some critics already mentioned in the paper. With regard to application of extreme power, control and dominance over the inmates, special attention must be paid to abuse of power on the basis of the traditional method of exercising power over people. It is also shown that repression of individuals and corruption are an inevitable part of the power and such themes emerge out of a pervasion from someone who desires power over others. By drawing our attention to such inhuman oppressions inflicted upon other human beings, Pinter strives to reveal human evil as a common universal quality of man. Additionally, aiming at heightening moral values, Pinter focuses on human evil as linked to extreme power.
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