

## I. The Play and the Playwright

The present research looks into Harold Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter* from the perspective of capitalist allegory. It is an attempt to prove that majority of individual's existence in the capitalist world is only to serve the cause of certain handful of powerful and ruling class people, who rule a large number of ordinary people. In fact, lower and the middle class people become just puppets at the hands of upper class people, who in one or other ways are ruling and imposing their hegemony on lower class or the middle class people.

*The Dumb Waiter*, through the irrational, meaningless and useless activities of its characters: Ben and Gus, shows that the purpose of life of common folks is futile and hollow. Ben and Gus are engaged in foolish, circular and repetitive dialogues and actions which depict that our world is an allegory to serve the greater purpose of capitalists. The capitalists create a mysterious world, where a normal character strives to find an essence of life and living under the mercy of that capitalist system. This obscurity is the allegory of capitalism.

According to *Encarta Students Dictionary*, allegory means, "symbolic work in which the characters and events are to be understood as representing other things and symbolically expressing a deeper, often spiritual, moral, or political meaning" (36). It is a symbolic expression of deeper meaning in story or scene acted out by human, animal, or mythical characters. As such, allegory is an act, which has deeper level of meaning, like that of the action performed by the characters of *The Dumb Waiter*, where their deeds are sponsored by the obscure resourceful man.

Ben and Gus display unintelligible and nonsense dialogues in *The Dumb Waiter*. In the play, Ben and Gus display irrational and foolish acts. They speak and repeat the same sentences and ideas time and again. Pinter's setting of the drama is also shabby,

minimal and static with very less objects and things. Like the characters are of trifle importance to the larger power, similar is the intention of the setting. The setting depicts that human condition is irrational, meaningless and absurd. Pinter, through these characters depicts meaninglessness of existence of normal human beings in the world marred by the capitalist ethics.

Harold Pinter was born in London in 1930. He is known for his so-called comedies of menace, which humorously and cynically depict people attempting to communicate as they react to an invasion or threat of an invasion of their lives. He is also noted for his unique use of dialogue, which exposes his characters' alienation from each other and explores the layers of meaning produced by pauses and silence. In 2005 Pinter was awarded with the Nobel Prize in literature.

Pinter as a school going youth was interested in acting and appeared in school plays. To pursue acting career, he joined at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art in London in 1948 and for the next ten years acted with various repertory companies. Pinter's first three plays were debuted in 1957: *The Room*, *The Dumb Waiter*, and *The Birthday Party*. *The Caretaker* (1959), a play about two neurotic brothers whose fragile relationship is upset by a vagrant who forces himself into their lives, established Pinter's reputation as an innovative playwright. This success brought renewed attention to *The Birthday Party*, which subsequently became one of his most popular plays.

As a child in the early 1940s, Pinter was forced to evacuate from London during the bombings of the World War II. He said later that the experience permanently changed his life, and as an adult he became an outspoken advocate for peace. In 2003, disturbed by the United States and British invasion of Iraq that spring, Pinter published a book of antiwar poems. He has written frequently about peace issues for newspapers and magazines.

Pinter has appeared as an actor, generally in minor roles, in movies for which he wrote the script. He continued acting into his 70s, giving a poignant performance in the one-man play *Krapp's Last Tape*, by Samuel Beckett, in 2006. Pinter declined a knighthood but accepted the Companion of Honor, a British honor that does not carry a title, in 2002. Some of his popular works include *The Lover* (1962), *The Homecoming* (1964), *The Basement* (1966), *Landscape* (1967), *Old Times* (1970), *No Man's Land* (1974), *Betrayal* (1978), *One for the Road* (1984) and *Ashes to Ashes* (1996). Pinter has also written many short plays for television and radio and numerous screenplays, including *The Pumpkin Eater* (1964), *Accident* (1967), *The Go-Between* (1971), *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1981), *Betrayal* (1983), *The Handmaid's Tale* (1990), and *The Trial* (1993). He also has directed plays, including those by other writers such as Robert Shaw (*The Man in the Glass Booth*, 1967) and Simon Gray (*Butley*, 1971). The citation announcing his Nobel Prize in 2005 declared that Pinter was responsible for the restoration of theatre to its basic elements. He was an expert on depicting his characters in an enclosed space, through unpredictable dialogue, where people are at the mercy of each other and pretence crumbles. It also noted that his unique style has resulted in the creation of an adjective used to describe a particular atmosphere and environment in drama *Pinteresque*.

*The Dumb Waiter* is one act play consisting of two gunmen, Ben and Gus, as the central characters. They do useless things and talk irrationally. Their discussion is held on irrelevant and trivial topics. They express and imply the same sentences repetitively. Ben acts like a clown or caricaturist while talking in the speaking tube. Similarly, they are staying in a dingy and shabby basement room attached to the kitchen and the bathroom.

Their dialogues have no logical coherence or sequence. Rather, the setting and their dialogues and activities seem to be a complex pattern of poetic images. Pinter has displayed such acts, dialogues and situations in the play to suit the true condition of human existence. Commenting on this technique of Pinter, Martin Esslin writes:

The so-called traditional realistic dramatists cannot depict the reality by using rational and coherent dialogues, logical development of the plot, motivated and intelligent characters, intentional and meaningful deeds, dynamic and macrocosmic setting because the world itself is irrational, purposeless, foolish, disordered and meaningless. In this way, the universe has no meaning or value whereas conventional playwrights through the well made plays tried to convey that the world has meaning, which is most untrue. (72)

Similarly, through the acts of Ben and Gus, we can say that these characters are un-influential and un-intelligent. They lack clarity and vision of life as such they represent normal humans like character. A normal human is simply the follower and supporter of a successful and powerful man. S/he is a dumb follower of whatever takes place in the society around him/her. Thus, in the true sense, a normal man is like an absurd entity, with no vision and mission of his/her own but follows, what the destiny, or chance make him/her to do.

Pinter as a realistic dramatist tries to affirm that the universe has no absolute truth or value. Through his plays he depicts that the life of a common man is meaningless and vague. As such the existence of a common folk is futile and purposeless. Therefore, our actions and creations have no value or significance. Esslin says, "The playwrights of the *Theatre of the Absurd* have shown that our existence is futile. Since all our creations are

doomed to decay as we are doomed to death" (4). Thus, it seems that the absurdist dramatists are the most real as they present the truest nature of the universe.

The title *The Dumb Waiter*, also hints that the existence of a commoner is determined by some mysterious force. The title of the play indicates that a waiter is dumb. However, the word waiter has two meanings: first, one who waits for someone, and second who serves food in a restaurant. Here, Ben and Gus are waiting for someone, so they are waiters, and there is a dumb waiter, who comes time and again to take their order. But as they are waiting for an unknown force to come to them with money, they ignore the dumb waiter. Instead, they linger here and there with irrational chats.

The title of the play refers to the machine that ferries clothing and messages from Gus and Ben's room to someone whose identity is unknown. It also refers to Gus and Ben's room to someone whose identity is unknown. It also refers to Gus and Ben themselves, who are waiting dumbly for a job. They do what they are told to follow orders.

This mysterious force manipulates the common folk and uses them according to their wish and will. As the story starts, we find the title characters waiting for a kill order. But the victim does not arrive in time. So, they do things completely nonsensical and purposeless to pass the time. Ben reads the newspaper. Gus moves around and takes out a matchbox and a packet of cigarettes from his shoes. Ben reads news about an old man of 87 years committing suicide by going under a moving truck. Gus says that Saturday comes after Friday.

Gus cannot identify the place where they are staying. So, Gus asks Ben the name of the place. It is indeed ridiculous that Gus does not recognize the place where he lives, which shows man's alienation in the world. Similarly, a person who doesn't recognize his own place is supposed to be either mentally retarded or ridiculous. In this sense, he

represents the true nature of the human condition as one of uncertainty. Gus says Saturday comes after Friday. It is an inborn fact that does not need to be stated, but is nevertheless stated with no end except to fill the space between people.

Then, an envelope comes in through the door. Following Ben's order, Gus picks it up and finds out 12 matches. Not even a single word is inscribed on it. As per Ben's suggestion, Gus goes out to see the person who has delivered the envelope but finds none. It apparently shows that Gus and Ben both want to know the ultimate truth behind the motive of their call. But, they are helpless and can not find the reasons because the universe itself has no creator or truth. In this regard, Ben and Gus are engaged in selves, like this:

Ben: Show it to me. Nothing on it. Not a word.

Gus: That's funny, isn't it?

Ben: It came under the door?

Gus: Must have done.

Ben: Well go on.

Gus: Go on where?

Ben: Open the door and see if you can catch anyone outside.

Gus: Who, me?

Ben: Go now!

Gus: No one.

(He replaced the revolver).

Ben: What did you see?

Gus: Nothing. (1164-65)

The mysterious letter sent by the master, who appoints them as the hit men is one of the dominating presences of the powerful capitalist, everywhere. It is the allegoric

presentation of the capitalist personality, who is capable of ruling and controlling these characters (minor people) from everywhere.

After some time the gas goes out because the gas meter has no balance. So, they have to wait Wilson, the owner of the house for money to fill the gas. But Gus views that Wilson may not come. Meanwhile, a dumb waiter comes down from the upstairs with an order of complicated food. They send up things. Some of them are decayed. Ben finds the speaking tube and takes it to mouth to speak and to hear alternately and repeatedly. Ben gives directions to Gus, and he reads them. Gus says he (unknown) is playing games with them but does not know the reasons behind this game. At last, Gus goes out to drink a glass of water. Only then Ben gets kill order. Then Gus gets in and Ben turns his revolver to him. They stare at each other for a long time and the drama ends in suspense.

*The Dumb Waiter* has received both hostile and favorable criticism and reviews since its publication. Below are given the commentaries of some critics.

Austin E. Quigley writes about the recurring stares between Gus and Ben in the play. He states:

One of the obvious functions of the stares that they show is the confusion of Ben and Gus when they are in disturbing situations. Moreover, this point has two meanings. One is that their relationship is cold for some time and another indication is that their start is frequently mutual and friendly especially in the final tableau. (3)

Stare is undoubtedly, one of the most important features in the play. It adds to curiosity among the two and, also helps to move the play forward.

On the other hand, Martin Esslin remarks that *The Dumb Water* has fulfilled the plan to fuse tragedy with farce. He further says it has been also successful in changing

the mysterious supernatural element into an additional element of comedy. In his view, *The Dumb Waiter* is:

[. . .] succeeds in turning the mysterious supernatural ingredient, which was merely sentimental in *The Room*, into an additional element of comedy: the spectacle of the heavenly powers bombarding two solemn gunmen with demand for macaroni, pastitsio [. . .] and beans sprouts it wildly funny. Yet the main element of comedy is provided by the brilliant small talk behind which two men hide their growing anxiety. These discussions of which football team is playing away on that particular Saturday, whether it is correct to say 'light the kettle or light the gas,' the desultory discussions of trivial news in the newspaper are utterly true, widely comic, and terrifying in their absurdity. (168-169)

Farce and tragedy are rare to go hand by hand. However, Pinter makes them go with a blast. Gus and Ben are tragic characters who have no vision and scheme of their own but are mere puppets in the hand of a powerful mysterious character; yet they take life as a farce. Such a situation where one has to enjoy tragedy as a farce represents the harshness of our capitalist social order.

Likewise, R.A. Buck analyzes the text from linguistic point of view. He talks about the power of linguistic ambiguity at the end of the play. Towards the end of the play, Gus goes out to drink a glass of water through the left door. Ben also goes to the left door to call Gus. Meanwhile, the right door opens and Gus stumbles in and Ben turns his revolver to Gus. But the play just says that Gus stumbles in, but it is not clear through which door Gus gets in. So, Buck says we can go on guessing which door Gus enters but can never be certain of which door it is.



On the other hand, critics like Charles A. Carpenter not take the play seriously. So, he gives a hostile review on the play. He calls the play a "mock-melodramatic farce" and indicates that the success of the play "is a kind of fun" (qtd. in "*The Dumb Waiter: Pinter's Play with the Audience*" 57). Another critic, Penelope Prentice annotates about the sympathetic situation of Ben and Gus. He says that the characters like Ben and Gus receive sympathy from the audience when the play discloses the power of the unseen villain. He writes:

The audience is led to sympathy for one hired killer, Gus and indeed, quite subtly to sympathy for both, as the play demystifies the power of the seeming villain as bluff coupled with inertia of motion. Once set in action, both characters remain in action, dramatizing also the partial responsibility of the seeming victim to know what is happening in order to overcome inertia and to act to prevent his own destruction. (11)

Ben and Gus are set in action by the unseen force. They are made to laugh, pass farcical comments and jokes on themselves, which resembles the power of the capitalists, who can rule from behind the curtain.

Similarly, Thomas F. Van Lann comments about the gaps present in the ending of the play. He says that the play has no tied-up ending like in the traditional play. So, while reading the play if we try to look for the proper ending or the missing element, we just keep up adding but it can't be exact. That's why Lann suggests that we just go on filling in the gaps. He comments:

The claustrophobic qualities of *The Dumb Waiter* (1957), with all its action taking place in a confined basement room, are typical of Pinter's play, which are often constrained by limits of space. To an extent, such a

constraint is a metaphor for the constraints that life itself places on people and that people place upon themselves. (496)

This metaphor has helped to ask the audience, if they themselves are in the process of filling in. The important point Pinter raises is that, we normal people are also in a gap.

Ben and Gus are masters of small talk. The language of the play has a meandering, aimless quality that characterizes much of Pinter's style. Ben says one thing, and Gus repeats it. Ben begins a sentence, and Gus finishes. After a point has been made, one hears silence, than the point is made again:

Ben: We do the same.

Gus: Exactly the same?

Ben: Exactly.

(Pause)

Gus: We don't do anything different?

Ben: We do exactly the same.

Gus: Oh. (1162)

This technique results in tension and anticipation. The technique also contributes to creating a sense of enigma – the audience strains to make meaning out of what appears to be banal observations, and in the process, those observations begin to take on more importance. And indeed, from the accretion of banalities, a deeper meaning grows until trivial matters, become matter of life and death.

The only conflict that develops in *The Dumb Waiter* is limited to the trivial disagreement between Gus and Ben. Certainly, this is not the kind of dramatic conflict that engages Ibsen's characters, or of a more traditional type. The petty disagreements seem very natural, and the play itself seems naturalistic. But the improbable intrusion of the dumb waiter changes our sense of what is not realistic. The dumb waiter sends down

messages virtually in the manner of the oracle of Delphi, and it is up to those who receive them to act. When the play ends, with the next victim walking into the room out of the lavatory, we can only assume that Ben will act on the oracle. And if he does, the message that has come down from on high is terrifying indeed.

Andrew Kennedy opines about the language of the play. He writes:

When Ben and Gus talk to each other, the dialogue between them becomes a sharper pattern because of its inconsequentiality. Similarly, when Ben speaks to the speaking tube, he looks as if he is performing a periodical ritual. He further states that Pinter has used quasi ritualistic pattern in the play repeatedly to give a rhythmic intensity to the climactic scene. Yet the rhythms of ritual responses, charismatic cross examination, litanies (players) are used periodically or playfully to dehumanize speech (67-68).

In this way, many critics have interpreted this play through different angles. Many of them have read the play from the linguistic point of view. Some talk about the existential problems and some other about the technicalities of the play. Though the play is looked into from different angles, no critic has seen it from the Marxist stand point. Therefore, the play still remains a fertile work for research. The petty action and the trivial objects can be seen as the effects of rampant commercialism brought about by the arrogant 'late capitalism' of twentieth century. Such march of capitalism has nullified the meaning of existence the common folks like Ben and Gus. They are just busy in the unconcerned with their own existence as they are the hand maiden's of late capitalist ideology. Hence, my thesis will explore how the play itself becomes an allegory of capitalist slavery.

In doing so, the present work will unleash the meaning and importance of futile, circular and repeated dialogues by Ben and Gus. It will also attempt to dismantle the

illusionary mentality created by the capitalist structure. So, the present study will be based on the analysis of these minor looking incidents that has larger allegoric meanings in the capitalist world.

## II. Allegory of Capitalist Slavery

### Capitalism

Capitalism is a market based economic system in which private individuals and business firms carry on the production and exchange of goods for services through a complex network of markets. Although rooted in antiquity, capitalism is primarily European in its origins; it evolved through a number of stages, reaching its zenith in the 19th century. Capitalism spread throughout the world from England, largely unchallenged as the dominant economic and social system until World War I. However, the unobstructed march of capitalism gets a serious blow when Marxism emerges as a vigorous and hostile competing system to political and economy of the west.

The term capitalism was first introduced in the mid-19th century by Karl Marx. Free enterprise and market system are frequently used synonymous to describe modern non-Communist economies. Sometimes mixed economy is used to designate the kind of economic system most often found in Western nations. An individual who comes closest to being the originator of contemporary capitalism is the Scottish philosopher Adam Smith. He was amongst the first to use essential economic principles, the backbone of this system to sustain and develop western economies. In his classic work *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), Smith sought to show how it was possible to pursue private gain in ways that would further not just the interests of the individuals but those of society as a whole. He writes:

Society's interests are met by maximum production of the things that people want. The combination of self-interest, private property, and competition among sellers in markets will lead producers "as by an invisible hand" to an end that they did not intend, namely, the well-being of society but to private benefits. (154)

Throughout its history, and especially during its ascendancy in the 19th century, capitalism acquired certain key characteristics to denote its features like possession of land. It (land) was one of the prominent sources of capitalism, as it the privately owned source of domination to the common folks.

Capital in this sense means buildings, machineries, and other equipments used to produce goods and services that are ultimately consumed. Second, economic activity is organized and coordinated through the interaction of buyers and sellers (or producers) in markets. Third, owners of land and capital as well as the workers they employ are free to pursue their own self-interests in seeking maximum gain from the use of their resources and labor in production. Consumers are free to spend their income in ways that they believe will yield the greatest satisfaction. This principle, called consumer sovereignty, reflects the idea that under capitalism producers will be forced by competition to use their resources in ways that will best satisfy the wants of consumers. Self-interest and the pursuit of gain lead them to do this. Fourth, under this system a minimum of government supervision is required; if competition is present, economic activity will be self-regulating. Government will be necessary only to protect society from foreign attack, uphold the rights of private property, and guarantee contracts. This nineteenth century view of government's role in the capitalist system was significantly modified by ideas and events of the 20th century. The same era; however, was dominated by Marxism, a system developed by socialist thinkers. Karl Marx is the leading figure of the school, who along with political economist Friedrich Engels founded scientific socialism, now known as communism.

The program they submitted to the world as the *Communist Manifesto* during 1856 is the first systematic statement of modern socialist doctrine. Marx contributed the central propositions of the *Manifesto*, which also embody the materialist conception of

history. This theory was later explicitly formulated in Marx's *Critique of Political Economy* (1859). Marx's concept of economic propositions in the book is as follows:

In every historical epoch the prevailing economic system by which the necessities of life are produced determines the form of societal organization and the political and intellectual history of the epoch; and that the history of society is a history of struggles between exploiting and exploited, that is, between the ruling and the oppressed, social classes.

(32)

From these premises, Marx drew the conclusion that the capitalist class would be overthrown and that it would be eliminated by a worldwide working-class revolution and there will be a classless society. This would eventually influence all subsequent communist literature and revolutionary thought.

One of the most influential French Marxist philosophers of the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century, Louis Althusser views that society is formed by a diversity of "Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA)" (69), including religion, family, educational institution, mass media, politics, multinational company, trade unions, etc. each of which is dove-tailed with the other in extricate ways. However, ideology of a particular institution is determined by its material base. He opposes the definition of ideology as a "false consciousness."

According to him, it is a "notion that truths external to the human mind may be known by intuition or consciousness, independently of observation and experience" (69). He rather declares that ideology is the imaginary relation of the individuals/human beings to their material existence in the sense that it is embodied in all sorts of materials practices.

Explaining ideology, he writes:

Ideology is one of the most essential elements of society. It is as if a structure essential to the historical life of societies. It is [. . .]

indispensable in any society if men are to be formed, transformed and equipped to respond to the demand of the condition of change that engulfs the existence of a society. (qtd. Slavoj Žižek 312)

Althusser firmly concedes that ideology represents the imaginary relations of individuals to their material existence. It means that ideology distorts our view of our true condition of existence. He classifies the ideology in various forms:

The first is negative concerns with the object which is represented in the material form of ideology. The second one is positive concerns with the materiality of ideology we find different types of ideologies: legal ideology, political ideology, racial ideology, gender ideology, and so on. Today in late capitalism, the expansion of new mass media in principle enables ideology effectively to penetrate every pore of the social body. (132)

Althusser connects ideology with its social practices. For him ideology functions through "ISAs," which, although they seem to be creating their sub-ideology, are all subject to the dominant ideology.

Ideological State Apparatuses is a terminology coined by Althusser to describe the modern sense of all the institutions through which we are socialized. According to him, "ISAs are weapons of modern state to impose its hegemony on the general public" (72). They include organized religion, the law, the trade unions, the political system, art and literature, and so on. He mentions some of the practices as, "The material existence of ideological apparatus, be it only a small part of that apparatus, small mass in a church, a funeral, a minor match, at a sport club, a school day, a political party meeting, etc" (qtd. Žižek 85).

A question arises why should ideology be preferred to real happenings? A first reason to this question goes as far as the eighteenth century, when ideology was a part of the



addresses of the despotic rulers. This was basically a conspiracy theory, which says that a handful of powerful men fooled the people into believing these falsified representations/ideas about the world. The second answer is that the material alienation of real conditions predisposes people to form representations which distance them from these real conditions. In other words, the material relations of capitalist production are themselves alienating, but people cannot quite deal with the harsh reality. So they make stories about the relations of productions, which were not so bad. These stories or representations alienated them further from the real conditions. The double destined involvement in imaginary aspects made these people more and more alienated from the reality. These ideas about representation and reality assume that what is related in ideology is the real world, or the real conditions of existence. Althusser says that ideology does not represent the real world, but human beings' relation to that world to their perceptions of the real conditions of existence. In fact, we properly cannot know the real worlds directly; what we know are always representations of that world, representations of our relations to that world. Ideology is the imaginary version, or the represented version of the stories we tell ourselves about our relation to the real world.

The word 'ideology' was coined long before the Russians coined 'intelligentsia,' taken as synonym to ideology. These words were not around when the French dictator Napoleon Bonaparte took the word 'ideologues' to ridicule his intellectual opponents. Gradually, however, the term 'ideology' has dropped its pejorative sting, and has become a neutral term in the analysis of differing political opinions. Ideological references are important to many people in the world. Karl Marx uses the term in his own context often throughout his works.

Ideology is a way of looking at and interpreting of living in the world. It also conveys as general as a system of ideas, values, and beliefs, either true or false. Ideology is a term

that embodies all the problems associated with cultural complexities of language. It must provide guidance towards logical and coherent actions. Ideology should be contrasted with the related (but different) issues of utopia and historical myth. It also has a rich history, during which it has taken as various, sometimes-contradictory meanings.

There are some critics who view science as an ideology in it, or being an effective ideology called scientism. Some scientists respond that, while the scientific method is itself an ideology as it is a collection of ideas, there is nothing particularly wrong or bad about it. In social studies a political ideology is a certain ethical set of ideas, principles, doctrines, myths or symbols of social movement, institutions, class, or large group that explains how society should work, and offers some political and cultural blueprint for a certain order a political ideology largely concerns itself with how to allocate power and to what end it should be used. Thus, political ideology has two dimensions: how society should work; and the most appropriate ways to which the ideas are arranged.

Dominant ideology appears as neutral, holding to the assumptions largely are unchallenged. Meanwhile, all other ideologies that differ from dominant ideology are seen as radical ideology. According to Terry Eagleton, ideologies can shape the desires and wants of those who are in power. He states:

Ideology can actively shape the wants and desires of those subjected to them, but they must also engage significantly with the wants and desires that people already have, catching up genuine hopes and needs, re inflecting them in their own peculiar idiom, and feelings them back to their subjects in ways which render those ideologies plausible and attractive. (15)

Eagleton, in his book *Ideology*, remarks that ideology has wide range of historical meaning and relates it with the interest wants of ruling class. He puts forward:

The term ‘ideology’ has a wide range of historical meaning, all the way from

the unworkably broader sense of social determination of thoughts to the suspiciously narrow idea of the development of false ideas in the direct interest of a ruling class. Very often, it refers to the ways in which signs, meanings, and values help to reproduce a dominant social power but it can also denote any significantly conjecture between discourse and political interest. (221)

Eagleton, in the very book *Ideology*, is of the view that ideology is the product of discourse rather than the product of language. He proceeds:

Ideology is a matter of discourse rather than of language of certain concrete discursive effects rather than of signification as such. It represents the points where power impacts up on certain utterances and inscribes itself tacitly within them. It is not therefore to be equated with just and any forms of discursive partisanship, interested speech or theoretical bias; rather, the concept of ideology aims to disclose something of the relation between an utterance and its material conditions of possibility. (223)

Ideology is a notion of free conversation rather than a concrete shape of ideas. It asserts in notion that when the conditions of possibility are viewed in the light of certain power-struggle central to the reproduction, it represents the whole form of social life.

Ideology, in its distinctively Marxist use, in any era is conceived to be the production of its economic and the resulting class-interest and class-relations. Karl Marx proposed that a society's dominant ideology is a part of superstructures. Superstructure comprises of society's ideology, as well as its legal system, political system and relation. For Marx base determines superstructure. The ruling class controls the society's means of productions and its superstructure. He proceeds:

The production of ideas, concepts, and consciousness is first of all directly interwoven with the material intercourse of man, the language of real life.

Convincing, thinking, the spiritual intercourse of man appeals here as the direct effluent of man's material behavior [...] we do not proceed from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from man as narrated thought of, imagined conceived, in order to arrive at man in the flesh. [. . .] They have no history, no development but men developing their material production and material intercourse, after along with this their thinking. 'Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life.' (qtd. Zizek 25)

The ideology of a society is of enormous importance; it confuses the alienated groups and can create false consciousness such as the fetishism of commodities, alienation and reification. In capitalist society, all means of production, distribution and means of economic foundation are owned by bourgeoisie. Thus ideology also represents wants and desire of bourgeoisie class. The labor force, or who are the workers are known as proletarians are not themselves proprietors of the means of productions and who are consequently obliged to sell on the market their own labor instead of the product of their labor. This condition alienates the proletarians from their real condition. Hence they undergo through the process of commodification.

In Althusser's opinion, ideology is similar to material existence, which exists in apparatus or practice popular among the commoners. He then claims that allegory and material practice hinge on the notion of the subject. As such, there is no reality in an ideology except the fact that the common folks are made to believe that there exists ideology. There are no belief systems and practices determined, unless there is someone believing and acting on these beliefs. Thereby material ideological practices are infinitely disseminated and widen to individual by each day. The logical factor about ideology is proceeding wherever we go and that everything we engage in is pervaded by ideology Althusser puts it in this way:

Ideas have disappeared as such they are already endowed with an idea of spiritual existence, to the precise extent that it has emerged that their existence is inscribed in the actions of practices governed rituals defined in the last instance by an ideological apparatus. It therefore appears that the subject acts in so far as he is altered by the following ideology existing in a material practices governed by a ritual, which practices exists in a material actions of a subject acting in all consciousness to his belief. (qtd. Zizek 86)

We concede that we are acting out of free will, but we are in reality acted by the dominant system, which is a gift of age old system incarnated by ideology.

Every individual is deemed as if they are acting out of free will, in their own volition, but are surrounded by the requirements of those who are in power. In capitalist society, all forms of social formations are subservient to Repressive State Apparatus (RSA). This is why person of different the classes and communities are of hostile attitudes towards each other. However, this hostility between the people of different groups, communities and nations is bargained in terms of the profit of ruling class people. It is thus, termed that the advantage of the rulers is the gain for all. Althusser puts the phenomenon, as:

In a society guided by ideology of an element in which the relationship between men and material are settled to the profit of the ruling class, it is difficult have a choice. Ideology is the reality, which determines the relation between men and their conditions of existence, in turn leveled to the profit of all the men. (qtd. Zizek 313)

Thus, in real sense, it is not the welfare of the large community of people, but in the name of majority rule, again, some limited group of people are taking advantage.

The state apparatus, for Althusser, is the kind of governmental formation that emerged with capitalism. A state is determined by the capitalist mode of production and is

formed to protect its interests. It is historically true that the idea of nations as discrete units is coterminous with capitalism. In this case, it is democracy, as an ideology of most government gives the illusion that all people are equal, and have equal power.

Althusser elucidates two major mechanisms for insuring that all within a state behave according to the rules of that state even if it is not in their interest. Althusser calls these mechanisms as 'repressive state apparatus' that can enforce behavior directly, such as the police, the army, and the criminal systems and prison system, etc. through these apparatuses the state can oblige s/he physically to behave. Secondly, he calls it 'Ideology State Apparatus' which functions on general consciousness of the public. ISA includes schools, religions, family, legal systems, politics, art, literature, sports, etc. It in turn makes sub-ideology, the belief and requirements of repression that state imposes through the first mechanism – RSA. All the state apparatus function both by repression and ideology, with the difference that the repressive state apparatus function massively and predominantly by repression whereas ISA function mainly and predominantly by ideology.

The Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) continues as an organized whole whose different parts are centralized beneath a commanding unity. This is applied through the politics of class struggle applied by the political representatives of the ruling class in possession of state power. The RSA are multiple, distinct, real, autonomous and capable of state power. The RSA are capable of providing objective fields to contradictions which express in forms, which may be limited to extremes. Thus, the effect of clashes between the capitalist class struggle and proletarian class struggle, as well as their subordinate forms the unity of the repressive apparatus. This in turn is related to unify centralized organization under the supervision of the representatives of the class in power ruling again to the meeker section of the society by the mythical power of state imposed ideology.

On the other hand, the unity of the state apparatus is conceived by different ISA. All the ideology has the function of constituting concrete individuals as subjects of enlisting them in any belief systems. The main thing about ideology is its structure supported by specific belief systems that people are made to believe. Ideology interpolates individuals to take up a pre-established subject as correct. That is a position or role of a person with certain values and views, which serves the ultimate interests of the ruling class.

Ideology exists in the different social positions and rules. As, Althusser says we occupy different subject positions, for instance the same man could be interpolated as a father, as a son, as a husband, as a member of church, and so on. It in turn provides us the subject position that is already familiar to us because it is the part of what we know. Taking us as subjects in this way, ideology makes us believe that these are individually addressed to us, and hence are true. Indeed, non subjects are allegory that constitute subject as an ideology. Thus every individual is already a subject. In this context, Althusser remarks allegory as ideology in following way:

[. . .] Ideology hails individuals as subjects. As ideology is eternal,[...] suppress the temporal from in which I have presented the functioning of ideology and say; ideology has always-already allegorized individuals as subjects, which amount to making it clear that individuals are always already interpellated by ideology as subjects, which necessarily leads us to one last proposition; individuals are always-already subjects. Hence individuals are abstracts with represent to the subjects which they always already are. (qtd. Bertens 132)

The thrust toward ideology of capitalism has created an allegory, since 13th century onward, which was enlarged by the forces of the Renaissance and the Reformation. These momentous developments changed society enormously and paved the way for the emergence

of the modern nation-state, which eventually provided the essential peace, law, and order crucial for the growth of capitalism. This growth is achieved through the accumulation of an economic surplus by the private entrepreneur and the plowing of this surplus back into the system for further expansion. Without some minimum of peace, stability, and continuity this process cannot continue.

However, in the postmodern era, the state of euphoria of material possession advocated by capitalist regime, mere cannot be explained in terms of various state apparatuses. It also has to be dealt in terms of newer cultural trends in practice. The last few years since the late 1980s and to the new millennium the world has been marked by an inverted millenarianism in which premonitions of the future, catastrophic or redemptive have been replaced by sense of the end of this or that the end of ideology, art, or social class: the "crisis" of Leninism, social democracy, or the welfare state, etc. In words of Fredric Jameson, it is essential to term phase "late capitalism" which alone can define the state of material euphoria invited by capitalist culture. He defines late capitalism as, "As the word itself depends on the hypothesis of some radical break from the features of capitalism of late 1950s and 60s, it is the waning or extinction of the hundred-year-old modern movement or its ideological or aesthetic repudiation and a march towards all conclusive concept of capitalism" (1).

Jameson finds late capitalism as an incredibly productive system that has created a flood of goods unlike anything the world has ever seen. It also is a system that is "fundamentally inhuman, anti-democratic and unsustainable" (2). Capitalism has given the residents of Third World lots of stuff, like food, medicine, education and awareness; however, in most cases they are in exchange for our souls, our hope for progressive politics, and the possibility of a decent future for our children. However, it has not been more than an



allegory, as in reality, these stuff are not more than First World mechanism to rule the Third World.

Allegory is a narrative that serves as an extended metaphor. Allegories are written in the form of fables, parables, poems, stories, and almost any other style or genre. The main purpose of an allegory is to tell a story that has characters, a setting, as well as other types of symbols that have both literal and figurative meanings. The difference between an allegory and a symbol is that an allegory is a complete narrative that conveys abstract ideas to get a point across, while a symbol is a representation of an idea or concept that can have a different meaning throughout a literary work.

Dante's *The Divine Comedy* is a well known example of allegory. Here Dante's character is on a pilgrimage to try to understand life. However, it is search for purpose in the world but is of entire human beings. Although Virgil literally guides Dante on his journey through the mystical inferno, he can also be seen as the reason and human wisdom that Dante has been looking for in his life. As such, allegory is a literary device to express artistic expression conveying a symbolic meaning parallel to but distinct from what is said or written. It is the fictional representation of characters and works other than said or done. It also has been defined as an extended metaphor. The symbolic meaning is usually expressed through personifications and other symbols, rather than blunt and direct expression.

Allegory is a figurative mode of representation conveying a meaning other than the literal. Fictions with several possible interpretations are not allegories in the true sense. Not every fiction with general application is an allegory. Allegory communicates its message by means of symbolic figures, actions or symbolic representation. Allegory is generally treated as a figure of rhetoric, but an allegory does not have to be expressed

in language it may be addressed to the eye, and is often found in realistic painting, sculpture or some other form of mimetic or representative art.

However, meaning of allegory is broader than used commonly. Though it is similar to other rhetorical comparisons, an allegory is sustained longer and more fully in its details than a metaphor, and appeals to imagination, while an analogy appeals to reason or logic. The fable or parable is a short allegory with a definite moral.

Allegory can also be used as a technique for critical interpretation, even of works that were not originally intended to be allegorical. Thus, underlying beliefs that are present in a text without an author's conscious awareness can be examined as a way of better understanding of the culture from which the text has been derived. In art, an allegorical painting or sculpture is one that has a symbolic meaning underlying the surface image. Although modern authors generally favor less abstract, more personal symbolism, allegories are still written.

Allegory, in modern time, as in words of Bruce Rev. Vawter is to determine the difference between what is actually said, and what actually it implies to. It is, “determination of what was originally written, whatever its meaning or relevance may be, is the concern of textual criticism or the so-called lower criticism” (32). Vawter further classifies allegory in two groups, as:

Allegory has two means of establishing a text: external and internal criteria. The external criteria comprise the physical properties of the manuscripts themselves – their material, age, and the style of the script and the history of the manuscripts. No autograph biblical text – original and handwritten by its author – has been found and it is unlikely that any will be. Internal criteria stem from the contents of the text that whose meaning is inherent in deeper level of cases. (38)

The outcome derived from a text depends on its inherent theme and mysticism of presentation based on the characteristics it depicts and represents of the age.

In the post modern era, the paradoxical nature in which literature is narrated and written reveals the unreachable standard of human mind. It also portrays a riddle of post modern allegory, as there is loss of representation of ideas and opinions. In view Paul de Man, post modern allegory is:

The loss of representation is modern to make us again aware of an allegorical element in the lyric that had never ceased to be present, but that is itself necessarily dependent on the existence of an earlier allegory and so is the negation of modernity. The worst mystification is to believe that one can move from representation to allegory, or vice versa, as one move from the old to the new, from father to son, from history to modernity. (qtd. in *Blindness and Insight* 186)

Allegory can blindly repeat its earlier model, without admitting to present way of time. The poet is a modern allegoric figure, as we understand his/her text, we do not understand him and vice versa. Similar is the nature of capitalism as it preaches one ethics in theory but next in practice.

Since the beginning of nineteenth century of a subjectivist critical vocabulary, the traditional forms of rhetoric have fallen into disrepute. Paul de Man in *Blindness and Insight* deals on the phenomenon as:

It is becoming increasingly clear in the present time. The temporary eclipse there was on allegory, due to recent developments in criticism reveal the possibility of a rhetoric that would no longer be normative or descriptive but that would more or less openly raise the question of the intentionality of rhetorical figures in allegoric expression of texts. (187)

Such concerns are implicitly present in many works in which the terms "mimesis," "metaphor," "allegory," or "irony" play a prominent part. One of the main difficulties that still hamper these investigations stems from the association of rhetorical terms with value judgments that blur distinctions and hide the real structures.

In most cases, the use of allegory is governed by assumptions that go back at least as far as the romantic period; hence the need for historical clarification as a preliminary to a more systematic treatment of an intentional rhetoric. One has to return, in the history of European literature, to the moment when the rhetorical key terms undergo significant changes and are at the centre of important tensions. A first and obvious example would be the change that takes place in the latter half of the eighteenth century, when the word "symbol" trends to supplement other denominations for figural language including that of "allegory."

### III. *The Dumb Waiter* as a Capitalist Allegory

*The Dumb Waiter* depicts the picture of a futile world, where the individuality of a person is defined and restricted within the limitations set by the capitalist ideology. Every action claimed to have done by an individual's free will is shaped by the leaders of the commercial world. These restrictions imposed on society in a long run become social norms and values.

Ben and Gus, the protagonists in *The Dumb Waiter*, are two assassins on hire to kill a man whose identity is not disclosed until the end. Professional killers or hit-men are the outcome of capitalist rivalry, as they are used by the powerful person to eliminate their rivals. In the world, marred by false ideologies and capitalist enterprises, ethics and values are fast falling prey to the profit motif of market. Humanitarian values are always seen below to maximum return. So, individuals like Ben and Gus are mere weapons of the capitalists who have hired and train them for eliminating their opponents.

Through the depiction of Ben and Gus as foolish and nonsensical characters in the play, Pinter shows common folks are just as the cogs of the vast capitalist machine in the modern world. We are the puppets animated to serve the purpose of handful of capitalists. By staging trivialities of Ben and Gus in the play Pinter depicts a harsh reality of human existence, where the individuals pretend to have the meaning of their lives, but in reality, they are just the characters of capitalist allegory.

In the play, Ben and Gus are two hired hit-men waiting for a kill order but the victim doesn't come in time. So, they perform nonsensical actions to kill time. Ben reads a newspaper while Gus ties his shoelaces as he moves around. Then, he unties his shoelaces and takes off the shoes. After that, Gus takes out a matchbox and a packet of cigarette from the shoes. The fact that he has kept the matchbox and the packet of

cigarette inside his shoes looks completely irrational since we keep a match box and cigarette in a pocket.

The play begins at a basement room. There are two beds in the room and a serving hatch between their beds. The toilet and the kitchen are also attached to the quarter. It being a single room has two doors. The left door goes to the kitchen and the toilet whereas the right door leads to a passage. The poverty of these characters is indicated by their room on the ground floor. Similarly, the serving hatch between their beds and the room attached to the kitchen and toilet tell us that the room is shabby and disorganized, which also refers to the disorder and incoherent of the world of poor characters. The play describes the setting in this way:

A basement room. Two beds flat against the back wall. A serving hatch, closed between the beds. A door to the kitchen and lavatory, left. A door to a passage right. Ben is lying on a bed, left reading paper. Gus is sitting on a bed right, tying his shoelaces, with difficulty. Both are dressed in shirts trousers and braces. (1161)

The term basement has several interpretations in the play. It stands for the poor living standard of the hired men, and also depicts that person with inhumane works are made to live in an underground den. Scanty living facilities provided to these characters depict the way these 'used' characters are used. It is also a way of telling us that their lives move ahead but just to reach the world, marred by capitalism.

After some time, the gas goes out because the gas meter has no balance. But they are penniless and they have to wait for Wilson, the so-called owner/master of the house for money to fill the gas. At that moment, Gus says Wilson may not come since he mostly doesn't come. It is, therefore, useless for man to wait for him. They discuss:

Ben: I haven't got any money.

Gus: Nor have I.

Ben: You'll have to wait.

Gus: What for?

Ben: For Wilson

Gus: He might not come. He might just send a message. He does not always come. (1167)

These poor characters are so dependent on Mr. Wilson – the representative of capitalists that they are certain to starve to death, if the mysterious bourgeoisie does not come. This is a stark example of the way our society is organized by dividing the whole population in the group of 'haves' and 'have nots.'

Pinter through this ridiculous act shows that normal folks perform such futile action to please the high profile people. This illogical action of the common man makes the sophisticated people laugh, which in turn makes us feel dignified, or secure ourselves for a post. In regard, Pinter presents a scene, which is meaningless and is mere an action of a crazy man, but he makes his characters perform it, as:

Ben lowers his paper and watches him. Gus kneels unites his shoelace and slowly takes off the shoe. He looks inside it and brings out a flattened matchbox. He kneels, unties his shoelace and slowly takes off the shoe. He looks inside it and brings out a flattened cigarette packet. He shakes it examines it. Their eyes meet. Ben rattles his paper and reads. Gus puts the paper in his pocket, bends down, puts on his shoe, and ties the lace.  
(1161)

This is performed to make their identity and individuality unique in the eye of their master. But, they do not know that by these actions they are foolish and in the process

are being mere puppets to the resourceful people. They are very similar to machines, who work according to the push and pull of a button.

Then they discuss on the death of an-old-man, 87 years old. Ben discloses the news to Gus as, "A man of eighty-seven wanted to cross the road. But there was a lot of traffic, see? He couldn't see how he was going to squeeze through. So, he crawled under a lorry" (1161). The incident of old man's killing narrated by Ben is contradictory, as there can be no death by one's crawling under a stationary lorry. He repeats: "He crawled under a lorry. A stationary lorry" (1162). This shows that the statement of Ben is nonsensical because no one can die by sliding under a fixed truck, but of course this is allegory to capitalist ideology, as it shows that they are made to believe what the paper writes. The written piece of news carries different meanings to each common folks, thereby creating a sponsored allegory in favor of the capitalists.

It indicates that normal men are made to die by sliding themselves into the wish of the bourgeoisies, as here the 'truck' or 'lorry' is the capitalist weapon and the old man is a faded warrior, of no use to the capitalist. Furthermore, the motionless truck here indicates to the nature of resourceful people, who are still and silent in the society, but are the real cause behind the degradation and decline of human beings.

In the same way, Ben reads news that a female child of eight years is killed by a cat. But after some time they come to know that her elder brother of 11 years had killed it. Ben finds out the reality behind that cat's death and further says that a boy of 11 years witnessed the incident from the tool shed. So, what exactly happened? Nothing is clear in the play, as it narrates it in the following manner:

Gus: What's that?

Ben: A child of eight killed a cat!

Gus: Get away.



Ben: It's fact. What about that, eh? A child of eight killing a cat!

Gus: How did she do it?

Ben: She –

(He picks up the paper and studied it.)

It doesn't say. (1162)

This unclear news is fragmented truth served to the common people, which will help to consolidate the fact that the common people are left to move around trifle facts which have no significance in their lives. This is the way the capitalist victimize the general people in spending useless life.

The play moves on to yet another meaningless dialogue between the two. Gus says that Saturday comes after Friday. It is a general truth that is known to everybody. It sounds like a daily formal conversation with no purpose but just to fill the space between people. However, here the idea is common human is forced to live within the silly things of our daily life.

In yet another action, an envelope comes in under the door. Gus picks it up and looks inside. He finds out 12 matches but it is a matter of surprise that even a single word is not written on the envelope. So, according to the instruction of Ben, Gus goes out to see the person who has delivered/sent the letter but Gus sees nobody.

In the meantime, Gus tells Ben that what they can do at the moment is to wait for the 'master.' It indirectly tells us what a common man can do is 'wait.' Then a dumb waiter descends from upstairs. He has brought an order of complicated food that Ben and Gus do not understand. Through this, we can understand that the world of a common man is becoming increasingly complicated. They do not take order for food, as they are either too costly for them or is beyond their understanding. Gus also asks Ben who is the owner of the house but Ben cannot reply it. This in turn is an indication that the world

has no master or no body can claim anything as his. After some time, they start to complain each other, and are again indulged in never ending foolish acts.

In the same way, Gus tells Ben that there are no windows to look outside, so he does not like the room. It is common to have windows in rooms, but Gus and Ben have no such facilities. A room that has no windows is expected to be shabby, ugly and grotesque, a prison like cave. But, Ben asks Gus why he needs a window in the room. Ben's question is purposeless because Gus has already given him an answer for it. Thus, conversation also appears to be meaningless and devoid of purpose; however, they are doing so, as there is no other things to be done.

Ben is a mysterious man, like the typical bourgeoisie, who goes to work in dark and returns in dark. Ben is engaged in more serious work than Gus. Once, Gus had seen Ben in a car sitting so straight as if waiting for a master's order. Upon the query, Ben replies that he was waiting for nobody. As such, according to Gus, "Ben's place is only when it is dark" (1163). However, it is sufficient to show the gap of confidence that lies between them. Ben seems to have direct link with the bourgeoisie, who here is the master, and Gus the follower. Ben's supremacy and Gus's inferiority is witnessed in the following conversation:

Gus: I was, but I woke up when you stopped. You did stop, didn't you?

(Pause) In the middle of the road. It was still dark, don't you remember? I looked out. It was all misty. I thought you wanted to keep, but you were sitting up dead straight, like you were waiting for someone.

Ben: I wasn't waiting for anything. (1163-64)

When Gus says to Ben that he did not stop for him and Ben denying the concept has dual meanings in it. It is a hint that the capitalist has been able to sow a seed of suspicion among the two best friends, a metaphor to the general folks. Things like human

relationship and friendship are objects to the capitalists whose policy is to 'divide and rule.' Pinter, thus, creates uncertainty in the life of common people, who are mere objects motivated and ruled by a certain class of people, for their personal welfare.

The audience is meant to sympathize with Gus, slower junior partner-in-crime to Ben. The common folks are in the same position as Gus: like Gus, we are not familiar with the job the capitalist regime performs on us. We don't know what exactly is motivating on what we are performing. Similar to, happening upstairs from the basement is not known to Gus. And, when Ben's betrayal is known to the audience, it is as much shocking, as it is to Gus. Gus is child-like, pestering Ben with numerous requests, complaints about their environment, and questions. He is generally submissive to Ben's orders – everything in, from making tea to investigating outside the door – though he stands up for what he believes as with the "Light the kettle" (1165) argument.

Similarly, Gus seems to be too anxious or nervous, which is similar in regards to the common people. A general person is likely to stammer and pause when something of importance happens in his/her life. It is the state of anxiety and nervousness that every lowly people are committed to do, in such situations. So, they are modest people, and Ben is the leader of these weaker groups of people. They also dispute over a trivial matter, like the common folks, who are made to dispute over singularity of truth, which in fact is of different facets.

We are habituated in carrying out similar activities in our daily life, which are ineffective but of importance to the capitalist world. Like in the case of newspaper reading, Gus states that Ben has read the same paper many times, which should have no meaning to him. But, in the other hand, it is the pre-planned conspiracy of the bourgeoisie, who wants them to be indulged in silly works. The repetitive and irritating action of Ben is thus presented, thus, from Gus point of view:

Gus: That girl.

(Ben grabs the paper, which he reads.)

(Rising; looking down at Ben.)

How many times have you read that paper? (1167)

Hence, the normal folks are used for mere repetition, as they could be used according to their (capitalists) will.

After some time, they grumble that the food items they have received are decayed. Food is one the most vital necessity of human being. But the bourgeoisies even do not provide quality food to their helpers and workers. In protest, Ben snatches the speaking tube from Gus and speaks upstairs like a caricaturist. When Ben is talking through the speaking tube, he puts his mouth and ear alternately in the tube, as there is no separate tube for hearing and speaking. In doing so, Ben looks like a fool crown. This scenario matches with the real nature of general people's notion of life and living. They are compelled to use hand and mouth at the same, as their food cannot be achieved by joining hand to mouth and ear. Ben talks to the tube like this:

Ben: (Listening): The biscuits were moldy.

(He glares at Gus. Tube to mouth)

Well, we are sorry about that

(Tube to ear)

What?

(To mouth)

What?

(To ear)

Yes. Yes

(To mouth)

Yes, Certainly, Right away. (1171)

Similarly, they address the upstairs as sometimes 'he' and sometimes 'they'. These very pronouns 'they' and 'he' refer to the unknown person. This unknown person is the chief architect of the conspiracy to kill Gus. This is in reality the tactics of the bourgeoisie, who believe in policy of 'divide and rule.'

These lines and actions imply that human society is incomprehensible because it is beyond man's reason. Ben directs Gus and Gus repeats it. In the sense, Ben is the capitalist and Gus is the working classman. Then, when Gus rereads them, it sounds so ridiculous, paradoxical and farcical that it becomes completely trivial and insignificant. As a result, the sense of domination of hierarchy is created. Gus follows Ben thus:

Ben: He won't know you're there.

Gus: He won't know you're there

Ben: He won't know you're there.

Gus: He won't know I'm there. (1172)

These repetitions of dialogue by Gus, shows the superiority of Ben over Gus. In a similar speech pattern, Ben gives some instructions to Gus who reads them. When Gus reads them, again with same effect as in the previous instance to reveal the sense of futility, he finds it disgusting. On example of repetition and circularity of the dialogue is as follows:

Ben: When the bloke come in-

Gus: When the bloke come in-

Ben: Shut the door behind him.

Gus: Shut the door behind him. (1173)

Thus, Gus repeats the same sentences like we repeat our activities in daily life. It further demonstrates that the life of we, puppet people is nothing more than mere repetition of futile actions, to please munch of capitalists.

Similarly, Gus states that though he knows that there is no gas in the room, he has sent for matches, downstairs. The situation tells us there is neither sense nor purpose in lowly people's actions, thus their life is meaningless and purposeless. But out of this uselessness, the capitalists make sense to rule on the inferior ones. They make us adapt to stupid behaviors, silly and trifling acts, just to make fools out of us.

Gus states that the unknown person at the upstairs is playing games with them. However, they do not know the cause behind it. The obvious suggestion is that the world is beyond man's knowledge or comprehension due to its infinity and complexity:

Gus: I told you before who owned this place, didn't? I told you.

(Violently) Well, what's he playing all these games for? (1174)

Likewise, the ending of the play seems to be improper and incomplete because the play ends as they look at each other for a long time. If we endeavor to look for a rational and coherent closure, we are bound to be disappointed. It is like seeking to reach for the absolute truth in the world. Pinter ends the plays thus.

He is stripped of his jacket, waistcoat, tie, holster, and revolver

He stops, body stopping, his arms at his side.

He raises his head looks at Ben.

A long silence.

They stare at each other. (1174)

We can also talk about ambiguity at the end of the play. Gus goes out to drink a glass of water through the left door. Then, Ben goes towards the left door to call Gus because Ben has received the kill order. Then the right door opens. And Ben is seen with a revolver aimed to Gus. Seeing revolver in Ben's hand, Gus "stumbles in" (1175). This is an ambiguous scene because the door, which Gus enters, is not mentioned. We are not known which door he enters from. So, we just keep guessing which door Ben gets in

through but can never be sure. However, this scene is the height of capitalist power structure, which can make even the best of friends fight against each other. In this sense, Ben represents the cruel master, and the inferior portion of the society are forced to think they are secured in the love and mercy bestowed to them by the capitalists. Thus the capitalist utilize the weaker portion of the society as per their will and wish.

This is one of the most powerful scenes in the play. Here, the audience, and, also Gus are acquainted with the real nature of the capitalists, who are expert in the game of motivating one of us, as a weapon, against us. This realistic proposition of the play is equivalent to real life, as someone of us is engaged in fulfilling the targets and goals of the powerful capitalist.

Similarly, Pinter's dialogue seems to go around in circle as if to present the circularity of life. Ben and Gus talk about whether it is correct to say 'light the kettle or light the gas' (1165). Then, they proceed talking about different kinds of subject matter. Then they change the topic and move on to yet another meaningless topic. It is an indication that the incoherent development of ideas and the circularity of life of common people neither have ends nor beginnings.

Likewise, Pinter has given many grammatically wrong and incomplete sentences, spoken by Ben and Gus. They are incomplete or grammatically wrong or the arrangements of words are not sequential, as to convey that life is imperfect, disordered and incoherent. It is thus, the depiction of straight forward life of minor people. Common folks are concerned with meaning, that is to say, they care for the essence of what language conveys, and not in to the rhetoric of it. But, the bourgeoisies are concerned with the style and rhetoric, similar to their nature of dominance. This is in sharp contrast between Ben and Gus, and the unknown master, as well, whose use of language is

identity to their nature. So, to say, Gus use of repetitive words, dialogues and copy cat of Ben is representation of Ben's superiority over Gus.

Similarly, Pinter creates a complex pattern of poetic images in our mind to narrate the tale of capitalist world. The poetic image is such that it corresponds to a happening of our life. This image is ambiguous in sense, as it has multiple meanings and is difficult to interpret. The silly and foolish acts of Ben and Gus thus create imagery in the perception of readers. We can visualize the actions of these characters in our mind, creating images of fiction into reality. However, it is difficult to understand these acts; but when it is compared to our daily activities, we find meaning in it. These images stand for the disharmony and incoherence created in the daily life of normal people.

Gus is more sensitive than Ben in issues of traditional human concerns, and hence, is more near to the common folks. He often touches upon deeper issues than Ben. Gus does not wish to think about the dull routine of life, the nature of the elusive employer Wilson and the death. He is concerned with the consequences of his job. He is haunted by the image of their messy murder of their last victim, a girl, and is anxious about this next job. He is fed up with the dull routine of life, but can do nothing to get out of it. His recurring trips to the bathroom underscore his imprisonment to routine, especially in contrast with Ben, who never goes to the bathroom. Unlike Ben, he has no hobbies, which accounts for his awareness of his static life and nearness to the simple nature of lower class of people.

Gus is the employee in *The Dumb Waiter* from the parable of capitalist slavery. Gus recognizes something wrong with the class structure and in the prevalent domination that must have invited orders for his killing. He sees cracks in the facade of Wilson, he is unafraid to yell and peer up the serving hatch to where the god-like figure reposes. He feels uneasy in his presence, as most underlings do with their powerful bosses. He also



places accountability on Wilson as the controller of the means of production; although Ben tells him otherwise. Gus believes that Wilson owns the cafe and should therefore pay for the gas meter and for should provide them with decent food. However, Ben, who is neared to Wilson, the capitalist remains silent in the issue.

Gus's class-consciousness includes some shame about his poverty, but it is less than that exhibited by Ben. When they send their working-class food up the dumb waiter, Gus calls out the brand names as if announcing a fancy dinner menu. Though little is known about his background, we learn that he has not seen his mother for a long time, that he enjoys soccer, and somewhat unfamiliar with the richer sport of cricket. By the end of play, Gus becomes somewhat resigned to his life enslaved to routine. He accepts Ben's instructions to kill by mechanically repeating them. When he realizes that Ben is betraying him, his silence does not seem like one of a shocked person. Rather, he has turned into a dumb waiter, in place of the one who serves them food and water. He in fact seems like a person succumbing to 'what destiny' has in store for him. He silently seems to prefer this way of death rather than carrying out the directions from some unknown capitalist.

On the other side, Ben is the more dominant of the two criminals. Ben broods and reads his newspaper, and his silences are as much a feature of his character as his dialogue. Whether, Gus is asking him about the job, Wilson, or if he ever gets bored with life, Ben refuses to enter into a meaningful discussion. Part of the reason, of course, is that he does not want to reveal the purpose of the job: to execute Gus. The other reason is that Ben's chilling silences are laced with a defensive violence. Pinter has defined speech as a strategy designed to cover the nakedness of silence, and Ben is a prime example of the slave mentality imposed on him by his superiors. He compensates for his naked silences with a constant aura of violence and intimidation. And just as he frequently

checks his gun to maintain his potential for violence, his often-venomous speech further obscures his naked vulnerability. In the argument over the phrase "Light the kettle" (1165) the narration of violent speech and violent action seems appropriate when Ben chokes Gus while screaming "The Kettle, You Fool!" (1168).

Ben's language denotes other parts of his personality, especially his shame over his lower class. He feigns understanding the names of the orders for exotic dishes sent down via the dumb waiter. When they run out of food in the basement, he tells Gus to observe decorum, then strains to make a formal apology. He is also immensely pleased when the person upstairs uses Ben's phrase "Light the kettle." Like Gus, Ben is a slave to the organization (one with several "departments"), but he does not have the same class-consciousness as Gus; his partner is more aware of their unfortunate lot in life, while Ben considers themselves "fortunate" and diverts himself with hobbies. He also accepts whatever Wilson tells him to do, making him as much a manipulated mute carrier of actions as Gus is to Ben -- a human "dumb waiter." His betrayal of Gus at Wilson's behest is an unsettling reminder of what workers will do to gain the acceptance of their superiors -- a stark example of slave mentality.

Wilson, who never appears in the play, but is directly or indirectly behind the messages from the dumb waiter and the speaking tube. Both are off-stage characters who exercise a powerful, god-like influence over the on-stage characters, or the capitalist structure of dominance. When Gus suggests that Wilson is playing "games" with them, it raises the possibility of Wilson's having a sadistic personality -- a malevolent bourgeoisie. Not only is he going to execute Gus, for unknown reasons, but he will put him through an agonizing final day. Gus also mentions that Wilson put them through tests several years ago to prove themselves, so we know that Wilson may also be paranoid, a reasonable expectation for the head of a crime syndicate.

It is capitalist mentality because, these shows the will of the sophisticated class of people, who in turn are dominating the meek and weak people in portions – meaning in pauses and stops. On one hand, they try to prove that they are the messiahs and on the other hand they are the parasite. The scenario is like the rich nations that provide economic assistance to poor nations, but in other hand pull back the money through the sale of equipments and so-called expertise manpower, which must be from the same country, that too, nominated by them.

Thus, it is the parable of capitalism that guides and dictates the normal class of people. These dominations are carried out on the hierarchical structures. At the top of the hierarchy lays the superior capitalist -- Wilson, then in the second, the hired capitalist – Ben, and the ordinary people represented by Gus, at the bottom. Thus, the metaphor of capitalism makes the general people mere puppets that are limited to acting and delivering according to the wish and will of these powerful bourgeoisies.

#### IV. Conclusion

Harold Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter* is a depiction of the reality that the normal folks are mere puppets to the wish and will of the small groups of capitalists. The hierarchy of power created by these resourceful people has turned the ordinary people into puppets, who can perform silly little repetitive acts to please the capitalists. Furthermore, these silly acts, too are performed according to the instructions they dictate from behind the curtain.

Ben and Gus are two hit-men, appointed to kill one of them, by the other. They are waiting for Mr. Wilson, the capitalist, to come and provide them with the basic necessities including food. These poor characters, in the process of waiting, perform silly and ridiculous little act to keep them engaged. However, it is Gus who is more engaged in doing this, rather than Ben, who is in turn the boss, among them. Ben is the depiction of mentality of those people, who add to the ladder of capitalism. He is in fact appointed to kill Gus, who in turn, is a humble lowly people.

Pinter has staged dingy, shabby and disorganized situation to expose the disorder, dis-harmony and triviality of the universe in which the general people are living. He presents a room that has two doors and two beds in a ground-floor of a large building. Besides, there is a bathroom attached kitchen, indicating the pathetic situation in which the common men have to live. Such a setting of minimum furniture and characters is Pinter's technique of depicting the reality of harsh working conditions of the normal people.

Life in capitalist world is full of belief that are controlled and guided by the unknown but powerful forces. These economically sound sources control and regulate the normal people through money power, which in turn implies through their network.

This network is used to suppress the meek and weak people of the society. These set of network, later turns into an ideology, a false ideology created by the capitalist structure.

Moreover, the tragedy is these characters (common people) are in turn used against each other. Super capitalists use the general people against each other, and this is how they rule on the lowly class of people. Ben is used as a weapon by the super capitalist to impose hegemony on Gus, the more inferior of the two. This is the allegory of capitalists, in which lays their success.

Thus, Pinter presents the allegory of capitalism that is able to rule and dominate the lower class of people from behind the curtain. Like Gus and Ben are made puppets and used against each other, the ordinary people are also used against each other. The play depicts the realistic nature of broad-spectrum of larger public, whose purpose of life, merely, is to please or follow the orders of some mysterious capitalists.

## Works Cited

- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review, 1971.
- . "Ideological State Apparatuses." Trans. Jean Rousset. *Monthly Review* 24.3 (Spring, 1975): 127-86.
- Bogard, Travis. *Modern Dramas and Essays in Criticism*. New York: Galaxy Book, 1965.
- Buck, R.A. "Pinter's *The Dumb Waiter*." *The Explicator*. 56.2 (Fall 1997): 45-76.
- Doren, Charles Van. *A History of Knowledge*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1992.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California, 1976.
- Esslin, Martin. *Absurd Drama*. New York: Penguin, 1965.
- . "Harold Pinter: Certainties and Uncertainties." *The Theatre of the Absurd*. London: Penguin Books, 1990. 5-169.
- Jacobus, Lee A. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford Books, 1993.
- Jameson, Fredric. "The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." *The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991. 1-18.
- Kennedy, Andrew. "In Search of a Language." *A Selection of Critical Essays*. New York: Macmillan, 1986.
- Man, Paul de. *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. 2nd Ed. London: Methuen and Co. 1983.
- Marx, Karl. *A Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- Peck, Richard L. "Theater of the Absurd." *Nursing Homes*. 48.7 (Winter 1999) 4-67.
- Pinter, Harold. "*The Dumb Waiter*." *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Lee A. Jacobus. Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press. 1992.

- Plock, Simon du. "Albert Camus – Existentialist or Absurdist." *Existential Dimensions in Counselling and Psychotherapy*. New York: International Publishers, 2004.
- Prentice, Penelope. "The Dumb Waiter: Paradigmatic Dramatication of Conflict Towards a Definition of the Pinter Ethic." *The Pinter Ethic: The Erotic Aesthetic*. London: Garland, 2000. 11-89.
- Quigley, Austin E. "The Dumb Waiter: Undermining the Tacit Dimension." *Modern Drama*. Vol. 16.2. (1978). 9-11.
- - -. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 1989.
- Smith, Adam. "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth." *Wealth of Nations*. London: Oxford UP, 1975. 114-156.
- Tarnas, Richard. *The Passion of the Western Mind*. London: Cox and Wyman Ltd. 1991.
- Vawter, Rev. Bruce. *Biblical Criticism*. New York: Microsoft Corporation, 2007.
- Zizek, Slavoj. *Mapping Ideology*. London: Oxford, 1996.