CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Since the beginning of his career as a playwright, Pinter has constantly innovated a form to suggest new ways of conceiving the surrounding world. His first play already shows what came to be known as “the principle of unverifiability.” This means that, for Pinter, the world does not go about explaining itself. Most of the reasons and motivations that guide his characters’ action are never explicitly stated. In such a world, Pinter’s figures move and try to get away the best way they can. This involves a series of negotiations, which frequently involve the revelation, or not, of the character’s identity, including the way they see and value their past. Because Pinter deals with the concrete world we inhabit, the characters are well aware of the dangers lurking around them. These may be concrete, as the threat to their individual territory, psychological, connected to the character’s emotional or social needs, especially in relation to the threats to individual freedom.

Pinter has delicately deployed the theatre of absurd and his idiosyncratic theatre of comedy of menace so that he could put forward solutions for the dominating existential problem of man entrapped in his era. To strike the mind the absurd philosophical thinking like purposelessness, alienation, and hovering horror, he has created a micro-level illustration of the obsessions in the dramatization and characterization of his theater. His early plays encompass the elements of the absurd and vividly demonstrate the postmodernism obsessions in the atmosphere and the behavior and nature of the protagonists. Pinter stages man's identity struggle exposed to violation, collapse, and deprivation in his specific characterization to manifest a macro-level problem entrapping humanity with the demanding postmodernism era characteristics. Man's view of his self and identity is one which is the ultimate target of these demanding features. The question of identity in the majority of Pinter's plays has been
demonstrated as one of the great obsessions of modern man. The ongoing identity struggle of characters clarifies this tragic obsession of postmodern man on the one hand, and has a pedantic theme for him on the other. Although man is befuddled by a host of annihilating forces of different ilk while viewing his self and identity, what is implicitly asserted is his view and attitude crystallized amidst the problems. This is what Pinter, in his Noble Lecture on “Art, Truth and Politics”, has been getting at, "that despite the enormous odds which exist, unflinching, unswerving, fierce intellectual determination, as citizens, to define the real truth of our lives and our societies is a crucial obligation which devolves upon us all. It is in fact mandatory" (442).

In his plays Pinter draws a vast landscape of human experiences. Man is presented as the prisoner of the web of uncertainties, ambiguities and ambivalences. The more questions he asks about the nature of time, reality, memory and identity the fewer answers he gets. The existential uncertainties diminish man to a total state of dehumanization and depravation as he is helpless, lonely, isolated and detached. Man experiences a vacuous existence. The haven does not protect him, the past provides no fixed reality, and the future promises nothing. Imprisoned in the gloomy present man realizes that there is no hope, escape or peace for him. Hence Pinter defines man's existence in the universe as a tragic and pathetic experience.

Pinter makes the relation between the victim and the victimizer and the distance between them central issues in his plays. The encounter between the victim and the victimizer is most often expressed through the confrontation between the victim placed in a room and visitors to that room. In The Room, Rose, the victim, is placed under a light while surrounded by darkness outside. Uncertainty and the lack of knowledge regarding what is outside of her room lead to her vulnerability. With the removal of the necessary distance between the two, the victim loses her power and is replaced by the victimizer at the end of the play when Rose
succumbs to her own weaknesses and fear and finally reaches out physically and emotionally to touch the blind eyes of Riley as her initial resistance gradually gives way. It is the first time that she looks at Riley, not with the eyes of Bert but with her own. But her own momentary awareness of her true identity confronts with the ferocious vengeance of Bert whose fear of being rejected by his wife ultimately compels him to act such. The analysis of the play shows that Bert’s own existence is totally dependent on Rose and to her willing seclusion in the room. And Rose herself has been a complicit for many years for her own captivity as it is she who has chosen the room considering it as a safe haven from the cruelty of the external world. But the violence she does to her own self in response to the supposed death of Riley at the hands of Bert is in actuality her realization of the true nature of her own existence in the room in which she wants to confines herself, away by putting the mask of blindness on herself and thereby regressing to her own past. Here, Pinter associates vision with the identity of the human subject. Particularly, Riley’s blindness and Rose’s supposed blindness at the end of the play define their individuality and the destruction of their own self. Her preference to blindness is actually her willingness to keep herself away from truth and acceptance to the way of life as it has been for ever in her ‘cosy’ room. Rose's blindness suggests two things. First, it suggests that the death of Riley kills any chance that she thought she might have of reaching out to touch her husband and to be touched by him in turn. Second, it announces the end of their relationship. Given what she has seen, given how she now feels in the wake of returning home physically and emotionally to herself, living with her husband is no longer possible; thus her ‘cosy’ room eventually turns into a tomb for her. On the other hand, Bert’s violent reaction suggests that he is aware that his power, a power that he had held over Rose for some time, has been lost and in order to regain that power, he must resort to violence. Bert uses much more dramatic measure to obtain power and to
reinforce his domination over both Riley and Rose, Rose loses her ability to see, and just like Riley she has become the dominated victim.

In *The Caretaker*, it is obvious that the three characters will not continue as friends. Davies cannot come to terms with the new information about Aston, and consequently treats him with disrespect. The tense situation develops into a fight where the two use their inhibitions, the obstacles they have repeated, against each other and are consequently unable to stay on good terms. Mick appears to intentionally lead Davies into a trap of confusion with another diatribe full of technical expressions and has, in the end, an alleged reason to expel Davies. As a result, none of the characters are able to stay on good terms. The consequences of this loss of a human connection do not, however, weigh equally heavy on all characters. The only character who suffers the true consequence of the loss of human contact is the one who has the most to lose and the least in his possession, Davies. For the other two, the consequence may be the loss of love and friendship, at least in the case of Aston. For the most powerful one, Mick, the one who owns the house and most of the material goods, the loss may merely be that of an employee.

Davies appears to be the villain because he is irascible and abusive and tries to play one brother off against the other to assure himself of a permanent place in the room. Davies is a victim who takes on the stature of a hero through the process of victimization. The subtle shift in emphasis and in sympathy account for the extraordinary power of the play. The audience sees Davies as an irascible old man, complaining about his bed and the shoes that do not fit, and attempting to manipulate the two brothers for his own benefit; however, it will not tolerate two young men tormenting an old man in the manner in which Mick and Aston torment Davies. There is a change in perspective on the part of the audience and it is brought through the conscious victimization of the old tramp. The victimization assures survival for Mick and Aston. Through the victimization of Davies we get a picture of man, naked,
defenseless and vulnerable. This is the basic kind of situation that Artaud envisioned as one of the key components of his Theater of Cruelty: “… it is understood that life is always someone’s death” (102).

The struggle in Aston’s house for control, dominance and survival also involves a search for identity. Davies hopes to get to Sidcup to find the man who has his papers. Davies hopes that Aston will give him a good pair of shoes that will make his journey possible. Thus Davies, who goes by the name of Bernard Jenkins but is really Mac Davies, struggle to get to Sidcup but meets Aston and his brother Mick on the way, and a secondary quest for identity develops. The three define themselves sharply in the tragic situation which develops as a result of their encounter. Ironically, Pinter reveals the dignity of Davies by showing the removal of the tramp’s last shred of respectability and hope of survival. The audience is gradually made aware that Davies is not just a dirty, wretched old tramp, but a human being who in the final struggle to assert his own worth, ends up alone and friendless.

*The Caretaker* is brilliant dramatization of the essential truth, that in the working out of the struggle for a room or territory, man’s basic humanity is revealed and his worth evaluated. At the point when the realization is made that Davies is the victim, the mood of the play changes from comic to tragic intensity. Davies’ harassment of his hosts produces a comic effect because the efforts of the tramp to manipulate the brothers are shown to be futile and petty, and we are inclined to look down on him. But the victimization of the tramp produces feelings of pity and an atmosphere of terror is created by the treatment which is brutal and sadistic. Pinter wondered why people laughed at the London production of *The Caretaker*, because the play is not intended to be comic, as he explained in an interview with Leonard Russell of The Sunday Times:

> I did not intend it to be merely a laughable farce. If there hadn’t been other issue at stake the play would not have been written …. From this kind of easy
jollification I must, of course, dissociate myself ... As far as I’m concerned, 

The Caretaker is funny, up to a pint. Beyond that point it ceases to be funny,

and it was because of that point that I wrote it. (qtd. in Dick 259)

In The Caretaker, Davies fights for his life, meaning his right to exist as an independent entity. Ironically, the more he fights, the more he loses, because his need for self preservation inevitably poses a threat to the existence of others. He in turn is manipulated, but ironically and tragically, he does not seem to be aware of what is happening. At the end of the play he is still pleading to be allowed to stay in the room, still trying to play one brother off against the other. In this play then we have a hero who is also a victim, not only of other individuals but of his own individual need to survive. Davies is consciously manipulated and ultimately destroyed by the other two characters in the play. Through this complex inter-relationship of three men, Pinter defines the universal human struggle and builds up a generalized image of the condition of men in the modern world. Davies becomes an archetypal figure, symbolic of life’s continual fluctuation between hope and despair. Pinter’s tramp will have no more expectations and his final reality is loneliness, despair and death. Penelope Prentice in her book The Erotic Aesthetic concludes in the following words:

In this play Pinter places the microscope on the private level of human relationship to show once again the inevitable destruction that occurs when self-knowledge is absent, consciousness, unawakened, and characters are driven by a need to supplant any inner identity with an exterior label constructed of illusion. The need to inflate an insubstantial inner self which has implications for the ethical action, revealing that if the basis for human connection is lacking the larger structure will not endure. (96)

In The Homecoming, Pinter presents two types of struggle working at the same time. The play is a depiction of struggle among the male members of the family for the control of
power and dominance. In this pattern of struggle, all the male members are striving for control and power in the family. While the older generation tries to maintain their control in the family the younger generation tries to subvert the power and dominance to gain power in turns in the family. Though Sam and Teddy are not involved directly in this conflict, Sam’s calm attitude in every situation as well as the keeper of secrets of the family indirectly makes him a gainer and powerful as his ability to reveal the secret threats to subvert the power balance in the family. Teddy keeps himself totally aloof from this power struggle. Rest of the characters is involved in the family to gain or maintain their control and power and in the process to achieve it they try to victimize the other. One important aspect of this play is that the battle remains restricted to a pure verbal level and there are one or two instances where physical violence is perpetrated by Max in moments of sheer desperation. Actual or physical violence is only hinted at in Lenny’s threatening speeches. The play shows that adoption of violent means indicates defeat. Max gets defeated, so does Lenny. Ruth wins by remaining calm like Sam. This shows that in Pinter’s theatre social control lies in the power to impose one’s language upon another.

In the struggle among the male members, Max being the father wants to wield his power over his sons while they try to defy it. It is the struggle between youth versus age in which youth subverts the power. Max, in the process of gaining his fading control in the family which he is gradually losing, even resorts to violence, symbolized by the stick, and by doing so consequently he degrades himself more and more. Max’s fear of being usurped by his son makes him more violent as he himself once usurped his aged father. It is apparently true as Lenny, the dominant son, clearly defies and mocks at his father’s power and even Joey, the weaker one, knows that his father has become an old man and unable to dominate them any longer. Clearly, Lenny emerges as the powerful one in the struggle between the male members before the arrival of Ruth in the family.
But the arrival of Ruth clearly shifts this power struggle to the struggle between opposite genders as each male member tries to take control of the only female in the family and for which everyone adopts different means. As it has been mentioned earlier, in Pinter’s world if there is a woman and two men present in the room then the two men vie with each other to take possession of the woman, to take control of the woman. In this play a woman is positioned among all male members of the family and all of them attempt to gain control over her. Ruth’s confrontation with each male member enables her to realize their actual position and power in the family and she understands that the absence of a female member makes them vulnerable in this power game. Her shocking acceptance of the proposal to stay in the family and cater herself according to the needs of the family draws a wider criticism ranging from the depiction of becoming a prostitute to the liberation of the female dependent on the male member of a family, as discussed in the earlier chapter, but it is she that at the end of the play who clearly gains control of the family and dictates terms according to her needs. The play is open-ended and it can be interpreted in different ways but the appropriate reading may show that Ruth emerges as the victorious one in the struggle for dominance in the family by using her own sexuality. It is not the male members rather she herself who manipulates the need of the male members in terms of her own needs and clearly pulls down the champions of patriarchy, Max and Joey, by making them kneel before her. But whether she is able to break Lenny or not cannot be inferred from the final tableau as it shows Lenny standing at distance silent and calm. As in Pinter’s world calm and silence is associated with power and control, so Lenny, standing at the distance and judging the situation as a professional pimp, has become a potential threat in this new power game started by Ruth. Defeated in the struggle to achieve power, Lenny’s calm at the end reflects that a more vicious power struggle between two opposite genders is stored in the future.
In her analysis of the play Penelope Prentice says that despite the struggle for dominance and victimization of the weaker one in the play, Pinter portrays each character with some dignity and identity, even at the end they all become victims in the hand of the rising female power who takes control of the family by using her dominant sexuality in the absence of any other female member. Prentice says:

Most important, Pinter allows each character some dignity, some quality to admire and like. Max, the aging patriarch, struggles to retain his position, to maintain the household, and the fact that he struggles in a worthy purpose is significant and evidence of an admirable vigor. He does keep the family together, and though he does not foster dependency, his two sons and brother require his shelter, and Teddy, his approval. His vitality and mind are remarkable, and he reveals his strength when he takes over from the others. It is Max who initially proposes keeping Ruth and who steers the final action toward its conclusion—until Ruth takes over from him. Joey, too, exhibits strength. He does defend Ruth against the others who call her a tease and reveals some generosity and even gentleness in his desire to retain her. Sam, however ineffectually, tries to express his love to Teddy when he confesses that Teddy was his favorite and that he cherished Teddy’s letters so much he did not share them with the others. He is also the only one to oppose the family’s proposal. Teddy, who fails to defend himself against his family, did manage to escape once, and in the end, leaves open the possibility, however unlikely, for Ruth’s return to the family in America. Lenny may prostitute his own identity by assuming, chameleon-like, the character of the person he happens to be with in order to assert his superiority over others—to his father he shouts, “Plug it you stupid sod,” but to Sam and Teddy he affects mock
deference. Yet Lenny shows himself to be in fact superior to Teddy on Teddy’s own turf, outmaneuvering and instructing the philosopher in ethics. Lenny is not wrong when he accuses Teddy of failing to provide the family with a model of virtue, “grace,” with that “generosity of mind, a bit of liberality of spirit,” anciently regarded as the crowning virtue without which a person has no virtue. Ruth asserts her intelligence and returns attack with some kindness by turning neither upon those who attack her nor away from those who seek her. (139-140)

In his political plays Pinter shows the struggle between individual and the state to demonstrate how the state, by using its repressive state apparatus, victimizes an individual. To give it a universal nature, Pinter writes his plays in unidentified settings that could be any country or any nation as the nature of state-oppressive measures are the same everywhere. He presents the reality of the state oppression and the victimization of the individual through the verbal as well as physical violence by the agents of state, though the physical violence takes place offstage. Moreover, in Pinter’s earlier plays male characters are not dominant in their struggle against female characters. They are dominated by the emotional complexities of territorial conflict between men and women. His political dramas concentrate on a struggle between the individual and the political (super)structure. As a result, these plays involve a radical change in the nature of space: once impregnable spaces become brutally conquered. The central themes of memory and sexuality are destroyed in the political plays, where masculinity trumpets the triumph of the will. The brutes have escaped from the Room.

In One for the Road Pinter depicts the victimization of a family who bear the mark of physical and psychological torture at the hands of Nicholas and his men. Victor is rigorously tortured and interrogated, while his wife is raped repeatedly by the officers of Nicholas and their little child is either murdered or kept in prison—all these happen for an unknown
reason. He shows that the absolutist state can only ensure its monopoly of power if it controls both the discursive and repressive apparatus. For Pinter the system represents a source of power that resists change. It is strictly hierarchical, and is here portrayed through the voice of Nicolas - the ‘mouthpiece’ of ‘the man who runs this country.’ When Victor, an intellectual/academic, is suspected of not fitting in with the system, he is by definition guilty of rejecting the ‘guiding light.’ He is faced with the pain of imprisonment and social degradation. His son is killed because he spat at his country’s soldiers, and his wife is raped in prison. Space has become degrading. Here is a place of physical and mental torture - with ‘a first-class brothel upstairs, on the sixth floor, chandeliers’ (Pinter 246). Pinter depicts a system which deprives the individuals of their ‘animal’ rights. This play is an embodiment of the victimization of the mass at the hands of state agents in the name of propagating their own ideology. This whole system aims at the one-dimensional man which Pinter developed in *The Birthday Party*. It does not want trouble; it eliminates or homogenizes he who causes ‘despair’: ‘Despair, old fruit, is a cancer. It should be castrated. Indeed I’ve often found that that works. Chop the balls off and despair goes out the window. You’re left with a happy man. Or a happy woman’ (Pinter *Plays 4* 233). Silence of any opposing voice is the ultimate goal of the state as is reflected by Victor’s inability to speak as his tongue is cut or the prohibition of speaking in one’s own language as in *Mountain Language*.

In *Mountain Language* Pinter depicts the victimization of the masses by not giving them permission to speak in their own language or when the permission is given to speak in their own language, the masses remains speechless in shock after tolerating so much violence. In this play Pinter writes about a culture of total repression - presenting a people who have lost their dignity. A minority culture in a rural area is colonized and maltreated by the capital. The capital’s language disables the minority’s dialect. The play exemplifies the systematic suppression of a minority’s language. The capital’s language has to be bowed to;
otherwise the victims are faced with humiliation and corporal punishment. Of course, language has always been a crucial issue in Pinter’s plays - his characters exist, fantasize, remember, dominate via the medium of words - however Mountain Language is a product of a counter-discourse, in which to speak is to tyrannize. The play portrays an authoritarian state whose major aim is to create a patriarchal, one-dimensional society. It presents human beings at the mercy of the cruelest, most incomprehensible, illogical social order, which does not allow any resistance, and whose only aim is to control thought and language. The central authority punishes and assimilates the intellectuals and the ethnic minority alike, because they are equally non-conformist. The prison is divided into two sections to identify the rural prisoners robbed of their natural linguistic rights, and the prisoners from the city - the intellectuals. Thus even amongst the oppressed, the system imposes a clear-cut distinction between the city/capital and the mountain people. Failure to conform to their segregation is treated as a crime in itself: when the Young Woman, Sara Johnson, says she does not speak the mountain language, and the Officer sees on her papers that her husband ‘doesn’t come from the mountains. He’s in the wrong batch’ (Pinter, Plays 4 257), he and his Sergeant abuses her physically. Pinter argues that the aim of the militarized state is to diminish both those whom it classifies as minority and those who consciously decline to conform. Again, the way that his plays of the 1980s treat the intelligentsia as a significant class marks a major development from The Birthday Party or The Homecoming where they are treated as impotent, powerless and pretentious fantasists. The change reflects Pinter’s growing belief that the failure of the post-war educated middle classes to contribute to the moral and intellectual growth of Britain, especially in the Thatcher period, was a profound problem that needed to be redressed.

The military are granted complete power over space and language: to dominate and define. The play is a reworking of one of Pinter’s recurrent themes - betrayal. Self-betrayal
transforms into forced betrayal. The mountain people, the weakest and the most vulnerable members of society, are not allowed to shape or discuss their own lives in their own language.

*Mountain Language*, like *One for the Road*, explores the rhetoric of nationalism. Both plays account for nationalism as an ideological configuration. The Power in both plays aims at a unity and control of national consciousness. Like Pinter, Lefebvre suggested in his *Production of Space* that ‘nationhood implies violence - the violence of a military space, be it feudal, bourgeois, imperialist, or some other variety’ (112). And *Mountain Language* is an urban nightmare with uniforms and hooded hostages—working for national unity while destroying the ‘other’, the minority, the female, the rural. The suppression expressed in *Mountain Language* is applied internally by state institutions and globally by forces which are sometimes subtle, sometimes savage, and Pinter indicts a universal system of oppression.

In *Ashes to Ashes* Pinter again presents the struggle in dual level; in one level the play is a depiction of the struggle of Rebecca with her traumatized memory which is haunted by the horrific images of the past that compels her to bring the past into the present, on another level the play is a projection of the power struggle between husband and wife or between a male and female in which Devlin is trying to dominate over Rebecca by forcing her to recall her past or in other words Devlin is trying to have control over Rebecca by possessing her traumatized memory. Like *The Homecoming* this play is also a depiction of gender struggle but here this struggle is positioned in a particular historical context.

Pinter's plays draw attention to the roles that are played in the struggle for domination. There are those who are in power and have a deep sense of satisfaction from that role. There are those who play the role of the victim, powerless and weak. Pinter is sympathetic to none of these characters. Instead, he is mirroring what he saw happen in the past, what he sees happening around him now, and what he fears will continue to happen in the future.
"Ashes to Ashes" is a poetic and moving political play. Except here the political encompasses more than the cruelty of state power that we see in *One for the Road* or *Mountain Language* but a wider sense of the accumulation of history’s wrongs on our consciences. *Ashes to Ashes* contains echoes of his previous work; combining personal relationships with an engagement with world affairs, but also with regard to the ambiguity of language, the recalling of memories as truths, the persecution of innocent victims, power relations between the genders and the male desire to possess a woman’s past. In all of Pinter’s plays, women are ‘othered’; they are made outsiders to an all-male club. Yet in this play, woman is not just ‘Other’ to the domestic patriarchy, but to the perpetrators of humanity’s atrocities. Women have a flexibility, a freedom, an imaginative sympathy frequently denied to men who are locked into unyielding power-structures. They are more empathetically in-tune with the suffering of others, which is why perhaps, certainly Pinter’s later female characters, are more sympathetically drawn as his plays have become more overtly political:

‘God was in much better trim when He created women. Which doesn’t mean to say I sentimentalise women. I think women are very tough. But if you look at what has happened in the world since day one, the actual acts of brutality have been dictated by men. […] Nevertheless in my plays women have always come out in one way or another as the people I feel something towards which I don’t feel towards men’. (Pinter, *Various Voices* 222)

This view of the ‘feminine’ as being carers and nurturers is certainly a stereotyped one, but it may explain why Pinter chooses to have a woman as the centre in this play’s action, as a bodily carrier of world history, atoning for man’s sins.

Despite Pinter’s insistence, *Ashes to Ashes* appears in many ways to chart the history of female sacrifice; of male domination and female submission. The play is haunted by
images of babies, children and childlessness. Devlin incorrectly sings the lyric ‘I’m nobody’s baby now’ which Rebecca corrects: ‘You’re nobody’s baby now’ (Pinter, *Plays 4* 402). Devlin is intrigued to hear the words used by Kim’s husband, who has left her for another woman, and wants to return because he ‘misses the kids’ (Pinter, *Plays 4* 421). Tales of the woman carrying the baby in the street, the recurrent image of babies being torn from mothers’ arms and Rebecca’s loss of her own bundle climaxes with the repeated echo of ‘baby’ at the end of the play, a poetic refrain of maternal loss and grief. This echo contains a kind of evocative beauty for an audience; it powerfully conjures the voices of the women who have gone before her, and continue to suffer today. Yet it also surrounds Rebecca with a vacuum, cutting her off from communication with another because of her sacrifice, which she ultimately denies. It is this denial that leads to Rebecca’s fate as a victim of atrocity. Pinter, in this play, is engaging with the history of world politics through his depiction of this male-female relationship. However, it is Rebecca’s vulnerability as a woman, as a mother, which leaves her open to the victimization of history.

The critics have suggested that Rebecca, as a woman, becomes history; imaginatively identifying with the victims of it, and through this empathy discovers her power to break from the past and emerge as a ‘non-victim’ (qtd. in Prinz 97). The ability to identify with the victim of atrocity redeems her as a guilty perpetrator. However, Prinz argues the opposite: she suggests that Rebecca’s development throughout the play, as first outside the atrocity, then witness to the atrocity means she inevitably becomes victim of the atrocity. Citing the oft-quoted poetic prose of Martin Niemoeller, ‘First they came….’, Prinz asserts that Rebecca is ‘both victim and cause, who brings suffering forth through her indifference and apathy’ (103). Because she does nothing to stop the atrocity, Rebecca becomes a victim of it, ending the play totally alone and abandoned, as she abandoned her baby. Could the blame for atrocity actually be leveled at Rebecca, as both representative of humankind and as a woman?
Prentice implies that Rebecca is as much to blame for perpetuating suffering through her love for the man who tears ‘all the babies from the arms of their screaming mothers’ (377). This seems to be a weak argument for having woman as so central here, as an active subject compared to Pinter’s earlier plays where woman is an object of dangerous sexuality. There is a distinct relationship in *Ashes to Ashes* between the gender politics of Pinter’s earlier works and the overt political engagement with world affairs that we see from the 1980s. The personal, amongst other things, is political, as one woman dreamily narrates her part in world history. It is upon her body that the history of the twentieth century is inscribed. The combination of interpersonal relationships between man and woman acts as a symbolic exploration of global politics, albeit an exploration that holds no answers for us, given Rebecca’s silence at the end of the play.