Chapter VI

*Inadmissible Evidence: The Subject as Symptom*

Any valid study of *Inadmissible Evidence* raises a lot of critical imponderables. Traditional critics failed to reckon with the new theatrical idiom that Osborne perfected in *Inadmissible Evidence* and considered the play a realistic portrayal of Maitland's life. According to them, the text mimics the reality outside and has the life of Maitland as its reference point. Alan Carter takes such a view. According to him, the play presents the progressive decline of Maitland, a solicitor. "It is superbly constructed, its episodic form revealing Bill to us and to himself, as he slowly 'slips down the drain'. Bill's self-destruction continues as the others leave him, and he is reduced to a tragic state beyond human dignity."¹ A. D. Choudhari also adopts a similar perspective. He comments: "It is the moving study of the failure of a man, like that of Archie Rice, to make his mark either in his profession or in his personal relationship."²

What is remarkable about the play *Inadmissible Evidence* is that the text resists appropriation back to the discourse of realism and demands a new reading strategy. What we find in the play is not the prosaic realism of John Galsworthy, but a higher kind of realism which may be called psychological realism. It is a play in which form is more important than content—or to put it in another way the form *speaks* more about the content than the content itself. The fact that the form is
very much important in any reading of the play has been underscored by Martin Banham:

In terms of depth Osborne has never analysed and exposed a character so absolutely on the stage as he does with Maitland, and in this he is greatly abetted by the form of the play, which moves in a half dream world of nightmare and confusion through which Maitland plays judge, prosecutor and the defender in the case of his own life and personality, and finds the case against himself overwhelmingly proved.³

This view finds approbation in Michael Anderson too. According to him, in *Inadmissible Evidence* Osborne drifts away from naturalism and presents his vision through its peculiar form and structure.

However, we must beware of thinking that Osborne is a kind of primitive among artists, using a rough and ready naturalism and a not-too-deep view of the world as a vehicle for his towering portraits of human character. Osborne at best is a master of language and that mastery implies a certain care about structure and form; but the form emerges through language rather than through the action or theatrical conventions employed.⁴

This is why the reading of the play *Inadmissible Evidence* necessitates a new critical idiom. The play is presented in the form of a
dream. The stage direction in the opening part of the play makes this amply clear.

The location where a dream takes place. A site of helplessness, of oppression and polemic. The structure of this particular dream is the bones and dead objects of a solicitor's office. . . . Down stage is a dock in which stands the prisoner of this dream, Bill Maitland. . . . Before this there has been an air of floating inertia before the three actors come to some sort of life out of the blur of dream. (JE 9)

This is also borne out by the description given of Maitland in the opening part of the play. He can't open his eyes and is obviously in the world of dreams delving deep into the labyrinth of memory. Bill: "... now I wish I could open my eyes. My eyelids. They're like oysters. However, this is my concern and not yours. I'll think of something (he presses he eyeballs)” (JE 16). Again the stage direction in the middle of Act I makes it explicit that the play is in the form of a dream.

The actor has to indicate the painful struggle into consciousness, without, at the same time, making the physical metaphor too explicit; the difficulty of breathing, the violent inner effort to throw off the burden, the fishy, palpitating struggle of the heart being landed into wakefulness. The gasping will take over. The focus fades on Bill, who emerges out of it. (JE 20)
This is repeated in the note for the telephone conversation in the opening part of Act II. "The telephone conversation and the ones that follow it and some of the dialogues should progressively resemble the feeling of dream and unreality of Bill's giving 'evidence' at the beginning of Act I." As in Hairy Ape and The Emperor Jones of Eugene O'Neill there is a blurring of the line that separates illusion from reality. Michael Anderson underscores the illusory nature of reality that is presented in Inadmissible Evidence.

The hectoring tone of the opening stage direction and some subsequent passages insist that we should look on the action, not as reality so much as some kind of hallucinatory re-construction of events inside the hero's muddled and desperate head.\(^5\)

The application of dream analysis is particularly relevant in the case of Inadmissible Evidence as a drama because the interpretation of dream is at the heart of psychoanalysis and Freud considers dreaming itself a kind of dramatisation. Freud borrows many terms from the field of drama for his interpretation of dreams, e.g. "acting out," "projection," "screen memories" etc. "If dreams resemble drama, drama also owes its form to dreams; rather than mirroring the outer world, the theatre gives external form to the internal dramaturgy of the mind, where anything may be invoked and brought to life."\(^6\) The dream is a drama enacted in the psychic theatre. The theatre, like a
dream, narrativizes events without the benefit of a commentary. Drama and dream are unglossed texts—texts without a commentary.

The application of dream theory to the play *Inadmissible Evidence* raises many textual questions due to the analogies between a dream text and a literary text. The ensuing discussion attempts to foreground these textual questions. The dream text of the play raises the question of meaning. Dream resists a reductive reading because any attempt to repress the plethora of meanings within the dream text is foredoomed to end in failure. This is the reason why *Inadmissible Evidence* is amenable to a multiplicity of readings. The play appears to be an open-ended text with no final signified. Due to the slippage of meaning, no reading can exhaust the plentitude of meanings within the text. This is true not only in the case of the events in the play but also in that of the characters. The characters in the play are like figures in a dream—not stable signs, but signifiers without any fixed signifieds. Dream is a playful and self-transforming literary text in which human identity is endlessly transformed. The same signifier can stand for a multiplicity of signifieds. 

"... so much so that in the dream, when the dreamer’s representation becomes overloaded, the dreamer splits into two and sets up another character, to represent separately, one or more of his characteristics." This applies to Bill Maitland himself as to all other characters in the play. Bill Maitland, as he figures in the play, is not a stable amalgam of consciousness, but a (mis)representation of the censored chapter in his unconscious being. The other characters in the play also do not have any fixed identity. Any character can slip away
from his being and can become another. Hudson can also become the judge. Thus the play gives us post-Saussurean and post-structuralist insights into the crisis of a sign. Post-structuralism postulates that signs do not carry with them their well-defined signifieds. The verbal sign floats free of what it designates. There is an undecidability or indeterminacy of meaning due to the slippage from signifier to signifier. As Philip Rice puts it, "the radical de-centering of identities and the emphasis on the signifier over signified form two central characteristics of post-structuralism." By making use of the technique of dramatisation, dream punctures the very stability of signs. Reading of _Inadmissible Evidence_ thus becomes an anti-theological activity that releases a multiplicity of meanings. We may take a cue from Freud's own interpretation of dreams. Freud himself states that dream defies analysis and the analysis of dream is an interminable process.

Even in the best interpreted dreams, there is often a place that must be left in the dark, because in the process of interpreting, one notices a tangle of dream thoughts arising which resist unravelling but has also made no further contribution to the dream content. This is then the dream's navel, the place where it straddles the unknown. The dream thoughts to which interpretation leads one are necessarily interminable and branch out on all sides into the net-like entanglement of our world of thought. Thus the play presents itself as an inexhaustible structure of meanings.
The play as a dream text raises important questions about Bill Maitland, the subject of the play. The subject can't be easily deciphered. The subject lies hidden under the pictographic script of dreams. The strategies used by dream-work—condensation, displacement, representability and secondary revision—distort the subject that is present in dreams.

The most important question posed by the text of the dream is the place of the subject. This question—the place of the subject—may be posed in the case of Inadmissible Evidence also. How does Bill Maitland manifest himself in the play? In the classical view the subject is seen as the founding source of all meanings—unproblematically standing outside articulation. This is encapsulated in Descarte’s dictum “I think therefore I am.” Lecan’s explication of the dream problematizes the place of the subject in the dream. In a dream, we are confronted with a paradoxical situation. The wish that is fulfilled in dream is abhorrent to the conscious subject. So wish-fulfilment comes close to wish-renunciation.

Fulfilment and renunciation of a wish turn out to be the same thing because the wish, drawing its energy from unconscious desire, must always be abhorrent to consciousness. A wish becomes unconscious insofar as it must be repressed. Such repression thus constitutes the subject, insofar as it is a subject of the unconscious.\(^{10}\)
The dreamer striving against his own wishes is like a combination of two incompatible persons. For such a subject pleasure coincides with unpleasure. Thus it is not only the separation between conscious and unconscious subject, but their active exclusion from one another. Behind the subject that appears in the dream, another subject lies hidden. It is a subject that is represented only through its distortions. This leads to the textual ambivalence of Bill Maitland. The play deconstructs the conventional view of character as a stable amalgam of consciousness.

This is how the dream text of the play problematises the subject. The Maitland that is represented in the dream is different from the 'unconscious' Maitland who does the dreaming. In the drama there are two Maitlands—the dreaming Maitland and the speaking Maitland. These two—one on the unconscious, the other on the conscious level—Maitlands are encoded in the textual psyche. The dreaming 'I' can't be a speaker reflexively posing the question of his own identity, since the 'I' replaces itself with another 'I' in the dream. Lacan puts it thus: "It is not the question of knowing whether I speak of myself in a way that conforms to what I am, but rather of knowing whether, when I speak of this, I am the same as the one of whom I am speaking." The Maitland that is represented in the dream is not a self-reflexive subject. Just as in language the character gets alienated in his own representation.

Our attempt to track down the subject of the play raises many textual questions. It poses the question of the relation between the
subject and the text. The birth of the text of dream leads to a split. There is disjunction between the writing 'I' and the written 'I'—here the dreaming Maitland and the Maitland who appears as a character structured in his dream. The written 'I' is born with the text. The character who appears in the dream is an absent presence because the person who does the dreaming is present in the character as an absence. The character in the play doesn't represent a being who antedates it, but is contemporaneous with the text itself. As Barthes puts it,

. . . the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not subject with the work as predictate, there is no other time than that of enunciation and every text is eternally written here and now.13

This is why every character in the play appears as a 'trace'—an absent presence. Every character is a ghostly mark carrying with it a trace of perennial alterity. There is an absence at the heart of every experience that is inscribed on the manifest text that we feel something missing or absent from what we perceive. What Derrida says about Freudian conception of a psyche is applicable to the text of Inadmissible Evidence.

Whether he acknowledges it or not, Freud implies that the psyche is a sign—structure 'sous nature', for, like the sign, it is inhabited by a radical alterity, what is totally other—
'Freud gives it [this radical alterity] a metaphysical name, the unconscious.'

Bill Maitland as a pre-existing reality outside the text, is not present in the text. We can't say that the life of Maitland is the final reference point or ultimate signified. A study of the play as a dream leads to the conclusion that the dream as a form of writing exists at the level of meaning and not reference. Maud Ellman refers to this as the technique of dramatisation: "The technique of dramatisation seems to be designed specially to hide us from ourselves and the task of the interpreter is to discern the words encoded in the pictographic script of dreams." There is no reference to any external reality. All traditional criticisms of the play commit this illusionist fallacy of regarding the work as the textual counterpart of the life of Maitland which exists outside. They follow Aristotle's theory that art imitates life.

But when the subject is written through language—dream is a language—the reference evaporates. This happens in the case of Bill Maitland too. In the language of dream there is dissolution of reference. Language erases reference. The very act of writing through the language of dream makes the reference disappear. The real outside can never be represented within the text because the text shows the relation between the word and the word and not the word and the world. "The real is what it is, but when it is represented, expressed, referred to, connected in some way or another to language, the real begins to be, what it is not."
Lacan means the same when he says that the word is the murder of the thing. There cannot be a cohabitation of word and object. Writing is fundamentally an activity in a void, creating a void. In language we can speak about 'nothing'. Nothing enters reality through language. Rather than portraying Bill Maitland or his life the language of the play hollows out reality. It shows the fading of the subject. In the play *Inadmissible Evidence*, the subject dissolves into a nameless scar—almost a punctuation. "As punctuation, the subject is near fully present, but is always either coming into, or dying out of being."\(^{17}\)

Patricia Waugh writes in *Metafiction*: "As linguistic signs, the conditions of fictional character is one of absence; being and not being."\(^{18}\)

If the dream is conceived as a piece of writing the author of the dream—Maitland’s unconscious that does the dreaming—is not present in his own work. The dream is only a scribe. "The subject of the dream receives the dream the way a scribe receives the text to be inscribed."\(^{19}\)

Colin MacCabe means the same thing when he says:

The unconscious is that effect of language which escapes the conscious subject in the distance between the act of signification in which the subject passes from signifier to signifier and what is signified in which the subject finds himself in place as, for example, the pronoun 'I'.\(^{20}\)

The text is independent of the author.\(^{21}\) The text leads to the death of the author. As P. D. Jubl observes, “the writer’s production, the text is merely an appearance,” the object of the critic’s gaze is located behind
or within it. The author is utterly dispensable. . . . the I that writes the
text is never, itself, anything more than a paper 'I.' In every piece of
writing the writer enters into his own death because it is language that
speaks and not the author. Here the word enacts its own meaning.
This primacy of language over meaning is a post-structuralist insight.
As Robert Young puts it, "... post-structuralism involves a shift from
meaning to staging, or from signified to the signifier."23

The text of the dream incorporates a reader within. Dream itself
is a reading of the unconscious life of the dreamer. The reader within
the text is inscribed in the form of a censor who represses and
(mis)represents the unconscious chapter in the dreamer's life. As the
chorus of fictitious citizens in Oedipus Rex of Sophocles, commenting
on the action of the play, dream contains its own critique. The reader
within the dream writes out the dreamer's life in the form of an
ambivalent and ambiguous text marked by elisions, distortions and
slippages. This text is subject to a re-reading during secondary revision.
Due to secondary revision, the dream is presented in the form of a
verbal account and not as it is dreamt by the dreamer. This is why the
dream appears as a substitute for the real thing.

A dream as remembered is not the real thing at all, but a
distorted substitute which, by calling up other substitute
ideas, provides us with a means of approaching the
thought proper, by bringing into consciousness the
unconscious thoughts underlying the dream.24
Through the secondary revision the dreamer weaves a coherent narrative out of his dream. “The ‘intelligible pattern’ which the conscious mind wants to impose on the visual material can ignore or falsify what is patently there, in the manner of a reader who is so engaged in the text that he ignores the misprints.”

It is the presence of such a reader that gives *Inadmissible Evidence* the form of an impersonal narrative. Bill’s life is presented in the play in the form of an impersonal narrative by different characters who figure in the play, Bill himself being one among them. Dream uses such an indirect language because an unconscious presentation as such would call forth strong disfavour from the ego and consciousness. “The unconscious implies a pleasure the subject seeks but cannot experience a knowledge which cannot be known by it, and forms of presentations which are themselves unpresentable in consciousness.” It is with such indirect reading of Bill’s life that the play opens. The clerk reads out:

William Henry Maitland, you are accused of having unlawfully and wickedly published and made known, and caused to be procured and made known, a wicked, bawdy and scandalous object. . . . Intending to vitiate and corrupt the morals of the liege subjects of our lady the queen, to debauch and poison the minds of divers of the liege subjects of our lady and to raise and create in them lustful desires, lewdness and debauchery. . . . (IE 9, 10)
The censored chapter in Bill Maitland’s promiscuous life appears in a disguised from through this indirect rendering.

Not only the narrative, but the characters in the play also are not themselves but only substitutes. They are (mis)representations without fixed boundaries as in a monodrama of Eugene Ionesco. In Ionesco’s dramas the minor characters are only stylised pieces of the central character’s experiences. Just as in the dream trial of Leopold Lewis’s *The Bells*, where the ‘judges’ who try Mathias are his own colleagues and friends, the judge in *Inadmissible Evidence* is Bill’s own employee, Hudson. Bill himself is present in the play, not as a person who experiences his life, but as one who reads his life from the outside. This is why Alan Carter writes “Maitland is on trial, asking to be judged, yet self-judging at the same time.” Lacan makes it quite clear that unconscious is a discourse which is pronounced in the first person. In a dream, this first person narrative undergoes modification through repression and through the work of censorship, during its return to consciousness. Listen to one such repressed reading of his own life by Bill:

I never hoped or wished for anything more than to have the good fortune of friendship and the excitement and the comfort of love and the love of women in particular. I made a set at looking them in my own way. With the first, with friendship, I hardly succeeded at all. Not really, no, not all. With the second, with love, I succeeded, I
succeeded in inflicting quite certainly inflicting, more pain than pleasure. (*IE* 20)

The dreamer is virtually dispersed in the characters who figure in his dream. The characters encode different aspects of the dreamer himself. This is the reason why, in a series of scenes with three women clients (it is worth noting that in three women clients are played by the same actor), Maitland finds their accusations against their husbands an indirect indictment of his own conduct. Just like various images in a dream these characters give an indirect vignette of Maitland's life—a life of promiscuity and dissipation.

This kind of an impersonal and indirect representation is nowhere better seen than in the words of Mrs. Garnsey. The description of Garnsey's own husband indirectly figures forth Bill's own character. Her words echo the failure and isolation of Bill himself:

He comes home to me, and I know that nothing really works for him. Not at the office, not his friends, not even his girls. I wish they would: God knows, he tries hard enough. But I can't and everyone, wherever we go together, whether it's a night out, or an evening at our club, or an outing with the children, everyone's I know, everyone's drawing away from him. . . . The children hardly notice him. And now it is *me*. I can't see him rejected and laughed at and scorned behind his back and ignored. . . . (*IE* 55).
It is only in such an impersonal context that the life of Maples—a homosexual client of Bill—assumes significance. Maples is the very alter-ego of Bill himself. The two of them are alike in their compulsion to avoid the issue of homosexuality. Maples reveals Bill to himself. Even his selfish daughter reflects Bill to himself. As Carter comments, “her selfishness echoes his own.”

An investigation of the nature of Maitland as a subject poses another textual question which again has post-structuralist implications. It gives us an insight into how temporality operates in a dream as well as in a work of literature. The search for the subject in the play leads us to the conclusion that the subject does not exist as a full presence in the present because the present in the dream is a deferred past. Present as such doesn’t have any ontological status in a dream. We need only remember Freud’s words that the dream is the hallucinatory fulfilment of an unconscious wish to understand how past and future operate in dream. Future is inscribed within the dream, because the ‘wish’ which the dream realizes is future-directed. But the future, which the dream anticipates, is a perfect likeness of the past. By picturing our wishes as fulfilled, dreams are after all leading us into the future. But this future which the dreamer pictures as the present, has been moulded by his indestructible wish into a perfect likeness of the past. Dreams unwrite the future by writing the past. As Forrester comments, “... dreams do create a future, but only insofar as that future is like the past. A future that is not like the past is not to be found in dreams.” Freud states in his essay on “Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming” how the wish makes
use of an occasion in the present to construct on the pattern of the past a picture of the future.

It is this involuted time-structure that makes the presence of the subject in the present problematic. This makes our search for the subject highly complex because the subject is not fully present as a full presence in the past, present or future. In a dream, the present itself has a tenuous existence because every point in the discourse of the dream is the intersection between remembrance and expectation.

For this subject, the present is not later than the past and not earlier than the future, because the present is the continual bringing into contact of past meanings that can be re-structured but never shed and future meanings that can be re-structured but never actualised. We find the incursions of the past and future into the 'now' of the dreams.

But when we say that the past has the character of inevitable destiny in dreams, it is not the absolute past that we refer to. It is not Maitland's absolute past that is imaged forth through the dream. Dreams cannot re-construct the absolute past as an absolute presence, as an always-already-there because memory which narrativizes the past is written in the present. In addition to this, analysis of dream shows that unconscious memories of the past use a recent event to carry the subject's original wish into consciousness. A past presence always implies a present pastness too. It is only in the present—which is the
future of the past—that the past becomes itself. Note Lacan's words: "What is realized in my history is not the past definite of what was, since it is no more, or even the present perfect of what has been in what I am, but the future perfect of what I shall have been for what I am in the process of becoming."³¹

This is how the temporality that is operative in *Inadmissible Evidence* challenges the Saussurean concept of full presence. According to Saussure, the meaning of a sign is like a spatial structure, which is fully present at any time. The temporality in dreams deconstructs this metaphysics of presence. The present itself is past which has deferred its meaning. The subject as a sign bears the trace of the signs which have preceded it and which follow it. As Mark Curri observes, "... the meaning of a sign is not complete in itself, or is not present within itself, but somehow spread out across all the others."³²

This makes the ontological status of Maitland as a subject highly precarious. He inhabits all the three time scales without being fully present in any one. Maitland thus becomes a Derridean 'trace'—an absent present. For Derrida, the present or presence itself is a crossed structure of 'protensions' and 'retensions' bearing with it in spectres of the past and future. Note the words of Derrida:

The concepts of present, past and future, everything in the concepts of time and history which implies evidence of them—the metaphysical concept of time in general—cannot adequately describe the structure of a trace. And
deconstructing the simplicity of presence does not amount
to accounting for the horizons of potential presence,
instead of a dialectic of pretension and retension that one
would install in the heart of the present instead of
surrounding it with it.33

In the matter of temporality Inadmissible Evidence invites
comparison with Beckett’s Krapp’s Last Tape, with its strange stage
direction “a late evening in the future.” It is indeed a strange stage
direction for a play which is concerned with the past. The sixty-nine
year old Krapp, senile and partially deaf, fumbles for the tape of his
choice and listens to the ‘strong rather pompous’ voice recorded at the
age of thirty-nine passing judgement on the Krapp still further back.

Still the play is located in ‘a late evening in the future’. It is
future both factually and fictionally. Factually it is past in future
because the play was written in 1958 and it would not have been
possible to tape record the speech thirty years earlier. Fictionally also it
is past in future since Krapp listens to a speech recorded thirty years
earlier. Even though past and future meet in the present, the past itself
has been reshaped by contact with the future. The Krapp at the age of
thirty-nine is not fully present in his own speech. He has failed to re-
possess his own past.

The application of dream-analysis in the study of Inadmissible
Evidence also brings to the fore the role of the reader in precipitating
the meaning of the text. There is a reader outside the text as there is a
reader within. According to the Freudian theory, the text of the dream does not contain the full presence of meaning because a dream yields its meaning only during interpretation. It is only during interpretation by the analyst that the meaning of the dream is precipitated. Dream thus incorporates a theory of reading which is applicable to all literary texts including Inadmissible Evidence.

According to the theory of reading, meaning is not fully present in the text as a full presence. The text doesn't encode Maitland or his life as a full presence because it is the reader as the Other who decides on the meaning of the subject's discourse. Truth or meaning in the text is always at the mercy of the reader. The text leaves a potential space for the reader as the Other. "The other is not so much a person as a place, a 'locus' required by the structure of the discourse." It is in the reader that the text comes to life.

Reading, thus considered, is a reductive activity—a repressive one—a process that disrupts the plentitude of meanings in the text. Every reading of Inadmissible Evidence contains a potential space for an alternate reading because the text is produced in the space of the relation between the reader and the written. Every reading of the text of Inadmissible Evidence is a new book because the reader writes the book by reading it. Reading makes the text a contemporaneous experience. This makes the ontology of the subject (Maitland) or his life all the more suspect because the subject exists in the book as a potential presence with a meaning deferred to the future.
Such a theory of reading of the play has much in common with the psychoanalytic theory of ‘trauma’ and deferred action. According to the theory of trauma every event that is inscribed on the psyche is a written word that defers its meaning; every experience on the psychic text is a word on which the meaning is conferred ‘belatedly’. Every event is an incomplete sign—possessing a meaning that is inscribed in the future, because the first event becomes itself only after the advent of the second event which is temporally located in the future.

One has only to transfer this insight into the process of reading to understand how the meaning of Inadmissible Evidence is inscribed in the future. Every word in the text is waiting for a future event—reading by a reader—to blossom into meaning. Meaning is a transitive phenomenon. It is not a thing that texts can have, but something that can only be produced, and always differently within the reading formations that regulate the encounter between texts and readers. The text of Inadmissible Evidence doesn’t contain the subject (Maitland) or his experiences. The text is engaged in an eternal quest of meaning which is contained in the reader—as the Other. It is only retroactively that the text will become what it was. As Michael Foucault notes down in The Archaeology of Knowledge: “The frontiers of a book are never clear-cut.”35
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