

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Conflict in Multitude: A New Marxist Study in Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of English, Ratna Rajya laxmi Campus, Exhibition Road, in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English

by

Binod Raj Upadhayay

Roll No: 400250 /2069/70

Regd. No. : 6-1-40-139-2004

September 2018

Declaration

I hereby declare that the thesis entitled, “Conflict in Multitude: A New Marxist Study in Harold Pinter’s *The Caretaker*” is my original work carried out as a Master’s student at the Department of English at Ratna Rajya laxmi Campus except to the extent that assistance from others in the thesis’s design and conception or in presentation style, and linguistic expression are duly acknowledged.

All sources used for the thesis have been fully and properly cited. It contains no material which led to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree at Tribhuvan University or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in the thesis.

Binod Raj Upadhyay

September 2018

Tribhuvan University

Letter of Approval

This Thesis entitled “Conflict in Multitude: A New Marxist Study in Harold Pinter’s *The Caretaker*” submitted to the Department of English, Ratna Rajya Laxmi Campus, by Binod Raj Upadhayay has been approved by the undersigned members of research committee.

.....

Rishi Ram Ghimire
(Supervisor)

.....

External Examiner

.....

Pradip Sharma
Head
Department of English

Date:.....

Acknowledgements

I am highly indebted and express my sincere honor to my thesis supervisor Rishi Ram Ghimire, a lecturer, Department of English, Ratna Rajya laxmi Campus, for his scholarly guidance, generous help and genuine encouragement to bring this dissertation to completion.

My sincere gratitude goes to Mr. Pradip Sharma, Head, the Department of English, Ratna Rajya laxmi Campus, for allowing me to work with this research and complete the thesis in time. Moreover, I am heartily obliged with my venerable professors and lecturers for their precious suggestions and insights.

I am wordless to express my gratitude to my honorable parents and my family members whose constant support and warm affection embalmed me to accomplish this effort. My thankfulness goes to my friends and well-wishers who directly or indirectly supported me to collect the materials and all well-wishers.

September 2018

Binod Raj Upadhayay

Abstract

The research based on Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker* that explores the issues of neo-Marxism in which the rich and poor are not divided into normative ways but in individual ways. Unlike, Marxism, Neo-Marxism focuses on the innumerable categories. According to neo-Marxism, there is no coherence and cooperation among capitalists and poor people. There are innumerable types of wealthy people and innumerable poor people. No one can be compared to one another. Neo-Marxism studies by looking at all possible areas of human differences and they can cover all: rich and poor individually. Yet, neo-Marxism also studies the societies where there is domination of wealthy people over poor people though in different ways. The researcher uses mainly the theory of Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Clyde W. Barrow Cynthia Weber, Theodore Adorno, Herbert Marcuse and so on to talk about Neo-Marxism. Literature is one of the weapons to reduce the gap between rich and poor as it shows the real picture of society and gives the ways out. *The Caretaker* is about the three characters: Aston, Mick and Davies. Aston and Mick are two brothers who are living together in a house until Aston brings Davies whom he finds in fight. Although they are all poor and depend on jobs for their living, their level of poverty is different. Mick and Aston are two brothers and own a house while Davies is homeless. They cannot be categorized into bourgeoisie and proletariat like traditional Marxism. Mick and Aston are not rich but they belong to empire because they are richer than Davies as they have house while Davies does not have. Davies belongs to multitude because he does not have house and taking shelter there.

Table of Contents

Declaration	ii
Letter of Approval	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Abstract	v
1. Introduction	1-7
2. A Study on Neo-Marxism	8-17
3: Neo-Marxist Reading of <i>The Caretaker</i>	18-25
4: Conclusion: Capitalism as a False Idea	26-27
Works Cited	28-29

1. Introduction

The research work deals with the neo Marxist perspective to study Harold Pinter's play *The Caretaker*. *The Caretaker* is about the three characters: Aston, Mick and Davies, two brothers and a visitor respectively. Aston and Mick are living together in a house until Aston brings Davies whom he finds in a fight. The tramp gives the turning point in the story as he gets obstruction from Mick in every step. Beyond the expectation, Aston finds Davies screaming in the night and complaining about people from other races. There is no clear identity about Davies though Aston provides him clothes, shoes, and a place to stay the night.

Davies gets uncomfortable when Aston goes out and Davies has to live with Mick who makes it more difficult for Davies to stay in the house. The next morning Aston tells Davies that he was being loud in his sleep, a statement that Davies strenuously rejects. Aston prepares to go out, and tells Davies he can stay there. The tramp says he will try to find a job. Aston tries to find the real identity of Davies but cannot. In return, Aston asks him to be caretaker of the house decorating and working in the flat for which Davies agrees. The two brothers force him to leave the house that deceives Davies repeatedly. Davies believes that he is successful to make Mick go against Aston but he cannot because at last it is revealed that Aston and Mick were planning knowingly.

Davies takes for granted and forgets that he is a refugee in the house. He argues that Aston should be taken out from the house. Davies blames Aston to be crazy and forces Mick to believe like that but he fails at the end. Thus, this drama deals with the experience of an outsider who suffers from the lack of coherence. The three characters have the same problems that they do not have stable life but they do not want to cooperate with each other. Apparently, it seems that there is class conflict

among them. For example, Aston and Mick are rich and Davies is poor. However, the situation is not like this. They have same problems but they do not want to solve it together because they do not want to fight together against which they are supposed to resist.

By studying the characters of the play closely, it is easy to understand the people in the world how outsiders are treated. The researcher raises the questions, why Aston brings Davies to his house, what are the causes that involve them into conflict and what leads Davies to leaving the house at last. The researcher uses neo-Marxism as a main methodology by which the house where Aston and Mick live symbolizes a country and the three characters the citizens. Neo-Marxism is a concept based on Marxist theory but gives wide range of study. Unlike traditional concept of bourgeoisie and proletariat it stresses on empire and multitude. Empire is not only a type of wealthy people but there are many categories of them. Similarly, multitudes are also innumerable they cannot be put in one categories. In other word, according to Neo-Marxism, there are innumerable types of wealthy people and innumerable poor people. No one can be compared to one another. To explain empire and multitude it is necessary to take reference from Hardt and Negri. They have explained the two terms based on Hegel's dialectical materialism but in new ways. Hardt and Negri's new concept 'empire' has many hierarchies and multitude has many levels unlike Marxist bourgeoisie and proletariat. They explain:

There are, of course, boundaries and thresholds that maintain the hierarchies that divide the global population and the sovereign rulers can subordinate specific populations even in dramatic and cruel conditions of misery, but exclusion of any population from the processes of bio political production tends to become a self-defeating

act for Empire. (335)

Thus, Empire takes multiple choices unlike Marx's classless proletariat. It means there are many levels of rich people and there are many levels of people. They cannot be put in one category that is fixed and final.

Aston and Mick are bourgeoisie or Empire (neo-Marxist concept) while Davies is proletariat or multitude (a neo-Marxist concept). By studying them closely, it is easy to understand the people in the world how outsiders are treated. Moreover, the house represents the European countries and the characters in the house, the people living in the nations. Aston brings Davies to his house thinking that Davies may help him relieve his own problems he suffers from as they belong to same class. Mick is main villain to create enmity because Mick intimidates Davies by torturing him in several ways. As it is almost impossible for Davies to live in the house, he goes away. It is not because of his own willingness but because of the conspiracy of the two brothers. It applies to the nations how outsiders are treated on the basis of class they belong to. Aston and Mick have illusion that they have their house and thus they are powerful. However, they are wrong to think in this way. In fact, there is impact of empire to put them in conflict. They do not understand how they are suffering and involve into fight by blaming each other.

Different writers have commented the play in various ways. About the play, Lyn Gardner says that the play should be read, as blood is thicker than water. Gardner writes: "It might be read as a play about how a good deed does not go unpunished; it could be seen as a warning that blood will always be thicker than water; and it is often like watching a chess game in which one player thinks he has a winning move only to discover that he has been tactically outplayed" (2). Indirectly, he raises the issues that people are discriminated in terms of where they belong to.

Similarly, Peter Brown argues that all characters in the play are failure, as they cannot achieve what they hope for. Brown puts:

Given electro-shock treatment when younger, Aston is wary of people. Like the other two characters in the play, he's a dreamer. All he wants to do is to build his shed – a workshop – in the garden and everything will be fine. But we know he's never going to get it finished, just as we know that Davies is never going to get down to Sidcup to get his references and other personal documents to reclaim his life. And Mick is no more likely to convert the flat into a stylish penthouse with swish fittings than he is to become Prime Minister. All the characters in this play are failures, but manage to scrape through life nonetheless. (1)

In this way, Brown poses that although these characters are living in the house, they are different in nature. Davies does not want to know about his identity even if he is unknown about it. They have their own plans to change the house and settle down differently. Brown implies that all people have individual feelings and attitude to look at things differently.

Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri talk about the causes and effect of Multitude and Empire that is main issue of Neo-Marxism. In the same way, the world has been experiencing innumerable changes all over the world. In the past, there was one kind of conflict in society: bourgeois and proletariat, according to Marxism. Traditional Marxism asserts that there are two kinds of society: the rulers and the ruled. The rulers are wealthy people while the ruled are the poor people. The conflict is going on between the main two poles but there is no any solution. Now in the modern societies, the study of Marxism has become outdated and new kind of study has begun, i.e. neo-Marxism. According to neo-Marxism, there is no coherence and cooperation among

capitalists and poor people. Talking about neo-Marxism, Cynthia Weber argues that Seattle protest in 1999 is the example of emergence of neo-Marxism. Weber writes:

The Seattle protestors lacked any coherent group identity, their aims and targets were varied and unpredictable. They did not, for example, all seem to be protesting against the logic of capital as Marx described it, and they certainly did not seem to be protesting against the logic of capital as Marx described they would. This is not to say that the Seattle protests were not powerful displays of contemporary political movements. It is simply to say that it is difficult to use these protests to reinvigorate Marxism. (132)

She says that Neo-Marxism is the study of situation in which people are not coherent. They have their own distinct ideas. There are different types of people in reality. One type of person cannot understand another. They are together physically but mentally and psychologically they are separated as they cannot understand each other. Unlike traditional Marxism, poor people have different opinions.

Cynthia Weber argues that there is conflict between multitude and empire. There are various types of rulers or wealthy people. They cannot be put in one category. Similarly, the working class people cannot be categorized in one type of people. Thus, individual study is required. Weber further poses:

Contemporary global political life is not an unwieldy, illogical mess. Rather, 'there is world order, and this world order is best described by the term Empire. Empire is the materialization—the tangible actualization—of political, social, and economic global processes of exploitation that repress what Hardt and Negri call 'the multitude,' a sort of globalized, postmodern proletariat. (133)

Weber brings the ideas of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri and says that neo-Marxism is postmodern Marxism. It has advanced ahead from traditional Marxism.

Similarly, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri say that the world is facing war all the time. It is not able to stop it because there are various kinds of conflict. They want to solve one problem but another problem arises immediately. Hardt and Negri express:

The world is at war again, but things are different this time.

Traditionally war has been conceived as the armed conflict between sovereign political entities, that is, during the modern period, between nation-states. To the extent that the sovereign authority of nation-states, even the most dominant nation-states, is declining and there is instead emerging a new supranational form of sovereignty, a global Empire, the conditions and nature of war and political violence are necessarily changing. War is becoming a general phenomenon, global and interminable. (3)

The statement shows concerns over the never-ending problems of the people in the world. The dominance of nation-states is declining while the personal problems are arising.

Moreover, Goren Therborn argues that there is not one solution to the problems like traditional Marxism. It is continually becoming complicated with the passage of time.

In the core capitalist countries, new sources of capital generation and management technologies challenged the capacity of the state. Heavy social commitments also made it increasingly difficult for even wealthy states to meet new demands for investment in infrastructure,

while the explosion of financial markets generated much more private capital. (17)

In Neo-Marxism, capitalism dominate people but in different ways. There are innumerable types of people and they have unlimited choices. They cannot be fulfilled by one type of theories. For all kinds of people, different principles are required.

Thus, there is a class conflict among three characters Aston, Mick and Davies. Although they belong to lower class family, their level of class is different. For example, Aston and Mick have their own house while Davies does not. They are poor in different ways.

2. A Study on Neo-Marxism

Neo-Marxism is a thought based on Marxist idea but giving new concept. Marxism focuses on broadly two divisions of people: bourgeoisie and proletariat. Bourgeois control the world economy and they give false ideas that money is everything. Proletariats, on the other hand, are working class people who are victims of negative ideologies of the wealthy people. Neo-Marxism breaks the traditional ideas of dividing people into these two categories and categorizes into multitude and empire. Multitudes are the people who are same as proletariats but in different form while empires are wealthy people in multiple ways. In this section, the researcher likes to bring some theories related to neo-Marxism that are relevant to the text.

Neo-Marxism has many areas to study. One of them is structuralism that comprises various kinds of institutions. Clyde W. Barrow says that mode of production is analyzed in terms of economic, political and ideological structures unlike Marxist idea of economic structures. Barrow focuses on the private property and the market. He writes:

A structure consists of one or more institutions that fulfill specific economic, political, or ideological functions necessary to sustain a particular mode of production. The economic structure of a capitalist society is constituted primarily by the relationships that organize the production and distribution of commodities, namely, private property and the market. Its political structure consists of the institutionalized power of the states. The ideological instance refers both to the subjective consciousness of individual social actors and to the collective thought systems that exist in a given society. (51)

Thus, capitalist society is constituted by the amalgam of economy, politics and

ideology. Single entity cannot affect the mode of production, according to him. It means, people's perceptions are not only determined by the economic status but also political and ideological aspect.

Andrew Levine argues that Marxism focuses on the normative study of class struggle in which all people are categorized into rich and poor. However, in reality such demarcation does not exist because there are innumerable types of wealthy people and working class people. Levine says Marx's traditional theory does not cover all kinds of people.

Marxism's focus on the whole may also point the way to a distinctive and continuing contribution to normative theory. I have remarked that the normative commitments implicit in Marx's thought, his dedication to self-realization, autonomy and community – and, more ambivalently, to equality – do not amount to a distinctive ideology; partly because Marx's understanding of these notions, community partially excepted, is no different from understandings encountered in the Aristotelian, Kantian and republican traditions. (170)

Levine, indirectly, postulates that Marx's theory is no more scientific as it cannot occupy various kinds of people. It is important to study all individuals distinctly what Neo-Marxism does. Neo-Marxism studies by looking at all possible areas of human differences and they can cover all: rich and poor individually. So, Neo-Marxism is more scientific and practical than Marxist theory.

To distinguish between multitude and empire in Neo-Marxism, Cynthia Weber gives their definition based on the ideas propounded by Hardt and Negri. She expresses:

The multitude is a concept reminiscent of 'the masses' in neo-

Marxism. Without going into any detail, the multitude –like the masses –represent both exploited labor and revolutionary potential. In Marxism, the masses are class-based. . . Referring to the multitude as a new proletariat, Hardt and Negri emphasize the indefinite identity of the multitude. The multitude is a postmodern agent/ontology. Like Empire, it is not territorially based. It is fragmented, fluid, and foundationless. Like Empire, it can be composed of seemingly disjointed political elements. (139)

Multitudes are the people who are exploited. They are revolutionary and potential who are likely to bring about change in society. They are different from Marx’s class-based masses. Multitudes have indefinite identity unlike proletariat’s one identity. Empire also has many identities. Empire divided into fragmented, fluid, and foundationless.

Weber compares Empire and Multitude to thesis and antithesis, a Hegelian idea to contrast to each other. She further says: “They are not opposite to each other like dialectical concept. They have open-ended ways of explaining them” (141). Weber further writes: “Empire (thesis) is opposed to the multitude (antithesis), although Hardt and Negri would insist that this Empire/multitude clash is not dialectical because it is non-teleological and because they claim their ontologies are post modernized” (141). In this way, it is related to post-modern idea changing according to the time and situation.

There is difference between individualism and collectivism. Multitudes refer to collectivism or community. If all people are united then they can have a society whatever, they like. Because of their unity, social problems can be solved and people can be happy. On the other hand, if they are individual they may not able to solve the

problems. Therefore, happiness and unhappiness come from the social harmony. In this respect, critic Herbert Marcuse alleges that happiness and unhappiness are not absolute things but they are the results of social practice. According to Marcuse:

Happiness and unhappiness are thus in part social affairs that can be influenced by social practice. The enforced prolongation of the working day, the maintenance of inhuman working conditions, class division and exploitation, repressive morality, and a crisis-ridden economy: all of these social conditions are objective fetters on freedom and happiness and can only be removed through an economic and political process encompassing the disposal of the means of production by the community, the reorientation of the productive process towards the needs and wants of the whole society. (14)

It means community can remove the problems of the society. There are various kinds of problems found in the society and the collective people can solve them. Happiness and freedom can be gained by people but they are dependent on economic and political process. Hence, individual freedom and happiness can only be secured in a project of radical social reconstruction. Marcuse makes clear his commitment here, albeit in muted language, to the Marxian concept of social revolution.

Now, it is necessary to discuss about the role of capitalism in one's life. In many societies in the world, capitalism attempts to control working class people or poor people who may include homeless people. Marcuse gives clear explanation on the domination of capitalists. He asserts:

To be sure, capitalism has always been brutal and ugly, criminal, but the presence of a strong and active opposition enforces a certain (ideological) restraint in the advertising of the real capitalist methods

and goals. It is this ideological restraint (itself still a form of morality) which has now been abandoned. (171)

According to him, capitalism is always brutal and criminal. It dominates and exploits the people who are powerless in any manner. Directly or indirectly, capitalists wish to control all mechanisms of society.

Marcuse further explains about the capitalism and poses that capitalism works against humanism and gives negative ideology to the working class people. He expresses:

Capitalism openly displays its own essence: the crime against humanity, which it has been from the beginning. The exploitation of man by man, and the perversion of human into commodity relationships, the degrading character and organization of work, the system of domination, the destruction of nature – all these qualities can no longer be concealed or attenuated by their progressive function in the development of the productive forces. The capitalist development and use of these forces, constantly spurred by exploitation and dehumanization, have culminated in the productivity of killing. (176)

Crime and exploitation are essence of capitalism, according to Marcuse; they show degrading character under the influence of capitalism. Moreover, they cannot hide these negative qualities as they are manifested in any forms. They lose their morality and humanism as they kill the productivity of the poor people.

Likewise, Marxist theory talks about literature as well because literature is the reflection of society. Marx compares arts and literature to politics with the word 'poetics.' The terms 'poetics' and 'politics' both deserve to be covering a broad area. Poetics includes the works of art, literature, painting, theatrical performance etc.

Stephen Greenblatt prefers to call his own critical enterprise, ‘cultural poetics’, in order to “highlight his concern with literature and arts as integral with other social practices that, in their complex interactions make up the general culture of an era” (Abrams 187).

Politics, on the other, includes the political systems of the society, the activities in the public affairs on the part of bourgeoisie who has the major economy of the society and of the whole country as well; and exploit the artist and producer for its own benevolence.

Marxist consideration of politics and art aesthetics, as both relatively independent ideological superstructures and their subjugation to socio-economic foundation of society, evidently presuppose their interrelation and reciprocal influence. Therefore, it would be wrong to subjugate literature and art under political framework; though being a direct outcome and visibly prompt materialization of socio-economic relations politics plays vital role in literature. The constituents of Marxist realism, the class struggle, historical materialism, social revolutions etc., by the large, directly includes and assumes the political movements and upheavals, and automatically emphasize the political element. By this reason many political thinkers and fighters like Lenin and Mao, though in their typical spacio-temporal limitation, emphasized the political propaganda role of literature and art. However, Lenin’s definition of politics in literary criteria approximated the writer’s commitment towards class struggle, working class and people’s point of view as a whole. In *Lenin and Problems of Literature*, Shcherbina writes:

Rejecting all vulgar interpretation of the very concept of politics, Lenin pointed out the political position of a progressive artist implied in the first place, his assimilation and representation of processes and

events from the standpoint of someone who champions the interests of the masses. (104)

According to him, the author cannot be untouched by politics in which place or setting he or she has experienced. The author's position is clearly noticed, when the readers his/her text. After Lenin, Mao was another person who emphasized political presence in literature more than Lenin. He proposes: "literature and art are subordinate to politics, but in their turn exert a great influence on politics" (271). It is close relationship between literature and politics as literature paves way to the politics guiding it to the right path.

Arguing against the political limitations of literature and art, critic Ninu Chapagain takes Mao's opinion as particular "product of particular situation" (12). Mao expands the explanation of politics in literary and artistic judgment in their relationship, which reads, "Politics cannot be equated with method of artistic creation and criticism" (27). Chapagain accepts the reciprocal relations of literature, art and politics but denies the one sided representation of politics in literature.

About the concept Marxism, the bourgeoisie remains the ruling class in the industrially developed countries of the west like France, England, and America. Moreover, capitalism is playing an active role in the new scientific and technological revolution, which is now in progress, while in art, the big question remains as to whether the art of the western countries has really regressed compared to the 19th century.

While looking at the problem of the development of art in contemporary capitalist society, it was not the Marxists but the vulgar sociologists and pseudo-Marxists who declare that art in the west was in full decay. Surely, it would be more accurate to say, "The genuinely artistic values created in the west in the present

century are product of the anti-bourgeois awareness” (Kuzmenko 13). Therefore, the modern concept of Marxism is against the traditional concept of Western ideas that are being deconstructed now.

Soviet art and literature, born of the first attempt in history to build socialism, is the practical answer to what a society guided by Marxist Leninist theories brings to humanism, culture and art. “Art which Gorky described as ‘the study of man’ is an embodiment of the humanistic problems of man and is at the same time a key to the solution to these problems” (Kuzmenko 17). The theory does not go beyond human study but remains within its periphery.

After getting the solution of the problem of art on the summits of aesthetic and social theory, we turn our attention to the practice of art itself-how it reacts to the change in the living conditions of the individual, how the “private individual” the man in the new stage of development of bourgeois society marks his appearance in art. The critic Y. Kuzmenko, in his article, *Art and Socialism* writes:

The heroes of Shakespeare’s tragedies and chronicles were conditioned by the circumstance of the great universal plan-they were dealing with the very universe of the existing order. Events, in their turn, depended on character and were determined by freely chosen aims of life. The tragedy of King Lear, for example, is a tragedy of down trodden humanism, a clash between the powers of good and evil, and not simple a description of court intrigue or the drama of a deceived father.

(349)

To state clearly, the innovatory contribution of soviet art to world culture is based, above all on its new hero the creative man who is changing himself as he transforms his environment.

Plekhanov describes society and art perfectly and writes, “the finest works of art are those which depict people taking part in the great advance of humanity, the bearers of the great ideas of mankind” (35). Here, Plekhanov takes side of that fine art which depicts the people taking part in the great advance of humanity who are the bearers of the great ideas of humankind.

Talking about Marxism and Post-Marxism, Goran Therborn says that whether positively or negatively Marxism has shown the clear picture of how capitalism has hidden the real motive. Therborn expresses: “For good or bad, right or wrong, Marxist parties, movements and intellectual currents became, for at least the hundred years from the late nineteenth to the late twentieth century, the most important means to embrace the contradictory nature of modernity” (67). Although, Marxism has been criticized for limiting categories into two: bourgeois and proletariat, it has opened the eyes against exploitation and alienation. Neo-Marxism has emerged from the traditional Marxism. Thus, without discussing what Marxism is, it is incomplete to talk about Neo-Marxism.

Matthias Benzer gives the idea of Adorno about society and capitalism. The class divide takes place between exploited workers and capitalists while the latter earns surplus. The laborer has to sell for the money that is marginal. Capitalists take benefit from the laborers because they are less aware of their status. Benzer writes about Adorno’s ideas:

Adorno’s conception of dependence plays an important role in his analysis of capitalism’s class antagonism. The class divide is reproduced by the exchange of labour for wages between exploited workers and capitalists acquiring surplus. This urges the question why labourers enter into commodity exchange relations that exploit them.

Adorno's response is multifarious. (24)

Thus, Adorno requests every one especially from working class people to be aware of their status and fight against exploitation and estrangement.

Theodore Adorno says that freedom cannot be realized only as the individual loneliness but by the combination of social norms and values. He says that in Marxism language does not play great role it appeals to the mankind. It talks about the collective freedom. Adorno poses:

In Marx language plays no role, he is a positivist. Kant is not only ideology. His work contains at some level an appeal to the species, to mankind as opposed to the limitations of the particular. In his philosophy the idea of freedom is defined as the idea of mankind. . . .

He had already noticed that the concept of freedom does not lie in the
(45)

It means Adorno focuses on the mankind and social welfare. He does not want to talk only class consciousness but the feeling of freedom by people. It is possible only by the collective welfare, according to him.

Therefore, this section is about the theoretical aspects of Marxism and Neo-Marxism. Marxism is traditional concept coined by Karl Marx and Frederic Engels. According to Marxism, there are mainly two classes: bourgeois and proletariat. The former refers to capitalists who want to control all mechanisms of society while the latter refers to working class people who are completely dependent on ruling class. Neo-Marxism, on the other hand, focuses on other aspects of class division that are indefinite referring to Empire and multitude. The next section revolves around the textual evidence based on the theories mentioned in the section.

3. Neo-Marxist Reading of *The Caretaker*

The research focuses on the neo-Marxist reading of Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker*. According to neo-Marxism, there are various levels of people in the society not merely bourgeoisie and proletariat. Traditional Marxists argue that there are only few types of rich people all over the world whose main concern is to exploit, dominate, use, and manipulate adopting multiple ideologies. Similarly, there are only few types of poor people who are forced to follow wealthy until they realize it, unite, and overthrow so-called rich people. However, the researcher attempts to analyze the text neo-Marxism in which there are innumerable types of haves and have-nots people in the world. They cannot be put in one category.

In this section, the researcher is analyzing the structure of the societies in terms of economic, political and ideological structures unlike Marxist's economical one. As Davies is brought to Aston and Mick's home, Davies analyzes people how he was treated. He expresses:

Davies: Ten Minutes off for a tea-break in the middle of the night in that place and I couldn't find a seat, not one. All them Greeks had it, Poles, Greeks, Blacks, the lot of them, all them aliens had it. And they had me working there . . . they had me working. All them Blacks hand it, Blacks, Greeks, Poles, the lot of them, that's what, doing me out of a seat, treating me like dirt. When he come at me tonight I told them. (6)

Here, Davies feels he is economically and socially outsider and poor. He is treated badly by others. He compares himself to others and realize that the so-called powerful people misbehave and consider him mess. His speech also reveals that he has used broken language that is different from standard one. His political position is also not

respectable.

Likewise, economic structure analyzed on the basis of private property and market. The wealthy or aristocratic people create the ideas to the common people or multitudes that they are great if they have property and money and vice versa. Antonio Gramsci postulates that serf has the mentality of dominated which is created by the ruling class or wealthy people. The poor want to rise to the rich but their mentality remains the same. Gramsci explains: “The peasant still has the mentality of a glebe serf: he erupts in violent revolt against the ‘gentry’ every now and then, but he is incapable of seeing himself as a member of a collectivity, nor can he wage a systematic and permanent campaign designed to alter the economic and political relations of society” (114). The working class people are in the mental prison from which it is quite difficult to come out of it. In this regards, Aston regards himself good and understands Davies’ problem because Aston has undergone similar experiences though he has a house and a little property to live in and survive. There is not a big gap between them so Aston understands Davies’ problem more than others. Davie makes conversation:

Davies: Comes to me, parks a bucket of rubbish at me tells me to take it out the back. It’s not my job to take out the bucket! They got a boy there for taking out the bucket. They got a boy there for taking out the bucket. I wasn’t engaged to take out the buckets. My job’s cleaning the floor, clearing up the tables, doing a bit of washing-up, nothing to do with taking out buckets! (7)

It is clear from the conversation that there is a gap between the haves and have-nots. Davies is currently penniless and he does not have his own property. Therefore, he is obliged to work cleaning and washing-up job. Wealthy people make him work against

his willingness. The society where Davies and Aston live influences the people. They are not independent beings but controlled by the society. They are only a part of whole organizations.

If we focus on Marxist theory then we can find that Davies and Aston have different social and economic status. Davies belongs to poor class while Aston and his brother belong to wealthy as they have their house while Davies does not. Aston seems to help Davies by bringing him to his house. His real intention can be different as to show his higher status than Davies. Aston may want to manipulate him by treating him a poor man.

As Mick comes to his house, then there begins the introduction with Davies. Mick is proud of having the house and room. He thinks that Davies is taking shelter in his house. He shows his superior manner to Davies and repeats the house and the things inside the house belong to him. From Marxist point of view, it can be interpreted that Aston and Mick belongs to middle class family while Davies is homeless. Their relationship is like bourgeoisie and proletariat. From the perspective of neo-Marxism, they belong to multitude. Empire means dividing rich people in different classes and multitude means dividing people in different working class. In other words, empire focuses on analyzing rich people in individual way. If they are rich they are wealthy in different status. Some are very rich while others moderate rich. Multitudes belong to different categories. Mick and Aston are not rich but comparatively they are richer than Davies as they have house while Davies does not have. How Mick treats Davies, the following text proves:

Davies : (banging on floor). All right!

Mick: you weren't uncomfortable?

Mick stands, and moves to him.

Mick: You a foreigner?

Davies: No.

Mick: you a foreigner?

Davies: No.

Mick: Born and bred in the British Isle?

Davies: I was!

Mick: What did they teach you? Pause.

How did you like me my bed? Pause.

That's my bed. You want to mind you don't catch a draught. (31)

From the conversation, it is revealed that Mick shows his superior manner in front of him simply because he has the house. Mick treats him like a foreigner while Davies has to protect himself from him. The same thing happens in the society. Working class people are dominated and exploited by the so-called rich people. However, Mick is not rich himself. He has the small house that is not enough for him and his brother to sustain their life. Davies, Aston, and Mick are all poor in reality but their level of poverty is different because they belong to multitudes, according to Neo-Marxism.

Another problem found between haves and have-nots or empire and multitude is that there is communication gap between them. Multitudes are busy with their own problems to solve while empires are busy in dominating and exploiting the working class or poor people. There is always conflict in one way or another. The capitalists have made such situation in society that the working class people fight with each other regarding themselves rich or poor. Mick and Davies have the same problems. Davies is brought home and Mick does not like. Mick shows his power and wants Davies to leave the house as soon as possible. Their conversation reveals so:

Mick: That's my mother's bed.

Davies: Well she wasn't in it last night!

Mick (moving to him): Now don't get perky, son, don't get perky. Keep your hands off my old mum.

Davies: I ain't . . . I haven't . . .

Mick: Don't get out of your depth, friend, don't start taking liberties with my old mother. Let's have a bit of respect.

Davies: I got respect, you won't find anyone with more respect.

Mick: Well, stop telling me all these fibs.

Davies: now listen to me, I never seen you before, have I?

Mick: Never seen my mother before either, I suppose? Pause. I think I'm coming to the conclusion that you're an old rogue.

You're nothing but an old scoundrel. (33)

So, Mick underestimates Davies because Davies is taking shelter in Mick's house. He blames Davies to be a scoundrel without understanding his reality. It can be interpreted that empires do not understand the real problems of poor people like Davies. He is dominated and exploited by Mick, it is enough to understand how working class people are manipulated by the rich.

There are thesis and antithesis in the conversation between Mick and Davies. Mick can be taken as thesis (empire) and Davies as antithesis (multitude). But this relation does not remain same according to Neo-Marxist theory. Davies is voiceless in the beginning and listens to Mick whatever Mick says. Davies gradually increases his power as soon as Aston comes in. Davies says that if anything goes wrong against him, then the troubler has to suffer. There is a great change in the power. Slowly he shows more power than the house owners. The conversation proves it:

Mick: I'm sorry if I gave you a start. But I had you in mind too you

know. I mean, my brother's guest. We got to think of your comfort, en't we? Don't' want the dust to get up your nose. How long you thinking of staying here, by the way? As a matter of fact, I was going to suggest that we'd lower your rent, make it just a nominal sum, I mean until you get fixed up. I just nominal, that's all. (44)

Now, Mick's language is completely changed. He says sorry to the manner he has shown to Davies. Thesis and antithesis have been changed. There is no fixed idea about the position. It is one of the features of neo-Marxism.

Similarly, Davies has got more power now than he did in the past. In the beginning, he was helpless but now he demands new facilities. He argues strongly with Aston. Thus, there is no permanency of anything. His power is growing and he realizes that he has some right. Thus, he argues:

Aston: I couldn't sleep in here without that window open.

Davies: Yes, but what about me? What . . . what you got to say about my position?

Aston: Why don't you sleep the other way round?

Davies: What do you mean?

Aston: Sleep with your feet to the window.

Davies: What good would that do?

Aston: The rain wouldn't come in on your head.

Davies: No, I couldn't do that. I couldn't do that. Pause. I mean, I got used to sleeping this way. It isn't me has to change, it's that window. You see, it's raining now. Look at it. It's coming down now. (51)

In this way, the happiness of Aston and unhappiness of Davies are not permanent. There is a change. Previously, Davies took shelter in Aston's house, but now he is asking for the facilities. His position has got changed. It is the feature of neo-Marxism. It is also called the feature of post-Marxism in which everything is temporary.

The play represents a good piece of literature. It symbolizes or reflects the then society in which how people thought property as. Their identity was determined by the amount of property they had. At the same time, the playwright presents the unimportant role of material things. They are changeable; sometimes people are rich while they are poor with the change of time. Aston and Mick are landowners or house owners in the beginning but later Davies has also consciousness and demands that he also should get some property in the house or something should be fixed as per her desire. Davies has more demands as Davies expresses:

See, what I need is a clock! I need a clock to tell the time! How can I tell the time without a clock? I can't do it? I said to him, I said, look here, what about getting in a clock, so's I can tell what time it is? I mean, if you can't tell what time you're at you don't know where you are, you understand my meaning? See, what I got to do now, if I'm walking about outside, I got to get my eye on a clock, and keep the time in my head for when I come in. (60)

Davies makes such kind of conversation. It proves that there is a great change in his attitude. He seems to be more powerful than before. He gains more energy and is likely to replace them from their house.

Likewise, Davies is Adorno's character who is aware of his position and status. He understands that he is helped by Aston but at the same time he is

manipulated and exploited. Davies does not feel happy when Aston makes noise and opposes it. It is the example of protest and awareness. Davies reacts in such way:

DAVIES: What do you expect me to do? I tell you, mate, I'm not surprised they took you in waking an old man up in the middle of the night, you must be off your nut! Giving me bad dreams, who's responsible, then, for me having bad dreams? If you wouldn't keep mucking me about I wouldn't make no noises! How do you expect me to sleep peaceful when you keep poking me all the time? What do you want me to do, stop breathing? (64)

Davies knows his status and opposes what Aston does in the night. He says that he cannot sleep because of the noise Aston makes in the night during his sleep. Aston does not get afraid of Davies simply thinking that Davies is taking shelter in his house. However, Davies does not endure it anymore and protests him.

4. Conclusion: Capitalism as a False Idea

The thesis is about the conflict among three characters for the possession of the house and other material things in Harold Pinter's *The Caretaker* using Neo Marxist theory. The researcher dwelled upon the issues why Aston brings an outsider named Davies to his house, what the causes are that involve them into conflict and what leads Davies to leaving the house at last. He concluded that Aston sympathizes on Davies and brings him to his house to help. However, Davies takes it for granted and attempts to grab it as if he is the owner of the house. The research proves that people are not rich and poor in normative way but in different and individual ones. Aston and Mick are also poor but their poverty is different from Davies because the former own house while the latter does not.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri have presented new ways of Marxist theory dividing people in innumerable ways under two broad topics: empires and multitudes. Likewise, Clyde W. Barrow focuses on mode of production in terms of economic, political and ideological structures unlike Marxist idea of economic structures. Cynthia Weber claims that multitudes are the people who are exploited. They are revolutionary and potential who are likely to bring about change in society. They are different from Marx's class-based masses. Multitudes have indefinite identity unlike proletariat's one identity. Empire also has many identities. Another critic Herbert Marcuse asserts that happiness and unhappiness are not absolute things but they are the results of social practice, under neo-Marxism. Critic Goran Therborn says that whether positively or negatively Marxism has shown the clear picture of how capitalism has hidden the real motive. One of the pioneers of post-Marxism, Theodore Adorno says that freedom cannot be realized only as the individual loneliness but by

the combination of social norms and values. He says that in Marxism language does not play great role it appeals to the mankind.

In the play, economic structure plays great role on private property and the market. The wealthy or aristocratic people create the false ideas to the common people or multitudes that money is a factor to show status. Based on Marxist theory, Davies belongs to poor class while Aston and his brother belong to wealthy as they have their house while Davies does not. Aston seems to help Davies by bringing him to his house. His real intention is different to show his higher status than Davies. Likewise, multitudes are busy with their own problems to solve while empires are busy in dominating and exploiting the working class or poor people. There is always conflict in one way or another. The capitalists have made such situation in society that the working class people fight with each other regarding themselves rich or poor. Mick and Davies have the same problems. As Marxist theory postulates, Davies gets more power now than he did in the past. In the beginning, he was helpless but now he demands new facilities. He argues strongly with Aston.

Thus, the characters of the play have illusion that money or material things are essential parts of their lives. The purpose of the research is to make aware to all concerned people that there are other so many aspects in life rather than material stuffs about which everyone should understand including the characters in the play.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th Ed. New York: Heinle and Heinle, 1999. Print.
- Adorno, Theodore. *Towards a New Manifesto*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Barrow, Clyde W. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1993. Print.
- Benzer, Matthias. *The Sociology of Theodor Adorno*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.
- Brown, Peter. "The Caretaker Review 2010." *London Theatre*. 18 Jan. 2010. Web. Retrieved on 6 Mar. 2018. < <https://www.londontheatre.co.uk/reviews/the-caretaker>>.
- Chapagain, Ninu. *Aesthetics in Marxist Thought*. Lalitpur: Fine Print, 1997. Print.
- Gardner, Lyn. "The Caretaker Review – Vintage Pinter Becomes an Electric Parable for Our Times." *The Guardian*. 15 Sep. 2017. Web. Retrieved on 6 Mar. 2018. <<https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2017/sep/15/the-caretaker-review-harold-pinter-bristol-old-vic>>.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *The Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. Ed. David Forgacs. New York: New York UP, 2000. Print.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: The Penguin, 2004. Print.
- Kuzmenko, Y. "Art and Socialism." *Socialism and Culture: History of Arts Institute*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1979. 349-382. Print.
- Lenin, V.I. *Selected Works*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977. Print.
- Levine, Andrew. *A Future for Marxism?* London: Pluto Press, 2003. Print.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *Towards a Critical Theory of Society*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Print.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *Selected Works*. 3 vols. Moscow: Progress

Publishers, 1977. Print.

- - -. *Capital*. 3 vols. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965. Print.

Pinter, Harold. *The Caretaker*. London: Encore Publishing, 1960. Print.

Plekhanov, G.V. *Art and Social Life*. Trans. A. Finberg: Moscow: Progress

Publishers, 1977. Print.

Shcherbina, Vladimir. *Lenin and Problems of Literature*. Moscow: Progress

Publishers, 1974. Print.

Therborn, Goran. *From Marxism to Post-Marxism*. London: Verso, 2008. Print.

Weber, Cynthia. *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. 4th Ed.

London: Routledge, 2014. Print.