Harold Pinter and Iraq: An Analysis of *War* (2003)

Assist. Prof. Muayad Enwiya Jajo (PhD)

Date of Acceptance 25/6/2007

Abstract

This research paper is an attempt at placing Harold Pinter's view of Iraq within his general humanitarian, political and antiwar outlook. The text selected for analysis is his verse volume *War*, published in 2003. The paper traces Pinter's interest in Iraq as reflected in his writings and speeches from the early1990s to his 2005 Nobel Prize acceptance speech in order to provide the background against which the volume is analyzed.

"We are not the doctors. We are the disease."
Alexander Herzen (1812-1870)

The recent and growing concerns of Harold Pinter (b.1930) about Iraq and the lives of the Iraqi people can be placed within the context of his general views on politics and war. An author who has been described as "an outspoken human rights advocate,"[1] Pinter does not express these views on account of his interest in politics and politicians, but because of the pain and suffering that might be caused by political decisions. He once stated to Mel Gussow in an interview, "Politicians just don't interest me. What, if you like, interests me, is the suffering for which they are responsible. It doesn't interest me – it horrifies me!"[2] For this reason, Pinter distrusts statements and promises made by politicians. "I don't understand," he informed Gussow, "how anyone could be convinced by any statement that issues forth from politicians."[3] On another occasion, he said, "politics do bore me, though I recognise they are responsible for a good deal of suffering. I distrust ideological statements of any kind."[4]

* Department of English, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad.

It was in fact this distrust that justified his early refusal to be involved in politics. Austin Quigley points out that

> Pinter's early refusal to get involved in political matters was … born not of indifference to social problems but of serious doubt that political channels, political arguments and political action could serve to ameliorate social problems rather than exacerbate them.[5]

Pinter's later concern with politics, however, indicated not only his protest against the injustices committed by political decision makers, but also his deep sense of responsibility as a writer. Mark Batty points out in his book *Harold Pinter* (2001) that

> Pinter's chief political concerns are essentially humanitarian; he is concerned with the relationship between the state and the individual and how the self-perpetuating concerns of the former often obscure and override the dignifying concerns of the latter.[6]

A contributing factor to this growing concern was his awareness of the United States' increasing involvement in Iraq. Pinter's biographer Michael Billington suggests that the 1991 Gulf War enhanced Pinter's political themes.[7] Billington states that during that time "Pinter remained as deeply involved with politics as ever. He could hardly be otherwise in a year that began in January with the momentous Gulf War."[8] Pinter also protested against the British government's decision to deport a number of Iraqi nationals resident in Britain "on the grounds that they constituted a security risk."[9] He denounced this deportation in a letter to the *Independent* dated January 28, 1991.[10] The same is true of his attitude towards the 2003 Gulf War. In his 2005 Nobel Prize acceptance lecture titled "Art, Truth and Politics," Pinter said,

> We have brought torture, cluster bombs, depleted uranium, innumerable acts of random murder, misery, degradation and

> death to the Iraqi people and call it "bringing freedom and democracy to the Middle East."[11]

He criticizes the media popularizing the notion of a bloodless war. On September 23, 2005, he said in a debate he took part in at the Imperial War Museum, "At least 20,000 civilians have been killed in Iraq and many thousands more mutilated for life. We don't see the corpses or the mutilated children on television."[12]

This attitude is also manifested in Pinter's anti-Americanism and his condemnation of the U.S. 23-cruise-missile attack on Baghdad in June 1993 that killed Leila Al-Attar (1944-1993), who was Iraq's leading artist and curator of the Museum of Fine Arts which housed thousands of paintings and sculptures. The target was supposed to be "the principal command and control facility" of the Iraqi Intelligence Service in Baghdad.[13] Pinter said,

> We have a great friend here, who's a Syrian woman, Rana Kabbani, she's a writer. One of her great friends was an Iraqi artist, called Leila al-Attar. She also ran a museum. She's dead. Those missiles killed her and her husband, and members of her family…. That woman is dead, and there are plenty of others. This kind of action represents a terrible doublethink.[14]

He was quite aware of the ironies involved in the Gulf War,

> where "surgical bombing" ensured minimized risk (to allies) affecting maximum damage. Oxymorons such as "friendly fire" and euphemisms such as "collateral damage" became shoulder-shrugging components of barroom conversations in which the pros and cons of war could be nonchalantly discussed.[15]

He was also one of the protesters who signed an appeal in the *New York Times* on March 28, 1999 to end the sanctions which were imposed on Iraq at the time.[16]

In 2003, Pinter published a small volume of verse titled *War*, which could be regarded as the poetic manifestation of this concern with Iraq. In a speech published in the same volume and delivered on November 27, 2002 on the occasion of being awarded an Honorary Degree at Turin University, Pinter expressed his happiness at surviving a major cancer operation which had been to him "something of a nightmare."[17] Referring to the United States' intention of waging war on Iraq, he explains that

> The United States believes that the three thousand deaths in New York are the only deaths that count, the only deaths that matter. They are American deaths. Other deaths are unreal, abstract, of no consequence …. The hundreds of thousands of Iraqi children dead through US and British sanctions which have deprived them of essential medicines are never referred to.
>
> The effect of depleted uranium, used by America in the Gulf War, is never referred to. Radiation levels in Iraq are appallingly high. Babies are born with no brain, no eyes, no genitals. Where they do have ears, mouths or rectums, all that issues from these artifices is blood. (7-9)

He tells his audience,

> The planned war against Iraq is in fact a plan for pre-meditated murder of thousands of civilians …. It is obvious … that the United States is bursting at the seams to attack Iraq. I believe that it will do this – not just to take control of Iraqi oil – but because the US administration is now a bloodthirsty wild animal. Bombs are its only vocabulary. (9)

These passages from Pinter's Turin speech serve to set the tone of his poems in *War*. They also account for the abundance of the grotesque, cephalic and hemal images in the volume.

In "Meeting," the first poem in the volume, Pinter describes an encounter between those who have been long dead and the newly dead. All the characters described in the poem are dead. The nocturnal setting is

symbolically in harmony with this posthumous encounter, for it is "the dead of night" (1.1) when the two groups meet. Death, however, is presented as an occasion for a happy reunion. The long dead and the newly dead "embrace" and "kiss / As they meet again" (1:10-11). Death, implies the speaker, is welcomed with tears of joy as the recently dead "cry" when they join the company of the deceased (1:10).

"After Lunch" describes how the "well-dressed creatures" (2:1) gather at the place where the dead are lying, supposedly a battlefield, where the former "sniff" for food, vampire-like (2:2). They use the dead people's bones as spoons to stir their soup. After lunch, they become intoxicated with the blood of the dead which they sip from "convenient skulls" (2:9), an indication of their Satanist practice. The imagery of human carnage presented in this poem evoke feelings of horror and disgust and consequently serve to emphasize the concept of war as a dehumanizing and bloodcurdling experience which turns human beings into cannibals.

In "God Bless America," which first appeared in the *Guardian* on January 22, 2003, Pinter describes how U.S. troops are airborne across the ocean to be deployed in Kuwait in preparation for the Gulf War which began on March 20, 2003:

> Here they go again,
> The Yanks in their armoured parade
> Chanting their ballads of joy
> As they gallop across the big world
> Praising America's God. (3:1-5)

In the next stanza, the scene is shifted to America in order to let the reader know why other Americans did not join those troops. The reasons, says Pinter, are their death, their protest against the war, their irrecruitability, or simply their indifference:

> The gutters are clogged with the dead
> The ones who couldn't join in

The others refusing to sing
The ones who are losing their voice
The ones who's forgotten the tune. (3:6-10)

The final stanza shifts the scene back to the troops and describes their deeds on the battlefield. It delineates a single typical act of decapitation committed by the troops:

The riders have whips which cut.
Your head rolls onto the sand
Your head is a pool in the dirt
Your head is a stain in the dust
Your eyes have gone out and your nose
Sniffs only the pong of the dead
And all the dead air is alive
With the smell of America's God. (3:11-18)

Pinter's use of the words "riders" and "whips" to describe the troops and their weapons respectively forms a link with the term "Yanks" in the opening stanza. These words – definitely inapplicable to modern warfare – are meant to associate the troops with the American past, particularly the Civil War, in order to draw an analogy between the modern troops and the cowboys of the American Civil War.[18] The injustices done in the past, implies the speaker, are recurring today, with the Iraqi people as victims. It is Pinter's poetic way of saying that America is regressing into "cowboyism."[19]

Despite the fact that the victims killed are Iraqis, Pinter uses the possessive pronoun "Your" instead of a third person pronoun in order to eliminate any feelings of detachment on the part of the reader. As in "After Lunch," gory details and grotesque images are employed to evoke the feeling of horror at the war. This is further intensified with the vivid elaboration of the post-decapitation scene, in which the head rolls in the sand and the eyes go out of their sockets, to present a nightmarish picture of war.

It is in the closing line of the poem where "America's God," already

introduced in the opening stanza, is defined as the desire to murder and destroy. Pinter's gradual revelation, and consequently the reader's gradual realization, of the dacnomaniac nature of this deity, corresponds to the historical dichotomy between the initial propagated picture of the war and the belated disillusionment in its consequences.[20]

In "The Bombs" Pinter tersely defines the vocabulary of the modern age – as he does in his Turin speech discussed above – as that of bombs.[21] Modern man, says the speaker in the poem, has unfortunately ceased to use the traditional verbal means of communication and is instead resorting to warfare to express himself:

> There are no more words to be said
> All we have left are the bombs
> Which burst out of our head
> All that is left are the bombs
> Which suck out the last of our blood
> All we have left are the bombs
> Which polish the skulls of the dead (4:1-7)

The absence of punctuation in the poem stresses the absence of verbal clarity. Moreover, the emphatic repetition of the word "bombs" at the end of alternate lines suggests that bombs themselves can serve to punctuate people's lives. The bursting out of one's head or the polishing of the skulls of the dead referred to in the lines above, have become daily events punctuated by explosions. Once again, Pinter employs cephalic and hemal images to arouse antiwar sentiments in his readers.

Pinter also criticizes the modern version of democracy as a pretext for war. In the poem "Democracy," he strikes a pessimistic note, telling the reader that there is "no escape" from this new type of democracy (5:1), whose achievement is described in the poem in terms of sexual assault. The employment of sexual abuse as a metaphor for the political abuse of authority is significant in Pinter's works in general, since both, according to the author, involve a violation of moral

codes and forced submission of the assailed.[22]

"Weather Forecast" seems at first glance to be the only poem in the volume which is out of tune, for it makes no mention of war or politics. It is a casual description of the weather, a description which the reader might hear on any broadcasting station. The language used also imitates the jargon of weather forecasts in its use of terms like "cloudy start" (6:1), "dry and warm" (6:5) and "brisk wind" (6:9). However, the closing line of the poem, "This is the last forecast" (6:12), establishes its relevancy and places it within the context of war. The forecaster seems to predict more than just weather conditions. He or she is predicting the death of the listener, who will live to see the sun shine the next morning but will not see the light of the morning after. The listener's death is also expressed in terms of the weather, since the wind, which is currently blowing, "will die out by midnight" (6:10), just as the listener's breath will. Afterwards, "Nothing further will happen" (6:11). The equation of wind with human breath and spirit, as made by Pinter in this poem, is a religious, mythological and literary motif.[23] It is true that life and weather alike will go on, but to the dead listener, the world will come to an end. Pinter thus gives priority to individual suffering and pain. The poem is also intended to show that the feelings of fear and horror are mingled with the very mundane experiences of everyday life such as the instance of listening to a weather forecast.

"American Football: A Recollection upon the Gulf War" is a record of Pinter's impression of the 1991 Gulf War. Though included in *War*, the poem was composed in August 1991 and has been described as "an expression of political anger" which Pinter felt at the time.[24] It depicts an American speaker viewing the Gulf War in terms of an American football game. The speaker takes no account of human loss and casualties caused by the war. All he cares for and is happy about is the fact that "It [the war machinery] works" (11:6). The significance of the ejaculatory phrase "Hallelujah!" (11:1), which the speaker utters aloud in joy at

the mass killings, recalls "America's God" in "God Bless America" and hence emphasizes bloodthirstiness as an object of worship and an end in itself.

The poem abounds in obscenities and taboo expressions. This stylistic feature is meant to distance the speaker from the poet and introduce war as a retaliatory, belligerent and sadistic act. It indicates the deteriorating effect of war and politics on the voluntary participant. For Pinter, "political imperatives can produce attempts to reduce individuality to mere enmity."[25] The situation described in this poem is in line with that found in Pinter's dramatic works where "a dramaturgy of sadistic power games" is presented, particularly in portraying war in association with sports.[26] This stylistic feature also expresses an attempt to bridge the gap between language and reality, a gap which Pinter believes is widening. In a comment on the poem, Pinter says, "This poem uses obscene words to describe obscene acts and obscene attitudes."[27] Billington similarly states that the poem was strongly motivated by "Pinter's obsession with the gulf between language and fact."[28] It represents a reaction against the euphemism with which the media approached the horrifying facts of war at the time:

> Pinter's poem, by its exaggerated tone of jingoistic, anally obsessed bravado, reminds us of the weasel-words used to describe the war on television and of the fact that the clean, pure conflict which the majority of the American people backed at the time was one that existed only in their imagination.[29]

Pinter says that the poem "sprang from the triumphalism, the *machismo*, the victory parades, that were very much in evidence at the time."[30] He considered this dichotomy between the glistening language of the media and the gloomy realities of war as

> a disease at the very centre of language, so that language becomes a permanent masquerade, a tapestry of lies. The ruthless and cynical mutilation and degradation of human beings, both in spirit and body, the death of countless thousands – these actions are

> justified by rhetorical gambits, sterile terminology and concepts of power which stink.[31]

Like the post-bloodbath indulgence in intoxication and carnal pleasures experienced by the cannibalistic creatures in "After Lunch," the speaker in this poem wishes to have fun after the killings. He tells a female partner, "Now I want you to come over here and kiss me / on the mouth" (11:17-18). With this final line, the ultimate and sole concerns of the speaker are shown to be sports, warmongery and sex.

The honesty and stark realism of the poem rendered its publication a difficult matter for the author. As Pinter himself relates in "Blowing Up the Media,"

> The first place I sent it to was the *London Review of Books*. I received a very odd letter, which said, in sum, that the poem had considerable force, but it was for that very reason that they were not able to publish it.[32]

The author then tried to have it published elsewhere:

> So I sent it to the *Guardian* and the then literary editor came on the telephone to me and said, "Oh, dear." He said, "Harold, this is really … You've really given me a very bad headache with this one." He said, "I'm entirely behind you myself, speaking personally." This is my memory of the telephone conversation. "But," he said, "you know I don't think … Oooh, I think we're in for real trouble if we try to publish it in the *Guardian*."

The author then tried with the *Observer*, whose editor told him that he could not publish the poem either. Pinter tried to convince him in vain by referring to similar material already published in the same newspaper. He said to the editor,

> Look, the *Observer*, as a serious newspaper, has in fact published quite recently an account of what the US tanks actually did in the desert. The tanks had bulldozers, and during the ground attack they were used as sweepers. They buried, as far as we know, an

> untold number of Iraqis alive. This was reported by your newspaper as a fact and it was a horrific and obscene fact.[33]

However, Pinter did not relinquish the attempt at its publication. He sent it to the *Independent*, whose editor also turned it down. Then, he sent it to the *New York Review of Books* "just as a laugh."[34] He knew for sure that the latter would decline its publication, but he was just curious to hear its editor make an excuse. Pinter's adamantine patience eventually led to the publication of the poem: "It was finally published in Britain, in January 1992, by a new newspaper called *Socialist*, with a limited circulation."[35]

In *War*, Pinter gives the poem a penultimate position, following it with "Death," which is the final poem in the volume. In this closing piece the reader is introduced to a speaker, presumably an officer, interrogating a person about a corpse. The opening stanza is spoken by the officer and it mimics the dull, robotic and redundant interrogation methods conducted at investigations:

> Where was the dead body found?
> Who found the dead body?
> Was the dead body dead when found?
> How was the dead body found? (12:1-4)

The questions asked begin to verge on absurdity and become self-contradictory when the interrogator attempts to establish the identity of the dead body:

> Who was the dead body?
> Who was the father or daughter or brother
> Or uncle or sister or mother or son
> Of the dead and abandoned body?
> ……
> What made you declare the dead body dead?
> Did you declare the dead body dead?
> How well did you know the dead body?
> How did you know the dead body was dead? (12:5-16)

The fact that not even one single answer is provided to any of these questions relegates the entire interrogation to a trivial experience and alienates the interrogator as a person talking to himself or herself.

The interrogator's obsession with sex, and in this particular case with necrophilia, is revealed in the instance when he or she absentmindedly asks, "Did you kiss the dead body" (12:21). Unlike the previous punctuated questions in the poem, the absence of a question mark at the end of this particular question indicates that the interrogator is perhaps not seeking a reply, but rather contemplating a repressed wish.

The relevance of "Death" to Pinter's concern with Iraq becomes evident if the poem is examined within its context. By choosing to place it at the end of *War*, Pinter stresses the fact that the ultimate result of war is death. The unidentified corpse in the poem recalls the anonymous nature of Iraqi deaths which he describes as "abstract," "unreal" and "of no consequence" in his Turin speech discussed above.[36] On the other hand, the situation presented in "Death" is analogous to that depicted in a sketch titled *The New World Order*, composed and directed by Pinter.[37] The sketch was first performed at the Royal Court on July 19, 1991 in the wake of the Gulf War. It presents a silent blindfolded man sitting on a chair. Nearby, two interrogators called Des and Lionel are standing and discussing the horrible torture they intend to inflict on him and insinuating that they will rape his wife. Pinter presents similar scenes in his political plays to stress the notion that politics affects even those members of society who have no political affiliations. Mark Batty observes that

> Throughout his political plays, Pinter sought to demonstrate that the seemingly innocent desire to belong to a group and play one's part in an ordered society can never be wholly free of political exploitation.[38]

As the conversation between Des and Lionel unfolds, the audience learns that the victim is a lecturer of theology who is not involved in politics.[39] The sketch is therefore a reminder of the injustices of the 1991 Gulf War which has devoured the lives of many men and women. According to Billington's

interpretation, *The New World Order* is an attempt to "pierce the insulated Western conscience which casually accepts the death of 150,000 Iraqis in the Gulf War … provided it is done in the holy name of 'freedom' or 'democracy.'"[40] Lionel and Des take it for granted that the road to democracy is paved with murder:

> Lionel: I feel so pure.
> Des: Well, you're right. You're right to feel pure. You know why?
> Lionel: Why?
> Des: Because you're keeping the world clear for democracy.[41]

As Mark Batty remarks,

> The use of the word "democracy" here might serve partly to inculpate those regimes which connive to mask their inhuman schemes behind a veneer of democratic government.[42]

Pinter points out in a comment on the sketch that its main theme is "power and powerlessness."[43] His clear message to his audience through this work is that the new world order, whose propagators are symbolized by Des and Lionel, is nothing more than the cruel exploitation of the powerless nations represented by the helpless victim. The belligerent attitude of the torturers in the sketch is typical of what Martin Esslin calls Pinter's "theatre of cruelty."[44] Batty explains that

> The Gulf War of 1991 seemed to illustrate the force, language and hypocrisy of the so-called New World Order, an ideology that, following the timely demise of the Cold War, purported to have the basic tenets of freedom, democracy and human rights as its motivating factors. Pinter was concerned at how easily such a vocabulary of morality can be exploited to cover, justify or even drum up support for foreign policies that might restrict freedoms and occasion innocent deaths.[45]

The silence on the part of the listeners in both the sketch and the poem is characteristic of what is often termed "Pinteresque" in that it marks the absence of communication between the speaker and the listener and in this case between the powerful and the powerless.[46]

Finally, one can fairly conclude that Harold Pinter's concern with Iraq is part of his humanitarianism and his general political views which consider political misjudgments and shortsightedness as the main cause of war. In turn, war leads to a great deal of suffering, pain and countless deaths, and can dehumanize many individuals who could easily be manipulated by the media for the sake of achieving selfish and mercenary political goals. As Mireia Aragay rightly warns her readers, "The cost of turning a deaf ear to Pinter's courageous interrogation of the pitfalls of our postmodernist political culture may be far too high to pay."[47]

( )

Notes

[1] Anne-Marie Cusac, "Harold Pinter," *The Progressive*, vol.65, issue 3 (March 2001), 32.

[2] Mel Gussow, *Conversations with Pinter* (New York: Grove Press, 1994), p.40.

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] Cited in D. Keith Peacock, *Harold Pinter and the New British Theatre* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1997), 134. For further details on Pinter's cynicism about politicians, see Michael Billington, *The Life and Works of Harold Pinter* (London: Faber and Faber, 1996), pp.19, 34.

[5] Austin Quigley, "Pinter, Politics and Postmodernism (1)," *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*, ed. Peter Raby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.9.

[6] Mark Batty, *Harold Pinter* (Plymouth: Northcote House, 2001), p.91.

[7] For the historical details on the war, see Alastair Finlan, *The Gulf War 1991* (New York: Routledge, 2003). For the various appellations of the war, see "Gulf War," *Wikipedia* (URL:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gulf_war), retrieved October 18, 2006.

[8] Billington, p.327. See also Charles Grimes, *Harold Pinter's Politics* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), pp.192-193.

[9] *Ibid*.

[10] For a transcript of the letter, see "Eroding the Language of Freedom" URL:http://www.haroldpinter.org/politics/politics_freedom.shtml#), retrieved January 6, 2007.

[11] Harold Pinter, "Art, Truth and Politics" (URL:http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11239.htm), retrieved August 3, 2006. See also Harold Pinter, "War Against Reason" (URL:http://www.redpepper.org.uk/natarch/x-pinter-dec2002.html), retrieved March 5, 2007.

[12] Harold Pinter, speech given at the Imperial War Museum for "Authors Take Sides On Iraq" (URL: http://www.haroldpinter.org/home/index.shtml#), retrieved June 5, 2006.

[13] Ami Ayalon, ed. *Middle East Contemporary Survey: 1993*, vol.17 (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995), p.401. For Pinter's anti-Americanism, see Daniel Johnson, "America and the America-Haters," *Commentary*, vol.121, issue 6 (June 2006), 27-44.

[14] Gussow, p.122.

[15] Batty, pp.115-116.

[16] Anthony Arnove, ed. *Iraq Under Siege: The Deadly Impact of Sanctions and War* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2000), p.189.

[17] Harold Pinter, *War* (London: Faber and Faber, 2003), p.7. All subsequent references to the poems in this volume will be cited parenthetically within the text by page number and line number.

[18] For the history of the American Civil War, see John William Draper, *History of the American Civil War*, vol.2 (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1868), p.i.

[19] For the association of modern American policy with cowboyism, see Victor Davis Hanson, "How Now, Cowboy? The Uses and Abuses of a National Icon," *National Review*, vol.58, issue 14 (August 7, 2006), 24.

[20] Dita Asiedu, "Two Years in Iraq: From Optimism to Disillusion" (URL:http://www.radio.cz/en/article/69731), retrieved May 29, 2006.

[21] See p.4 above.

[22] Drew Milne, "Pinter's Sexual Politics," *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*, ed. Peter Raby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.196.

[23] For examples from mythology, see E. Washburn Hopkins, *Epic Mythology* (New York: Motilal Banarasidass, 1969), p.13, and *UpaniSads*, trans. Patrick Olivelle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p.322. For occurrences in the Bible, see Gordon V. Boudreau, "In the Beginning Was the Word," *Melville Society Extracts* (February 2002): 5. For examples from literature, see Michael Ferber, *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p.235. See also J. C. Cooper, *An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1978), p.192.

[24] *Ibid*., p.202.

[25] Quigley, p.10.

[26] Milne, p.201. For Pinter's political views in his plays, see Michael Karwowski, "Harold Pinter-A Political Playwright?" *Contemporary Review*, vol.283, issue 1654 (November 2003), p291. I works cited must be 291-296.

[27] Harold Pinter, "Blowing Up the Media," *Various Voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-1998* (New York: Grove Press, 1998), p.221.

[28] Billington, p.329.

[29] *Ibid*., p.330.

[30] Pinter, "Blowing Up the Media," p.217.

[31] Harold Pinter, "Oh, Superman," *Various Voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-1998* (New York: Grove Press, 1998), p.217.

[32] Harold Pinter, "Blowing Up the Media," p.218.

[33] *Ibid*., p.220.

[34] *Ibid*., p.221.

[35] *Ibid*.

[36] See p.3 above.

[37] Pinter classifies the work as a "sketch." See Gussow, p.102.

[38] Batty, p.118.

[39] Harold Pinter, *Plays Four* (London: Faber and Faber, 1993), p.273.

[40] Billington, p.329.

[41] Harold Pinter, *Plays Four*, p.277.

[42] Batty, p.115.

[43] See Gussow, p.102.

[44] Martin Esslin, "Harold Pinter's Theatre of Cruelty," *Pinter at Sixty*, ed. Katherine H. Burkman and John L. Kundert-Gibbs (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1993).

[45] Batty, p.115.

[46] Margaret Attwood, "Pinteresque," *The Pinter Review*, ed. Francis Gilen and Steven H. Gale (Tempa: The University of Tempa Press, 2000), p.5.

[47] Mireia Aragay, "Pinter, Politics and Postmodernism (2)," *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*, ed. Peter Raby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.256.

Works Cited

Aragay, Mireia. "Pinter, Politics and Postmodernism (2)." *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*. Ed. Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 246-259.

Arnove, Anthony, ed. *Iraq Under Siege: The Deadly Impact of Sanctions and War*. Cambridge: South End Press, 2000.

Asiedu, Dita. "Two Years in Iraq: From Optimism to Disillusion." URL:http://www.radio.cz/en/article/69731. Retrieved May 29, 2006.

Attwood, Margaret. "Pinteresque." *The Pinter Review*. Ed. Francis Gilen and Steven H. Gale. Tempa: The University of Tempa Press, 2000: 5.

Ayalon, Ami, ed. *Middle East Contemporary Survey: 1993*. Vol.17. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.

Batty, Mark. *Harold Pinter*. Plymouth: Northcote House, 2001.

Billington, Michael. *The Life and Works of Harold Pinter*. London: Faber and Faber, 1996.

Boudreau, Gordon V. "In the Beginning Was the Word." *Melville Society Extracts* (February 2002): 1-10.

Cooper, J. C. *An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Traditional Symbols*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1978.

Cusac, Anne-Marie. "Harold Pinter." *The Progressive*. Vol.65. Issue 3 (March 2001): 32-39

Draper, John William. *History of the American Civil War*. Vol.2. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1868.

"Eroding the Language of Freedom." URL:http://www.haroldpinter.org/politics/politics_freedom.shtml#. Retrieved January 6, 2007.

Esslin, Martin. "Harold Pinter's Theatre of Cruelty." *Pinter at Sixty*. Ed. Katherine H. Burkman and John L. Kundert-Gibbs. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1993:.27-36.

Ferber, Michael. *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Finlan, Alastair. *The Gulf War 1991*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Grimes, Charles. *Harold Pinter's Politics*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005.

"Gulf War." *Wikipedia*. URL:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gulf_war. Retrieved October 18, 2006.

Gussow, Mel. *Conversations with Pinter*. New York: Grove Press, 1994.

Hanson, Victor Davis. "How Now, Cowboy? The Uses and Abuses of a National Icon." *National Review*. Vol.58. Issue 14 (August 7, 2006): 24-25.

Hopkins, E. Washburn. *Epic Mythology*. New York: Motilal Banarasidass, 1969.

Johnson, Daniel. "America and the America-Haters," *Commentary*. Vol.121. Issue 6 (June 2006): 27-44.

Karwowski, Michael. "Harold Pinter-A Political Playwright?" *Contemporary Review*. Vol.283. Issue 1654 (November 2003): 291-296.

Peacock, D. Keith. *Harold Pinter and the New British Theatre*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Pinter, Harold. "Art, Truth and Politics." URL:http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11239.htm. Retrieved August 3, 2006.

_____. "Blowing Up the Media." *Various Voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-1998*. New York: Grove Press, 1998: 218-222.

_____. "Oh, Superman." *Various Voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-1998*. New York: Grove Press, 1998: 208-217.

_____. *Plays Four*. London: Faber and Faber, 1993.

_____. Speech given at the Imperial War Museum for "Authors Take Sides On Iraq." URL: http://www.haroldpinter.org/home/index.shtml#. Retrieved June 5, 2006.

_____. *War*. London: Faber and Faber, 2003.

_____. "War Against Reason." URL:http://www.redpepper.org.uk/natarch/x-pinter-dec2002.html. Retrieved March 5, 2007.

Quigley, Austin. "Pinter, Politics and Postmodernism (1)." *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*. Ed. Peter Raby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 7-29.

UpaniSads. Trans. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.