

IDEOLOGICAL FANTASY ON FEMINIST CLICHÉ IN HAROLD PINTER'S *THE ROOM*: A ŽIŽEKIAN ANALYSIS

Fantasi Ideologis dalam Klise Feminis dalam Naskah Drama the Room Karya Harold Pinter: Sebuah Kajian Žižekian

Rahmat Setiawan¹, Armelia Nungki Nurbani², Sri Nurhidayah³

^{1,2}Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya,

³STKIP Bina Insan Mandiri

Pos-el: nurhidayah@stkipbim.ac.id

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengungkap hasrat perempuan akan kebebasan (tanpa ancaman), namun ia justru mereproduksi pengekanan kekuasaan laki-laki seperti yang ada dalam naskah drama *The Room* karya Harold Pinter. Penelitian ini menggunakan kerangka berpikir kritis Žižek tentang ideologi, subjek dan tindakan. Pendekatan yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah *grounded theory*, data yang digunakan adalah kutipan dalam naskah, dan sumber datanya adalah naskah drama *The Room* karya Harold Pinter. Dengan Teknik analisis interpretasi, penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa cita-cita agung kebebasan perempuan bersifat fantasmatis. Kebebasan perempuan adalah fantasi ideologis. Teks drama ini merefleksikan Kebebasan perempuan tetapi justru menjelaskan realitas bahwa ia terbelenggu oleh wacana patriarkis. Harold Pinter menegaskan kuasa laki-laki melalui definisi kebebasan perempuan melalui Rose dalam *The Room*. Dengan kata lain, hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa posmodernis, yang notabene menentang hirarki, juga ada yang patriarkis.

Kata-kata kunci: perempuan, subjek, dan fantasi ideologis.

Abstract

This study aims to reveal women desires for freedom (without any menace), but she reproduces of male power restraints as it is represented in the drama script of Harold Pinter's The Room. This research uses Žižek's critical thinking framework regarding ideology, subject and practice. The approach used in this research is ground theory, the data used are quotations in the script, and the data source is the play script Harold Pinter's The Room. With interpretation analysis techniques, this research reveals that the great ideals of women's freedom are fantasmatic. Women's freedom is an ideological fantasy. This play script reflects women's freedom but instead explains the reality that they are shackled by patriarchal discourse. Harold Pinter seems to assert male power through the definition of women's freedom through Rose in The Room. Therefore, the result shows that postmodernist, whose perspective is opposed to hierarchal system, is still trapped in patriarchal perspective.

Kata kunci: women, subject, and ideological fantasy.

Informasi Artikel

Naskah Diterima 2 Juni 2021	Naskah Direvisi 17 Mei 2023	Naskah Disetujui 26 Juni 2023
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------

Cara Mengutip

Setiawan, Rahmat., Armelia Nungki Nurbani, Sri Nurhidayah. (2023). Ideological Fantasy on Feminist Cliché in Harold Pinter's *The Room*: A Žižekian Analysis. *Aksara*. 35(1). 53—61. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29255/aksara.v35i1.898.53--61>

INTRODUCTION

Harold Pinter, an English postmodern scriptwriter, offers chaotic meaning of feminism in his work, including in his debut, *The Room* (Pinter, 1996). The implication of his work is the definition of woman freedom. Pinter narrates a woman, Rose, who is in her room, avoids to interact with other people outside the room. For her, external sphere is a nuisance, threat, or in Pinter's term, *menace*. The question is, being a free woman in no-distraction isolation without getting out of the room is a freedom? This is the paradox; a polemical state of Pinter's character in *The Room*.

Patriarchally speaking, the nomenclature of the name *Rose*, the main character, has the equivalence of the name of a flower whose appearance is beautiful but the skin is prickly; lovely but painful, beautiful but wounding. It is typical of mythologies about female stereotypes (for instance, Medusa with her beauty-deadly power). Freud declared that rose is a common symbol for female genitalia (Moleski, 1980). However, Pinter insists that he wants to propose an alternative standpoint, "Nevertheless, in my dramas, women always appear in one way or another as people I perceive, something I don't feel for men" (Roblin, 2014). In other words, when Pinter wants to present something he does not feel from men and produce a female narrative that rejects the presence of interference and chooses to be in the room. The narrative of Rose, as a problematic subject, who is included and excluded in this realm of feminist freedom, needs to be examined more deeply.

In Žižek's perspective, the subject's conflict lies in his actions, not his know-ness; they *know* (it is not right), but they are still *doing*. This paradoxical state between what is known and is acted is referred to as *cynical* consciousness. What makes us still do even though we know it is not right is the work of fantasy. Fantasy here is the scheme constituting the desire; it is a scheme that makes us desire by obscuring *reality*. The fantasy, of course, generates a sort of ideological disidentification. Here, this condition is applied to the female character in Pinter's play, *The Room*, and identify her ideological desire for freedom.

Žižek implements the Lacanian triadic, in which the subject is formed through three orders: the *Real* order, the *Imaginary* order, and the *Symbolic* order. The *Real* Order is a languageless order; a phase where the self does not experience shortages, all needs are encountered without *demand*. The psychic body is still in a total without any ruptures. Self feels one with the image of mother. For sure, it is inevitably, the impartiality of the image of the mother creates unmet needs and leads to prosecution. This prosecution is a logical consequence of the sense of deprivation present due to such ruptures. The *self* realizes that it is not the mother, it is just a figure that it does not yet know, therefore, it tries to identify itself in the imaginary state. The imaginary order is a mirror or *self*-pursue phase. In the process, the self gets trapped with *the other*. Lacan once said that "the mirror stage is a drama in which the internal impulse of the *self* is precipitated from its inadequacy towards ... the pervasive succession of fantasies of fragmented self-image in a form of its totality" (Lacan, 1977).

The *self* is increasingly fragmented when self-identification is carried out using the image of *the other*. Not only getting lost of its identity, the self covers its identity with the image of the *other*, and it gradually plunges it into a perpetual abyss of meaning when it enters the *Symbolic* order. The universe of language and constructed meaning; a phase where the self must live and revive itself with *presence metaphysic*. What Language offers is a universe of signifiers trapping us with the enticement of the opulence of meaning behind it, which for Lacan, never actually exists in reality. It is actually *the Other*; an anonymous symbolic structure, an illusion that gnaws us. Subject is self-adherence to Language and language offers *the Other*. It explains why the ego turns into a subject (the *submissive*).

With this situational logic, this also explains why the unconsciousness is structured like language. The Symbolic Order is a circuit of discourse (text) in which the subject is integrated

within it. Lacan analogized, "... insofar as my father made mistakes, yet I am the one who will be condemned to reproduce them ... because I am obliged to take back the discourse handed down to me, not only because I am his son, but because one cannot stop the chain of discourse, and it is precisely my duty to transmit it in a distorted form to others" (Lacan, 1956).

In other words, the subject is the result of the construction of the text or discourse. This trap shows that the power of the *Other* over the subject is quite determinant. The simple question is, if the *Other* does not exist, then why is the subject still subjected to it? The route of empty space in the Language is a logical consequence of the deception of the *Other* through what Lacan called Fantasy.

Fantasy is a scheme constituting desire, not vice versa. The simple logic is this, the deficient self seeks its totality but is instead patched up by language that is not *Real* alias *Symbolic*. In order for the subject to remain on the trajectory of the symbolical desire (Language and its futility), fantasy plays the role of creating a kind of scheme for the subject to remain desirable for the *Other* (behind the Language) through *objet petit a* (small object substitutes for desire). Thus, fantasy is (what do you want?) *Che vuoi?* (Žižek, 2012).

Fantasy always provides an *outlet* for the subject. Our desire is *symbolical* desires. Our desire is constructed in a relevant way to the desires of the other because we are held hostage by the power of the *Symbolic* order with *its Other*. In other words, fantasy provides an avenue for subjects to regulate their *jouissance* (Homer, 2014); an avenue to tame the traumatic loss of pleasure that cannot actually be symbolized or represented. Fantasy allows the subject to avoid impasse with unacceptable reality. When fantasy can no longer provide an escape, it is the moment when the subject cannot *translate* the desire into a sort of *positive* interpellation (Žižek, 2012) and what happens is, the presence of momentum driving an unconscious movement of action beyond the conventional symbolic order. With the *act-out* of the subject from the Symbolic order, the subject performs *a radical* action.

However, reaching the radicality is not a piece of cake to happen, because we are manipulated by Symbolic order; it causes what we think/feel, sometimes, is contradicted to our action. The simple logic is like this, the *Other* is like Happiness, Love, Freedom, Democracy, Law, and so on. We all want it, but we cannot present it in reality, but we can only represent it through its *substitute* objects. Since we can only understand through its substitute object, it means that we only get its representation. This representation offers a pseudo-totality that makes us realize that it is not what we need. In other words, fantasy's job is to unceasingly drive the subject on other routes. Even though we know the fact that it does not exist, fantasy will always continue to drive our desire to do it anyway, even though we know it is not real. The problem between fantasy or desire and need, mind and action, is the main path to Žižek's thought, especially regarding his critique of ideology.

The relationship between the subject and the Other is a "*transitive reciprocal*" relationship in which the subject will not be separated from *the Other*, and vice versa. As Žižek illustrates, "*I myself am included in the picture constituted by me [...] myself as standing both outside and inside my picture*" (Žižek, 2004). What we create, actually creates us. Language, *the Other*, or Ideology works that way. Žižek suggests that ideology not only forms a certain picture of fullness, but also tries to set a certain distance between subject and ideology. It is this space that causes the subject to seem to see the existence of ideology and experience a sensation of pleasure in practicing it. For Žižek, ideology is its practice, not its language or symbolic setting. The task of the ideological critic is to distinguish hidden needs against what appear to be mere contingencies (Žižek, 2012).

Ideology as well as what exists within the subject seems like an impossibility that will not overcome and will continue to be defended in an acceptable way (Docherty et al., 2004). Ideology itself is divided into three aspects, *doctrine* (ideas, theories, and beliefs), *belief*

(materialization and manifestation of externalities), and ritual (internalization in the form of unconsciousness). Ideology looks real in the mind but fictional in practice. The subject is a figure who destroys the presence of ideology because the subject is only able to practice it through his representations. Communism has a vision of classless humanism, but a radical, arrogant, and brutal political subject that redefines Communism. Democracy has a humanist vision of freedom and the right to human life, but it is a corrupt, manipulative, and greedy political subject that redefines Democracy. Love has overtones of romance and compassion, but it is hateful subjects that redefine it. There is no radical Islam, there is a radical subject, it just happens to be Islam and shouts in the name of Islam, just an example. The subject's joke on practicing ideology is due to the act of fantasy. The subject knows that his actions are wrong, but fantasy encourages him to keep acting and declare as if they were real and definitively true. It works the same way as the devil. Satan will not say "do not worship," but it will whisper, "worship, but do not forget to show off." Worship, which in fact is a personal matter, is actually displayed in public and becomes a joy that is clearly very contradictory from the substance of worship. In short, what ideology offers is only a pseudo-reality construction of the *Symbolic*, it is *the ultimate fantasy* (Docherty et al., 2004).

In the context of this study, the *interpretation* that freedom exists in women may be an ideological fantasy. The highly biased and vague definition of freedom assembles the problem; is being in a room without interruptions a freedom or is leaving a room with interrupt consequences a freedom for Rose? Does freedom exist in the definition of social construction or in the subject himself? If freedom exists in the subject himself, what if the subject is already in a sort of phase where the unconscious is already patriarchal constructions? Does not that explain if it only reproduces the power of male domination?

In this context, Rose, in the play *The Room* by Harold Pinter, is a subject who feels comfortable in his space, which certainly indicates freedom, but freedom is suspected as a construction of the patriarchal system. This is the cliché. A cliché is an expression, idea, or element that is used too often so that the original meaning or effect fades, even to the point of being obnoxious, especially when these elements are initially thought to be meaningful or new. Feminism seems to be a popular propaganda or agenda with sublime goal of equality but when it is gnawed in the mouth of ideology with its tendency, it falls into problem. It is this paradoxical that will open the padlock of the analysis in this paper.

METHOD

This study used data in the form of text quotes. Quotes can be both sentences and phrases. The source of the data is taken from the play entitled *The Room* by Harold Pinter. Data collection techniques are documentation and the steps are to read, record, and quote. This research uses Žižek's critical thinking framework regarding ideology, subject, and practice. The approach used in this study is *ground theory*. Interpretive analysis techniques are used in analyzing and the steps are proposing problems, presenting data, interpreting, and concluding.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Shackles, this word seems to be an endless polemic. Its esoteric nature has also *negativized* this word into a kind of central principle of imprisonment of liberty. Thus, to begin with, this word is worth debating in the text of *The Room*.

As already implied, the script of this play tells the story of a woman, about sixty years old, who feels safe in her space, with her husband who is silent. She served her husband, and always said that "*It's very cold out, I can tell you. It's murder*" (Pinter, 1996). This passage is still not too poignant to reinforce suspicions of the shackles of patriarchy that surround it. The thing that seems to be considered is the activities carried out by Rose.

BERT is at table, wearing a cap, a magazine propped in front of him. ROSE is at the stove. [...] She replaces bacon and eggs on a plate, turns off the gas and takes the plate to the table. [...] She returns to the stove and pours water from the kettle into the teapot, turns off the gas and brings the teapot to the table, pours salt and sauce on the plate and cuts two slices of bread. BERT begins to eat. (Pinter, 1996)

Rose, as a woman of about sixty years, with a husband ten years younger than her, illustrates a pattern of maturity. Rose's motherly demeanor is illustrated in a description of how she serves her husband's bread, meat, and various fittings. However, the focus is, the activity shows a discourse of male domination to women, especially what construct is behind it. How Rose does this, such as serving her husband or bringing down men, is how the patriarchal system works against women who must obey men. At least this, directly point the finger at Harold Pinter's nose as the author. This implies that the character created by Pinter depicted here is a female figure of a household who is obedient and obedient to men, or in other words, Pinter creates a female character who is subversive, submissive, restrained, and shackled.

Shackles here, refers to the text at hand and constructs Rose serving her husband. In fact, Pinter claimed that it was as if he harbored some sort of sexuality politics. Pinter's drama is considered to float an idea, that was previously believed, that humans are basically helpless creatures waiting for their fate (Prentice, 2002).

It sounds like a classic Greek tragedy; the story of Antigone and Agamemnon, where women are weak, and their fate is destined. How unfortunate it is. The theme of paralysis of the human soul, much discussed in modernist literature, is now attacked repeatedly and appears in Pinter's drama about power between individuals (Prentice, 2002).

Power and supremacy—where it began and how it was acquired—are fundamentally linked to the most prominent subject of Pinter's work. When these power struggles take place between individuals of different genders, such battles inevitably fixate into something sexual and political simultaneously.

By cornering Pinter like this, it appears that a *judgment* becomes very subjective and authoritative; subjective refers to the subjectivity of the author. Pinter, as an author, clearly provides a subjectivity, but this subjectivity does not merely describe Pinter as a subject.

"Subjectivity is a name for this irreducible circularity, for power which does not fight an external resisting force (say, the inertia of the given substantial order), but an obstacle that is absolutely inherent, which ultimately "is" the subject itself. In other word, the subject's very endeavor to fill in the gap retroactively sustains and generates this gap [...] thus (it is) defined not by a struggle against the inertia of the opposed substantial order, but by an absolutely inherent tension." (Žižek, 1999)

Subjectivity becomes a kind of reduced circularity; a power which is incapable of resistance and negation of itself against external forces, but a truly inherent obstacle or obstacle. Therefore, the effort of the subject cannot be clearly defined immediately just by the struggle against the inertia of the substantial order being opposed, but rather by the tension that is completely attached.

The thing that needs to be observed is how the assessment or claim to the discourse of housewives, like Rose becomes in a patriarchal discourse. There is a kind of ideology that lingers with it, and the claim to this has clearly become a kind of fantasy dispute. It is as if something is seizing *jouissance* from the fantasy of the Other.

More conveniently, when Pinter celebrates his ideas through his work—in this case *The Room*, Pinter exerts a kind of subjectification to what he creates. His creation is clearly to

represent *his Other*, but would and always be failed. This failure is because *the Other* is indeed a non-existent entity. Rose's narrative in the room by resisting interruptions is a representation of *Freedom* and Pinter's passion for her. There is a phantasmatic scheme here; Pinter proclaims the definition of women and her freedom struggle but struggles to detach her from the patriarchal narratives.

The text of *The Room*, especially its depiction of female characters and idealism of thought, seems to expose how woman has freedom by eliminating menace from others, but by positioning the woman in the room, it precisely reproduces male dominance that imprisons her. It is the cliché of feminism. It comes with the manipulation of *freedom* (offered by Pinter) which seems to crystallize in the form of the emanation from woman emancipation. This can be seen from how Rose said that, "*This is alright for me. [...] this room's all right for me. [...] I haven't been out. I haven't been so well.*" (Pinter, 1996). Of course, When the subject knows, but still does, this is what ideological drive works; pseudo-radical action. Rose's act of staying indoors is the *Real*, the *Symbolic* is what he conveys about comfort feeling. Real is non-linguistical expression, including how the feeling is expressed into the air of words.

The dichotomization of *the Other* here will always be in its paradoxical dualism. Pinter has his subjectivity about women, but he sets aside one crucial thing about the fact that he is not a woman. His subjectivity is subjectivity robbed from a male perspective. Logic is simple, how does a wealthy man feel the misery of the poor? How does an atheist understand religion? Or, sarcastically, how do the Eunuchs perceive sexuality? This is the logic of the impotent men who read the Kama Sutra. They can enjoy but still, they cannot get into it. They are like crossing an empty space when they talk about women. It is like a radical who speaks peace. It is like the vibrant and happy chicken logo on some chicken crispy restaurant, but the reality is the facts of how the chickens are chopped *brutally* just to be served on the dinner table. The government always talks about anti-corruption enforcement, but the corruption is always from the government. By offering a fitting portion of Rose, Pinter appears to be narrating the patriarchal shackles there while he speaks about freedom.

Pinter's angle of the patriarchal can also be embedded in its history because this debut drama was made in the late 1950s. The 1960s saw the emergence of feminism around the world, culminating in what is usually called the second *wave* of feminism. Women's rights and social status became hot topics that were always discussed, the identity of housewives in the 1950s experienced a serial ideological attack and attitudes towards women at that time drastically changed radically (Oakley, 1998).

The idea of a clear and definite role for women in the home is torn down, devastated, and demolished, instead, a new role will and is being fought. This change obviously has a domino effect as well as a snowball effect that keeps rolling like the doubtful fate of children when their mothers are too busy with their own stupid viral-dance on *TikTok*.

This diversity of women then becomes a sort of topic commodity for contemporary playwrights to move further by exploring, traversing, and sailing these issues with a sharper and more critical *axe*.

Going deeper, something happened in the 1960s with patterns of thinking about gender that continued to shape public life and private life (Oakley, 1998). From 1960s to 1970s, there were also years in which the change and revision of British laws regarding women's social status from protective to permissive was revolutionized. Thus, laws such as the Law on Divorce, '*Equal Pay*', and the Law on Discrimination of Sexuality, have all been enlivened in these years (Storry & Childs, 2016)

By looking at this, interpretively, the characters Pinter creates are women with experiences in the late 1950s to 1960s who are always closely related to male characters who try to align their ideal women; at home, cooking, and serving.

“*She goes to the table and cuts a slice of bread. [...] She goes to the rocking-chair, and sits. [...] She goes to the table and pours tea into the cup. [...] She takes a plate to the sink and leaves it. [...] She rises and pours out tea at the table. [...] She wraps her cardigan about her.*” (Pinter, 1996).

Suspicion of the patriarchal horizon, Pinter was increasingly appeared. When seeing Pinter's works written between 1960-1964, having a recurrence of obedient characters, it seemed to declare that this is the trademarks in Pinter works (Billington, 2014). Moreover, there is a clear tendency in male characters to see women as a threat or something depraved, as a gender to be rejected and banished from the social structure (Sakellaridou, 1988). However, something to watch out for, Pinter's creation like this—as shown in *The Room*—clearly pays attention to the dichotomous scheme of women. On a hand, the woman she created, Rose, is a woman who is obedient and considerate to her husband, but on another hand, the obedient woman is suspected to be a woman who is under the auspices of patriarchal culture.

When it is read textually, Rose, with her reality in the text, is clearly visible, for her, her vibe is *Real*. There is *Comfort, Tranquility and Peace* without any intervention and interruption from anyone and anything. Her prejudice about the presence of *Comfort* by rejecting the presence of others in her room is just an illusion of jouissance offered by fantasy so she desires to remain in her room. It also explains the failure of fantasy in fulfilling the reality of freedom to be outdoors for a woman. Fantasy offers a room and guarantees the *Comfort*, even though the subject knows, she is *just* in a room, which is not spacious and for sure, *restrained*. Rose's submissive and servant actions of her husband, Bert, further explain that it is a Patriarchal ideological fantasy. Rose's actions are a result of patriarchal cultural construction.

Symbolic is only a manifestation of the fantasy pinned to the subject. The *Other* and its boastful promises are fantasy constructs that boost her desire even though it is not real. As Žižek alluded, in a sort of scheme of fantasy-dominated consciousness, what happens is actually cynical consciousness.

In the cynical consciousness, the problem with the subject is not his knowledge, but his actions. This refers to the synthesis of what the subject knows, but still doing. The subject knows that it was not real, but he still pursues it. That is, Rose actually knows that she is only in a room. She is still in the room and thinks that staying inside the room is her freedom.

The title of the drama, *The Room* connotatively distracts meaning into ruptures in feminism horizon. Personally, Rose may feel free without any menace, however, existentially, she is trapped in a room where she is hidden in the shades of men, menace, and *inability*. This is the cliché of feminism agenda Pinter tried to expose. It is not a dilemma. It is just about how fantasy ideology (of woman freedom) precisely strips off paradox of ideology (here is feminism) and makes it fall into patriarchy.

In the narration, Rose gets three guests. The first is Mr. Kidd, second is the Sands family, and finally is Riley. Mr. Kidd is the master owner of the apartment where Rose rents the room/space, while the Sands family is a potential new resident. Riley is a black guy who ultimately makes Rose's *peace* torn apart, so then Rose grabs Riley's eye at the end of the story (this could be a discussion on other topics of fantasy and racism, but will not be elaborated in this research). The three guests successfully *gnawed* at Rose's jouissance. The question that arises, still related to the discourse of patriarchal construction that exists in Rose, is about *peace* against *interference (reassurance vs menace)*.

Rose's comfort in her space, as well as her activities that cater to men, can also be relevant to existentialist feminism. For Rose, her room is her space of existence. The famous creed of Sartreian existentialists is *that existence precedes essence*. Existence can create its own essence.

Just as Sartre argued, Beauvoir (Sartre's lover) also asserted, "the *task of man is one: to fashion the world by giving it a meaning. This meaning is not given ahead of time, just as the existence of each man is not justified ahead of time either*" (de Beauvoir, 2014). Existence determines all meaning in human history and universe, because it is an existence that fundamentally presents and sustains all truth. This kind of justification is then brought into the realm of women who were previously modified and mystified existentially primarily through biological (or sexual) categorization. Women are subdued through various ways and forms, so that the essence of women from the beginning has been erased, because their existence has indeed been buried alive.

Simply, women are *constructed*. If everything is a construction, then what exists is existence. It is something absolute in existentialist construction; *Existence asserts itself as an absolute* (Card, 2003), then comes essence. With the status of women's submission to the maintenance of their mystification and their patriarchal traditions, women do not exist, because its existence is determined by the existence of patriarchal discourse. Therefore, the only consequence is that, "women know and determine themselves not to exist for themselves (*pour-soi*) unless men define themselves" (de Beauvoir, 2014).

This is interesting, Rose was created by Pinter, in an era where women were domesticated. Pinter tried to give a definition of freedom for women through Rose and from there, he also indirectly pointed out the locus of women's existence. What happened, however, was not the existence of women, but the existence reproduced by Pinter. Implicitly, Rose felt that she was in the room, but it was certainly a form of submission to patriarchal discourse. Making her a domesticated female. The tendency of existence refers to Freedom.

Freedom is the *other*, a *symbolic anonymous structure*, the falsehood of its prestige is merely the act of fantasy presenting a substitute object so that we desire and end up on an eternal trajectory of *jouissance*. By looking at this context, existentialism is only the existence of the *Other* and its *objet petit a* which is a patriarchal ideological fantasy.

CONCLUSION

Pinter's subjectivity as an author through Rose in the text explains that there is a reproduction of patriarchal discourse. The freedom that is discoursed is precisely the shackles affirming the role of domesticated women. The domestication in the text of this play is a space that for the female subject, Rose, is the locus of freedom she desires. Thus, criticism of both Pinter and Rose, ultimately ended in hesitation, and did not even bring about the emancipation of women, because it claimed and offered the *ideal* form that Rose should have, but instead shackled her. With Žižekian's perspective, it is important to touch reality rather than to delve into the world of idealism offered by the Symbolic order with the Other. The reality is, Rose is in the room and serving her husband, that is what patriarchal shackles are all about. It is not about the wall jailing her in the room, but it is about how she feels *fine* by serving her husband and just stay in the room with motherly role. Rose may feel free without any menace, but existentially, she is trapped in a room where she is hidden in the shades of men, menace, and *inability*. This is the cliché of feminism agenda Pinter tried to expose. It is not a dilemma. It is just about how fantasy ideology (of woman freedom) precisely strips off the paradox of ideology (here is feminism) and makes it fall into patriarchy.

REFERENCES

- Billington, M. (2014). Celebrating pinter. In *Pinter at 70: A Casebook*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203952801-30>
- Card, C. (2003). Introduction: Beauvoir and the ambiguity of "ambiguity" in ethics. In *The Cambridge Companion to Simone de Beauvoir*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/->

[CCOL0521790964.001](#)

- De Beauvoir, S. (2014). The second sex. In *Classic and Contemporary Readings in Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315840154-29>
- Docherty, T., Žizek, S., & Daly, G. (2004). Conversations with Žizek. *The Modern Language Review*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3738515>
- Homer, S. (2014). Lacan – the unconscious reinvented. *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642537.2014.966593>
- Lacan, J. (1956). The Psychoses: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. *English*.
- Lacan, J. (1977). The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XI: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. In *Jacques-Alain Miller, trans.*
- Moleski, J. J. (1980). Dreams of Passion: The Theater of Luigi Pirandello by Roger W. Oliver, and: The Dream Structure of Pinter's Plays: A Psychoanalytic Approach by Lucina Paquet Gabbard. *Comparative Drama*, 14(3), 289–292. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cdr.1980.0038>
- Oakley, A. (1998). The second wave: A reader in feminist theory. *Sociology-the Journal of the British Sociological Association*.
- Pinter, H. (1996). The Room. In *Harold Pinter Plays 1*. Faber and Faber. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780571292417.000000013>
- Prentice, P. (2002). The Pinter Ethic. In *The Pinter Ethic*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/-9780203905289>
- Roblin, I. (2014). The visible/invisible screenwriter: The strange case of Harold Pinter. *Adaptation*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/adaptation/apu006>
- Sakellaridou, E. (1988). Pinter's Female Portraits. In *Pinter's Female Portraits*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-09220-8>
- Storry, M., & Childs, P. (2016). British cultural identities. In *British Cultural Identities*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315440606>
- Žižek, S. (1999). The Ticklish Subject. *Verso*.
- Žižek, S. (2004). The parallax view. In *New Left Review*. <https://doi.org/10.7551/-mitpress/5231.001.0001>
- Žižek, S. (2012). Mapping Ideology. *Mapping Ideology*.