International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion
https://ijchr.net | eISSN: 3028-1318
Received: May 23, 2025 | Accepted: July 1, 2025 | Published: July 14, 2025
Volume 7 Special Issue 2 | doi: https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.184

Article

Power Interplay and Political Possibilities: A Critical Analysis of Postwar Psychology and Political Thought in David Hare's Plenty

Hussein Zaboon Mutashar and Dr. Fael Asadi Amjad
Kharazmi University, Tehran
Correspondence: husseinyan97@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the postwar imagination and psychological landscape in David Hare's Plenty, focusing on power dynamics and political alternatives. Utilizing Organski's power transition theory, the paper analyzes the legacy of World War II on individual identity and power relations. Through a single-case cultural study of the protagonist, Susan Traherne, the research highlights the dissonance between wartime idealism and postwar disillusionment. Qualitative and interpretative methods, anchored in political psychology and critical discourse analysis, reveal how sociopolitical upheavals fragment identity and reshape power structures. The findings illustrate that Plenty dramatizes postwar instability, ideological struggles, and the psychological toll of geopolitical realignments, positioning personal crises as microcosms of global power shifts.

Keywords; *Power play, political possibilities, postwar psychology, political thought, David Hare, Plenty*

Suggested citation:
Mutashar, H., & Asadi Amjad, F. (2025). Power Interplay and Political Possibilities: A Critical Analysis of Postwar Psychology and Political Thought in David Hare's Plenty. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion, 7*(SI2), 278-295. https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI2.184

Introduction

Power has always been a part of politics, but physical war radically altered the power-political dynamic. The political boundaries changed because of war; however, intellectual structures and social attitudes did as well (Byrne & Klem, 2015). Post-war societies were never the same again; fear, lack of security, anger, and hope were the prevailing feelings of the people. These psychological shifts intervened in the conduct of governance and required politicians to fashion a new conception of power and the source of political legitimacy (Bernstein, 2020). On the other hand, the sense of having wanted to shake the foundations of power was profound for those who had lived through war. They did not believe in simple political promises and were seeking processes that could have prevented something like that. In that context, new political theories emerged and new theories of power that affected the national level and international affairs (Bridoux, 2017).

A seminal effect of the war was the greater realization in a democracy of the meaning of the state in terms of society. Devastating wars have shown how dysfunctional political systems can exacerbate crises and how authoritarian governments can exploit public sentiment to justify their policies (Morris, 2011). On the other hand, the war experience has reinforced the idea that the state should function not only as an executive institution but also as an institution charged with managing collective sentiment. In this context, politicians and theorists have sought ways to balance the needs of security, social control, and popular participation. These shifts have produced new thinking about power and the right rule for society (Dean & Henman, 2004).

According to Janus (2023), the psychological changes caused by the war paved the way for changes in governance and policy-making methods. Governments realized that war continued not only through the battlefields, but also through its influence on public minds (p. 71). Therefore, attention to collective psychology, the emotions of the masses, and the mechanisms of influencing public opinion became one of the key elements in politics. Fear, insecurity, and the need for stability became tools for shaping policies (Janus, 2023, p. 82). Politicians used public emotions to justify their decisions, and in some cases, by taking advantage of social anxieties, they exercised indirect control over society. World wars showed how public opinion could be influenced by propaganda, insinuations, and government policies. This problem has generated fresh controversy within both the field of political psychology and theories of governance, aiming to study the impact of war on social psychology and its use in politics (Jones & Whitehead, 2018).

Thus, the postwar era may be viewed as a point of departure in the relationship between psychology and politics. Political thinking underwent intense transformation, but not only has power also been changed (Thomas, 2012). David Hare's play Plenty is one of the best analyses and criticisms made on the political world following the war and the psychological and social mutations of that long period. In this piece, Hare explores the post-World War II scenario and the psychological impact on people and society from varied angles. Organski's theories of power relationships and social and political processes were invoked in the interpretation of this work. Organski's concepts highlight how great powers shape social and political changes (Bussmann & O'neal, 2007). In Plenty, Organski's laws of shifting power reflect the connections that bind the characters and their choices. Hare's comedy also becomes a criticism of post-war politics and society, through an exploration of characters' inner conflicts and a discussion of the socio-political context of this period.

The criticisms about family and domestic life are an expression of the psychological state that the postwar period had reaped. In the play's protagonist, Susan Traherne, who has experienced the taste of war's bitterness, we see a woman hoping to carve a niche for herself after the war. Finally, in drawing on these political and psychological contexts, Hare also illuminates the difficulties politicians have making choices, and the results of those choices, during periods of change. The play's investigations reveal how the characters ultimately want political and social change, Susan most of all, while grappling with their own psychological and personal issues.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative and interpretative framework to analyze David Hare's Plenty as a literary artifact reflecting postwar political psychology. The methodological approach integrates three key strands:

1. Textual Analysis: Close reading of the play's dialogue, character arcs, and structural motifs to identify themes of power, disillusionment, and identity fragmentation. Scenes are dissected to expose how Hare theatricalizes geopolitical transitions (e.g., Suez Crisis, British imperial decline) through interpersonal conflicts.
2. Theoretical Application: Organski's power transition theory (1958) is the primary lens to decode macro-micro power dynamics. This framework illuminates how declining hegemonies (e.g., postwar Britain) intensify internal rivalries and psychological crises, as reflected in Susan's struggles.

Complementary insights from political psychology (Janus, 2023; Bernstein, 2020) contextualize collective trauma and governance legacies.

3. Critical Synthesis: Academic secondary sources (e.g., Niebel, 2020; Organski & Kugler, 1980) are triangulated with textual evidence to criticize postwar sociopolitical structures. Thematic coding of "power voids," "institutional deceit," and "identity erosion" links character experiences to broader historical narratives.
    a. The study adopts a single-case design, centering Susan Traherne as an example of postwar dislocation. Data derives exclusively from Hare's script and scholarly discourse, ensuring a hermeneutic exploration of power's psychological interiority.

Power Dynamics and Psychological Depth

David Hare's Plenty is a study in power dynamics and characters' psyches, particularly in the post-World War II world, when life and society had irrevocably changed. Hare's characters allow him to illustrate the effect of war crises on the mind and spirit of the individual, and how participation in war can lead to a crisis of finding no place in a post-war world. The play's central figure is Susan Traherne - a highly strung woman who has experienced profound and traumatic events in the war - as she attempts to adjust to the new peace (and the febrile world of the Cold War that inaugurated the world she entered). For her, war is not so much a historical epoch but a part of her identity and view of the world.

Alongside the mental battles, the play Plenty deals with power relations on different levels. Power is relevant on the political and social surface and rests on a solid relational basis. Susan, a woman who craves change, faces barriers from within herself and society. This dichotomy is best illustrated in her interactions with her husband, Brock. Brock embodies the purists who long for stability and refuse to engage with any process that might destabilize incumbents.

In this work, Hare examines the impact of war on the characters' psyches and shows how power flows in different layers of human life. Through the characters' narratives, he presents a picture of a post-war world where the tension between change and stability has become a fundamental theme. By depicting these conflicts, the play offers a critical perspective on the political and social developments after the war and, through the characters' stories, examines the impact of these changes on individual mentality and human relationships. The following part of Plenty explores

the tension between diplomacy, the decline of the British Empire, and the competition to maintain power in a critical tone:

Sir Andrew: *Don't you feel a small quantity of disdain in a field where truth cannot be spoken? Charleson: That, Mrs. Brock, is the nature of the business. It is known as diplomacy. Moreover, in carrying it out, Britain has long led the world.*

(He offers a faint smile.)

Furthermore, here is the irony: back when we ruled an empire, our entire staff here totaled six hundred. With the empire breaking apart, we have grown to six thousand. The less authority we have, the less politeness we fight over the tinsel that is left, more frantically, more brutally, maybe.

Holding onto conviction grows more challenging as our empire diminishes and our rule unravels.

Dialogue between Sir Andrew and Susan reflects intense contradictions, inferring the characters' power relations and psychological nuances. Susan satirizes the limited freedom of expression in this area with an amusing question of whether someone is a professional diplomat. He further refers to the fall of British power and indicates increasing rivalry among diplomats as the economic resources and the status of the empire were declining. In such a hostile environment, the battle for the few remaining spots gets tougher, and the political field becomes more of a place for local wars and unsightly battles. For this part of the play, Organski's power transition theory is worth exploring. According to this theory, as the dominant power declines, a power shift occurs to different countries or new powers (Schulter, 2020). Pointing to the wane of the British Empire, Sir Andrew demonstrates how this shift in power brings weakness and decay and a heightening of internal rivalries. David Hare exploits these rivalries to reveal the personal and moral crises of the characters, particularly Susan, who is confused and unhappy with these developments. In this exchange between Sir Andrew and Susan, we see the paradoxes of power and the layers of psychological complexity in the characters. Susan depicts the stifling and hypocrisy of freedom of speech within diplomacy, and Sir Andrew bemoans the diminution of British power. According to Organski (2014), a dominant nation cannot hold on to its dominant position forever. With the increasing power of weaker states, the balance will inevitably shift, and this shift may induce competition, even conflict (p. 210).

In addition to revealing social contradictions, these power dynamics create a complex psychological atmosphere in which the characters resort to various methods to maintain their position and authority. In this way, Hare not only analyzes the political and social dimensions of these changes but also depicts their profound effects

on the minds and psyches of the characters. In a scene where Susan and Darwin discuss political betrayals during the Suez Crisis:

Darwin: Last week, the Foreign Secretary went abroad. I was not briefed. We believe he met with the French and the Israelis, urged the Israelis to attack. I believe our ultimatum was written in France last week, hence the mistake in the wording. The Israelis had reckoned to reach the canal but met with unexpectedly heavy resistance. I think the entire war is a fraud cooked up by the British as an excuse for seizing the canal. And we, we who must execute this policy, even though we were not told (Plenty, p. 400)

In this part of David Hare's Plenty, Darwin's dialogue explores the complexities of power relations and the psychological dimensions of characters in the post-war period and the political upheavals of Britain. Criticizing the state of diplomacy and policymaking in Britain, he points out fundamental errors in foreign decision-making. He shows how some decisions are made without the knowledge of the members of the government. He sees this as a sign of corruption and deceit in the British political structure. Referring to the psychological and political changes within the government, Darwin shows that even those responsible for implementing policies are kept unaware of their main objectives as Organski (2014) states that a nation in decline may resort to concealment and manipulation to maintain its position, even at the cost of irrational decisions (p. 209).

Organski's theory of power transition is well analyzed in this section. This theory states that as a significant power decline and loses its global position, internal conflicts and fierce competitions to maintain or gain power increase (Tammen, 2008). Through Darwin's character, Hare shows Britain as a declining power trying to maintain its global influence. The characters in the play feel helpless and confused during this transition period, in which they enter the post-war world from a position of power. By admitting his ignorance of the true nature of policies, Darwin clearly shows the depth of the psychological and political crisis in Britain in the post-war era. Susan's psychological depth is revealed in her interactions with Brock:

Susan: Not. I am not telling you anything right now. Anything personal I tell you, you would think I was looking for sympathy or trying to sway you. So, I'll remain silent. All that I request, however, is this: return to me, cease moving about the room, meet my eyes, make up your mind quickly and thoroughly about what you believe.

By refraining from expressing her feelings openly, Susan explores power dynamics and psychological crises in the postwar world. She refuses to recount the details of her life, believing that any statement might be interpreted as an attempt to gain sympathy or support. She wants to be seen without the distorted judgments and assumptions of others, but at the same time, she is afraid to face her inner truth. This

psychological crisis reveals part of her dissatisfaction with postwar society and her identity crisis. Organski's power transition theory offers profound insight into the hidden tensions in Susan's experience. Organski and Kugler (1980) argue that periods of power transition provoke external conflicts between nations and internal psychological crises as individuals and institutions grapple with the uncertainty of a changing world order (p. 219). Susan's crisis can be understood in this context: Britain's decline in influence after the war reflects her instability.

Organski's theory of power transition is also relevant here; as a power declines, internal conflicts and individual competitions for position intensify (Wang, 2016). At the individual level, characters resist the unexpected changes brought about by the decline of power. As a postwar woman who feels her social and political position is deteriorating, Susan is highly reluctant to feel pity and demands honest judgment. This conversation depicts her inner conflict in the face of a changing world in which she struggles to maintain her identity and personal authority. In a conversation between Susan and Sir Andrew Charleson, the tension between institutional power and individual dissent is palpable:

Susan: However, as a colleague I respect, I am compelled to tell you about my course of action. If I do not receive news of a promotion from Brock in the next six days, I will kill myself.

(Susan stands up from where she is sitting. Charleson promptly moves after her.) *And thanks, but I will not have that drink*

Charleson (calling out): Begley

Susan: I am soon due at a function celebrating Australia Day.

In this part of David Hare's Plenty, Susan displays a complex psychological state by making a shocking decision to commit suicide if her husband is not promoted. At this moment in the dialogue, Susan indirectly demonstrates her power as an individual to influence her husband's position. However, at the same time, this decision to commit suicide is a strong reaction to the feeling of helplessness and powerlessness in which she is trapped. According to Organski's theory of power transition, in periods of power transition, when a country or individual gradually steps away from a position of power, there are intense attempts to maintain their position and status (Heckman, 2009). According to Organski (2014), declining power creates uncertainty and instability, causing individuals and institutions to resort to extreme measures to maintain their influence (p. 208). Susan's threat to commit suicide is not only a personal crisis, but also a symbol of a struggle within a changing power structure. Just as countries facing declining influence resort to extreme measures, Susan, faced with losing control over her life, resorts to radical power-playing. Here, Susan represents someone who feels that their social and political status is declining

and, for this reason, tries to implement the changes they desire by using extreme means. Susan is unconsciously coping with the decline in power and discredit, and by threatening suicide, she is trying to make a profound impact on those around her.

Susan: If I am supposed to spit up "acceptable material," as our bosses call it, all I need to do is dumb down your thinking. I must sit and meditate on what it is like to be so damn stupid. That is what awaits all of us. The following 20 years will be the fake-dumb era. "Sorry, Miss Traherne, we did consider employing you, but you are just not stupid enough."

In this section of Plenty, Susan bitterly criticizes her and others' situation in the post-war world, pointing to the influence of power in professional and social spheres. She states that to please social institutions and her supervisors, she must pretend to be ignorant and to ignore her accurate intelligence and wisdom. These words reveal her dissatisfaction with the status quo and highlight the identity crisis and weaknesses of the post-war era. She speaks of social and political pressures that force individuals to accept roles that require them to abandon their wisdom and embrace dramatic ignorance. In the framework of power transition theory, this situation reflects a situation in which great powers are in decline and individuals are forced to adapt to these changes (Niebel, 2020). In such periods, internal efforts to maintain personal and social positions intensify, and Susan, who finds herself in a declining position, is forced to adapt to the prevailing system. Once intelligent and talented, she must accept a role in which she abandons her intellect and independence and submits to power structures. This crisis represents the inner conflicts that many people experience in such periods. Her dialogues point to an identity crisis in which people are forced to adapt to social and professional expectations imposed.

Brock: Spare me the condescension, Susan.

Susan: Well, perhaps in the spring it will be nice to be altogether in earnest....

Brock: Please do not ask if I understand. I know you deeper than you think. I have learned the signals to read. It is usually a prelude to some lie whenever you wax nostalgic about the war."

Toxic conservative misogyny in action.

The dialogue between Susan and Brock illustrates the complex power dynamics and psychological crises that arise in the relationships between characters in the post-war era. Both Susan and Brock struggle with their own personal problems and failures, but at the same time, they try to maintain control of their relationship in the post-war world. Their dialogue, especially about the war and the past, clearly shows the fundamental differences in their attitudes and patterns of behavior. In the post-war situation, when empires decline, individuals try to establish their place in new structures (Lemke & Reed, 1996). Susan, who was once idealistic and politically visionary, now finds herself in a crisis caused by the changes in the post-war world

and is trying to find her place. These crises sometimes cause her behavior to be accompanied by denial or an attempt to mislead others, especially Brock. Brock, who is aware of these psychological and emotional changes in Susan, tries to dominate her by indicating that he recognizes her signs. This bid for control of personal relationships indicates the psychological and social pressures the characters experience in the shift from war to peace.

Social Commentary and Power Struggles

The protagonist, Susan, struggles with internal conflict "resulting from her war experiences and the new post-war world." For one, she is a bitter old soldier; for another, she is a forgotten veteran of life after the war. On this path, she encounters many social and psychological constraints. These restrictions are imposed on her by a society that not only has not accepted social changes quickly but is still involved in old ideologies and inhumane behaviors. Along with these social dimensions, power struggles are prominent in the relationships between the characters, especially at the family and social levels. The relationship between Susan and Brock, her husband, exemplifies these conflicts. While Susan is trying to introduce herself as an independent and opinionated person in post-war society, Brock continues to look at her based on old and traditional attitudes. These conflicts of view and clashes between these two characters represent power struggles at the individual and social levels. Here, Hare skillfully demonstrates how social and political structures can influence individual relationships and characters' psychology. The play also criticizes social and political systems that force individuals to accept a particular role. In the post-war world, there is no place for independent and idealistic individuals, and individuals must submit to systems of power. By criticizing social systems, Hare examines how individuals attempt to survive socially and psychologically by pretending to assume accepted roles. In the following excerpt, Susan reflects on the disillusionment and loss of ideals in the post-war world, criticizing the pervasive lying and the lack of clarity in what the war was truly fought for:

Hindsight never lacks clarity, but what you sensed so clearly then is now stunningly clear to the rest of us today: that as sure as we were about what we did not want, not one of us had the tiniest idea about what we wanted.

Over the years, I have seen people's ideals slowly erode, a decline in moral fiber and honesty, and the continual and habitual lies. It is pathological, and after 30 years

of its daily habit, deep in the national brain, it has infected the brains of most Americans. Moreover, through it all, I keep thinking about you.

In this part of the play, Susan sharply criticizes the post-war situation and expresses the psychological and social consequences. She clearly points out that people knew exactly what they were fighting against during the war, but none of them knew what they were fighting for. This lack of awareness of the purpose of the war and its consequences has gradually led to a decline in ideals and values in society. Susan's words are not only a criticism of the social and political situation of the post-war era but also point to the contradictions that arise from the moral and social failures of political structures. She speaks of the loss of faith in social ideals and truths and points to the everyday lies and corrupt national habits that have systematically spread in society. These references address the social and political weaknesses of the post-war era and show that people can no longer believe in what they fought for. In this section of Plenty, Susan sharply criticizes the post-war situation and depicts its psychological and social consequences. She states that during the war, people knew very well what they were fighting against, but did not understand what they were fighting for as Organski and Kugler (1980) argue that wars waged without a clear vision of postwar leadership often lead to instability, as the victorious power struggles to establish legitimacy and coherent direction (p. 221). Organski's theory of power transition is applicable here; when power is declining, identity crisis and the inability to define new goals are the main consequences of this transition (Knudsen, 2014). Once a person with clear ideals and goals, Susan now finds herself in a post-war world where people can no longer believe in those past goals and ideals.

Susan: So, what do you mean?

Charleson: There is more to it than being right or wrong in this country. Features that are sometimes hard to put into words.

Susan: So, you tell me that no one can talk or refute anything.

Charleson: In fact, discretion is one of the most coveted of virtues.

(A brief silence.)

Susan (Aside): And truth in the lowest.

Susan: Oh, Sir Andrew, do you never experience a flaring of contempt for a profession that abhors honesty of thought?

Susan and Sir Andrew Charleson engage in a conversation that directly analyzes social values and the internal tensions that arise from power and social politics. In this conversation, Sir Andrew explains to Susan that qualities such as diplomacy and social tact are more important than whether one's opinion is right or wrong. This view reveals the dominance of hidden and invisible values in power

structures, where people must express their opinions within specific frameworks and cannot speak freely. This dialogue can be interpreted within the framework of Organski's power transition theory. In periods of power transition, when great powers are in decline and old orders are challenged, new power systems gradually emerge, in which new constraints are placed on the expression and exercise of power (Torjesen, 2018).

Susan: And there is something I have decided to tell you. It will end my life if Brock isn't promoted within the next six days.

Anyway, I know you are busy, so I will not disturb you by having a drink with you.

Charleson (calling out): Begley.

Susan: I need to go to an event at the Australia Day reception.

In this scene, Susan takes a strong stand against the social and political structures that have oppressed her and her husband by threatening to commit suicide if her husband does not receive a promotion. This action reflects Susan's deep dissatisfaction with the status quo and her desire to influence the world around her. This threat not only reveals Susan's psychological crisis but also symbolically challenges the social and economic powers that have limited her and her husband's position. Susan uses the threat of suicide to attract attention and bring about necessary changes in others, especially Brooke and the power structures. According to Organski's theory of power transition, in situations where great powers are declining and changes are occurring in the political and social arenas, individuals, especially those like Susan who find themselves in weak power systems, turn to threats of violence and suicide to attract attention and achieve their goals (Niebel, 2020). This situation reflects the internal and social conflicts arising from the decline of traditional powers and new power structures. Susan, who feels powerless due to her social and gender position in society, uses extreme actions such as the threat of suicide to put pressure on the system and attract attention.

Susan:(I guess you know that by now, I am aggressive, and when I am with them, I often feel as though I must "hold back" so I do not sweep them out of the room!) They are kind, they are capable, but I fail to see why I should put up with something, why I should be expected to have some mournful, respectable marriage for the sole purpose of having a child.

Furthermore, I cannot think of any reason any woman should be expected to do so.

The compulsion to accept roles such as marriage and motherhood, which are imposed on women only to fulfill the traditional needs of society, reflects her protest social and ideological structures that place women in limited and subordinate positions. Furthermore, Organski (2014) argues that as established hierarchies are

challenged, individuals and groups previously excluded from power begin to assert themselves, often creating tension with dominant forces (p. 209). Susan embodies this assertion; she challenges the rigid structures that intend to confine women to predefined roles. According to Organski's theory of power transition, when societies undergo political and social change, traditional structures decline and are replaced by new orders (Buyandelgeriyn, 2008). Susan symbolizes those struggling to accept modern roles and not return to a past that forced women to accept restrictive roles. By criticizing these conditions, she tries to establish her position as an independent woman and, in this way, she supports social change while confronting existing power structures. This part of the play also explores the psychological depth of Susan's character. It shows how her attempt to maintain personal independence in the face of social norms has become an identity crisis. A woman who once had high ideals now lives in a world that still demands that she fit into traditional frameworks such as marriage and motherhood. With these words, Susan shows that she is resisting these social pressures and is seeking to break free from these limitations.

From War to Peace: The Political Landscape of Postwar Psychology

David Hare's play Plenty is an in-depth exploration of the political, social, and psychological changes that followed the war. The post-war atmosphere in this play not only refers to the economic and political problems of the post-war period, but also carefully examines how the psychological effects on individuals' minds, and especially the reflection of these effects on human relationships and social changes. Through examining the psychological interactions and complexities of these characters, Hare indirectly reconstructs the political and social structures of the post-war era, showing that this process is profoundly influential not only on a social level but also on an individual level:

Tony: I had more sense, not that much more, but I was glad he called. Some of us who lived through that war have a certain kinship. It is evidenced in impatience, a predisposition to snap judgment, and a refusal to entertain nonsense.

When we return to England, coming home afterwards can be somewhat discomforting; those left behind are naive, even relatively small. I think that is partly what made Tony feel so compelled to leave. Suppose you have never experienced genuine hardship; instead, well. This is why, traveling through Europe with him, I knew at minimum that I would be free to act as I pleased for a spell. That is all there is to it, folks.

Tony recounts an experience in which he points out the psychological differences between those at war and those who remained behind the front lines. He

speaks of his own *"impatience"* and *"intolerance"* from his war experiences. Tony's reference to "intolerant" and "needed to get away" also indicates the psychological crisis that many soldiers face upon returning to their home countries. They feel they no longer belong in the post-war world and seek to escape this situation and gain freedom and control over their lives. Thus, this part of the play reflects the psychological state of an individual faced with identity and social challenges after World War II. In this regard, Organski and Kugler (1980) state that when a dominant order declines, those who were part of it experience identity confusion and a sense of alienation from the new situation (p. 21). According to Organski's theory of power transition, these crises play an important role not only at the individual level but also at the social and political level. Post-war society is facing a new era of reconstruction. However, people affected by the war cannot easily adapt to this new era because they are still affected by the bitter and psychological experiences of the war (Baptista, 2019).

Brock: I suppose the sadness spreads. You spend the day lurching from one ruin to the next, looking at the starving, the displaced, the bereaved. It is estimated that thirty million have been dispossessed across Europe, compelled to cross frontiers and begin existence anew. And from this vantage point…

(He moves around space.)

… It feels weirdly surreal to watch all this happen from here. Were you married for a long time?

Susan: We met during the war.

Brock: I did notice some marks on the body (Plenty, p. 362)

In this section, Brock's speech symbolizes the physical and psychological effects of war that remain in individuals. These effects remain in the characters not only physically, but also more deeply on a psychological level. In such circumstances, people face not only physical problems caused by war, but also many identity and psychological challenges that directly affect their human relationships. This conversation represents the deep gap between the pre-war and post-war worlds. People in the post-war era can no longer return to their old world. The psychological and social pressures caused by war place them in a situation where they cannot easily cope with their past. Organski's theory of power transition indirectly links these changes to changes in political structures and global powers. After the war, powerful countries faced internal and external changes that simultaneously caused individual and psychological changes as they rebuilt their structures (Buyandelgeriyn, 2008).

Furthermore, Organski and Kugler (1980) explain that people who have participated in political and military changes find themselves in a situation where their previous roles and positions have become meaningless post-crisis. This often leads to identity and emotional crises (p. 229). Brock's experience of observing and

understanding the devastating situation after the war symbolizes the internal and social changes that occur globally and individually.

For instance, there was a man in France. His code name was Lazar. I suppose I had been there a year, and one night I had to see him on his way. He just dropped out of the sky. An agent. He was lost. I was trying to be blasé, tough, and all the usual stuff- irony, hardness, cleverness, and wit- and then suddenly I began to cry. On the shoulder of a man, I had never met before. But not a day goes by without my wondering where he is (Plenty, p. 378)

This narrative clearly shows that after the war, characters, especially those involved in political and war crises, face complex feelings such as isolation, confusion, and worries resulting from the war experience. According to Organski's theory of power transition, this psychological crisis in the post-war period is more common in people who have experienced and returned from war (Baptista, 2019). After the war, global power structures changed, and new forces emerged. In this situation, many people engaged in various activities during the war face a sense of purposelessness and confusion after the war ends. In this case, the play's character suddenly realizes his deep feelings for Lazar and expresses these feelings by crying and using strong emotions. This expression symbolizes the loss of direction and inability to deal with the post-war world that people face after experiencing war.

Discussion and Conclusion

Power in David Hare's play Plenty is revealed not only in terms of politics but also in the psychological dimensions of the characters. For many people, especially the protagonist, World War II was a time of excitement, idealism, and belief in a bright future. The play's main character, Susan, as she transitions from a freedom-seeking guerrilla to a woman struggling with the barriers of marriage, career, and social relationships, is a concrete manifestation of the conflict between individual power and broader political and social forces. Her war-making thoughts do not fit the postwar circumstances, and she finds an enormous psychological tension within her. As the play demonstrates, power is not based so much on politics as on the heads of humans. People who once had the upper hand and controlled and felt powerful on the battlefield are now forced into a society with no personal freedom after the wars. It devastates the characters' psyches and shows how complicated and multi-faceted the exchange between power and personal psychology is.

The protagonist, who had a significant role in the resistance during the war in the play, faces social forces that do not grant her the same power and authority as she exerted in the war times. This opposition between the war and post-war experience

emerges even as one of the central axes of the play. It demonstrates that the mechanism of power is decisive in political and social life and individual psychology. So too do the shifting relations of the characters mirror the difficulties they encounter as they try to come to terms with peace. This situation turns out, somewhat counterintuitively, not to be one of peace at all, but of frustration and dispiritedness for many of the novel's survivors of war.

As the analysis of the play demonstrates, it is a matter of how power works in different strata and how post-war social structures re-appropriate power from individuals who had been centrally involved in the resistance and struggle. The protagonist, who used to feel influential, free, and strong during WWII, found a world that, in peacetime, marginalized the values of history and brought in norms of life engines that reduced the opportunities to will. These changes are found in the play's characters. However, they also reflect larger truths of the post-war period, when governments and bureaucracies took control, and they shoved aside the people who were previously fighting.

In the play, power is at work in structures and institutions of social life, the political order, and everyday exchanges between individuals. As characters' relationship to each other reflects their power relations to each other, particularly the layout of the main character from her surroundings, we can see that as internal contradictions between wartime experiences and peacetime expectations are getting exacerbated, they even propel into psychological crises. She, the protagonist who was powerful and meaningful during the war, was tangled in a peacetime setting that did not recognize her power and made her a disillusioned, helpless woman. This conflict between personal authority and societal limitations is one of the central strands to the play, and David Hare scripts it well.

The political and social analysis that the play offers is that war-to-peace is not a straightforward, even process; it is full of problems and paradoxes. Plenty demonstrates a power, macro-political and then within personal relationships, as fluid and shifting, reshaped by social and historical contingencies. The protagonist, who once fought for a grander purpose during the war, is now struggling in a setting where such ideals appear not just faded, but pointless. This feeling of emptiness and disconnection is the key element of post-war psychology, which must be treated tenderly, and David Hare does just that.

Nevertheless, it is the war that, for all its violence and chaos, somehow provided them with a clear sense of purpose and assertion of personal power. Nevertheless, during peacetime, meaning vanishes to despair, alienation, and a desperate search to regain the power that was lost. This is true not just of the characters in the play, but of

a kind of wider malaise in post-war societies in which people are torn politically and psychologically. If characters in the play were veterans of World War II, it was not necessarily because of other retro fads, everyone was, but because World War II was, for many of them, a time of meaning and purpose; it was a time when all would have been able to say that they were fighting for some- thing larger than themselves. However, in peacetime, a sense of that mission is stripped away, replaced with despair, hopelessness, and an identity crisis. Susan, a female member of the French Resistance during the war, now feels empty and passive in the world after the war. Instead, she has an uncaring society around her, and all the roles thrust upon her completely counter the sense of freedom and raw power she wanted. Hare, in this play, demonstrates that for so many, peace after the war is not at all what was anticipated; peace means becoming embroiled in crises one never for a moment considered during the war. The War Playwright has plenty to see you questioning how government is turned upside down and inside out by war, but plenty to help you also be wondering how people go from feeling great about themselves to feeling lost and even homeless in the peace that follows a war.

References

[1] Abd Al Khanaifsawy, A. N. (2021). A pragma-dialectical study of David Hare's Stuff Happens. Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2, 136–186.

[2] Baptista, E. (2019). The psychological legacies of World War II. Journal of Historical Psychology, 42(2), 133–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794119838221

[3] Bernstein, S. (2020). The absence of great power and responsibility in global environmental politics. European Journal of International Relations, 26(1), 8–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066120908539

[4] Bridoux, J. (2017). Stronger than strong: Perceptions and misperceptions of power. In American hegemony and the rise of emerging powers (pp. 19–39). Routledge.

[5] Bussmann, M., & Oneal, J. R. (2007). Do hegemons distribute private goods? A test of power-transition theory. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 51(1), 88–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002706296157

[6] Buyandelgeriyn, M. (2008). Post-post-transition theories: Walking on multiple paths. Annual Review of Anthropology, 37, 235–250. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.37.081407.085207

[7] Byrne, S., & Klem, B. (2015). Constructing legitimacy in post-war transition: The return of 'normal' politics in Nepal and Sri Lanka? Geoforum, 66, 224–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.10.003

[8] Dean, M., & Henman, P. (2004). Governing society today: Editors' introduction. Alternatives, 29(5), 483–494. https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540402900501

[9] Heckman, G. A. (2009). Power capabilities and similarity of interests: A test of the power transition theory [Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University]. LSU Digital Commons.

[10] Janus, L. (2023). Reflections on the psychological and psychohistorical causes of the war in Ukraine and of wars in general. The Journal of Psychohistory, 50(2), 139–151.

[11] Jones, R., & Whitehead, M. (2018). 'Politics done like science': Critical perspectives on psychological governance and the experimental state. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 36(2), 313–330. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775817745388

[12] Knudsen, T. B. (2014). The politics of power transition. International Relations, 28(1), 25–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117813513148

[13] Lemke, D., & Wood, R. M. (1996). The effect of democratic joint ventures on interstate conflict, 1919–1992. Journal of Politics, 58(4), 1265–1287. https://doi.org/10.2307/2960474

[14] Morris, J. (2011). How great is Britain? Power, responsibility, and Britain's future global role. The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 13(3), 326–347. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2011.00459.x

[15] Niebel, D. (2020). The power transition theory and the Sino-American contention for power. Towson University Journal of International Affairs, 64(1), 1–17.

[16] Organski, A. F. K. (2014). Power transition. In C. Brown (Ed.), The realism reader (pp. 207–210). Routledge.

[17] Organski, A. F. K., & Kugler, J. (1980). The war ledger. University of Chicago Press.

[18] Schulter, J. A. (2020). An adapted Organski transition model for the twenty-first century. Hentedato, 16, 1–18.

[19] Tammen, R. L. (2008). The Organski legacy: A fifty-year research program. International Interactions, 34(4), 314–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050620802518357

[20] Thomas, G. W. (2012). Governance, good governance, and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges. In Thinking about global governance (pp. 168–189). Routledge.

[21] Torjesen, S. (2018). Power transition theory and the rise of China. International Studies Review, 20(1), 44–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/vix058

[22] Wang, W. (2016). How to maintain peaceful Sino-US relations: A critical analysis of the power transition theory. Asian Education and Development Studies, 5(3), 278–287. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-10-2015-0052