

**Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War: A Study in
David Hare's Stuff Happens**

**الاستجابات المسرحية للحرب الأمريكية في العراق
دراسة في الأشياء تحدث ل ديفيد هير**

Professor.Dr

Hana Khaleif Ghani

PH.D. Al Mustansiriyah University

Assistant Professor

Mithal M. Chellab

Al-Qadissyah University

ABSTRACT

Contemporary War drama is described as a reaction to the profound suffering brought up by war that has, unfortunately, become a supreme language of communication in the Modern era. Hence, the English contemporary political theatre has displayed unique interconnectedness between drama and politics: interest in US-Iraq war is indeed not an exception. British playwright, David Hare, belongs to a trend of war drama that enables the world to witness the truth, trauma and the violence of US-Iraq war. *Stuff Happens* subtly helps show how US coercive diplomacy manipulates other Powers to fulfill the new doctrine of "New American Century."

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare documents the recent tragic history of Iraq in such an approach that blends the documentary with the fictional to display the events from 2000, till the actual invasion of Iraq in April, 2003. The play traces the origins of US-Iraq war and unveils all the attempts and the procedures undertaken by Bush and his administration team to invade Iraq.

This study mainly focuses on the Power motif that characterizes the American leaders' impulses and ceaseless quest of power. Hare's *Stuff Happens*, however, contextualizes Bush's Coercive strategy in relation to Iraq, as well as his manipulation of the UN, Blair, Powel, and other characters to help reaching his goals.

“Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will”¹

Most people have intuitive knowledge about power and define it as the ability to influence people and events, or the capacity to affect the behaviour of others. But many questions have been raised concerning power: is it a means or an end? How can man understand the real meaning of power, for example when (s)he thinks of power in relation to divinity, nature, humanity, or science? What is the object of power? Should one follow Orwell’s opinion when he says “the object of power is power”², or try to explain the meaning of power in relation to love as Mahatma Gandhi did, who states that: “ The day the power of love overrules the love of power, the world will know peace”³.

Some people are convinced by the definition of power in the dictionaries like that of Cambridge Dictionary: “power is an exchanged relationship that occurs in transactions between an agent and a target. The agent is the person who uses the power and the target is the recipient of the attempt to use power.”⁴ On the other hand, other scholars search more about the meaning of power: Robert A. Dahl assures in his *The Concept of Power* that there is no single concept for power, rather it appears in many different concepts, depending on “the available data”. He defines power as “a relation among people and other animate or inanimate objects, and this relation exists in a time lag”⁵. According to Joshes C. Goldstein, the starting point to understand the meaning of power in the current time of power is to think of “Hegemonic Stability Theory”.

HST is a theory of international relation and it is rooted in the fields of political science, economics and history. It indicates that the international system is more likely to remain stable when a single nation-state is the dominant world power.⁶

HST explains the rise of certain nation or country to the level of great power to have the role of the world leader or hegemony. The United States of America (henceforth US) tries to have this role by the aid of its special military, structural power and an ideological hegemony whose power is able “to make the rules and to structure the situation owing to the penetration of the economies of other states by US transnational corporations”⁷. In brief, US has hegemonic power that enables its authority to overthrow any regime it dislikes with the claim of reconstructing stable replacement, but the truth is such act that it leads to

an “empire of chaos” and not stability, as in Second Persian War/US-Iraq War 2003.⁸

US-Iraq War (2003-2011) explains the new grand strategy of US using of coercive diplomacy to have new position in the affairs of the Middle East, like that of oil politics, as well as a great interest in ruling coalition which supports its global grand. In other words, US tries to achieve global power that fulfils its new doctrine of “New American Century”.⁹ This doctrine has been formulated as a response to the attack of September 11, after which US calls for “full spectrum dominance”. The terrorist attack of September alters US thinking, and so quickly, US tries “to sustain its standing point as the sole superpower of the 21st century”.¹⁰ US sets various plans in all levels: social, military and political, and manipulates all its potentialities to achieve “unilateralism” that supports one –sided action. According to this intention, forming any coalition is set under US command, so it is called “coalition of the willing”. The latter helps US in its new project of “preventive wars” that is designed against terrorism.¹¹ US major concern is to find a solution to the problem of the security threat.

Indeed, Iraq does not cause any threat or any form of danger for US or any European country, but the clue is that “great powers never can get enough power”.¹² US sets the war on Iraq, for the sake of US national interest of a global hegemony.¹³

With motivation of power, Iraq attacked his neighbor Kuwait in 1990, and this attack put Iraq for thirteen years under UN economic sanctions. These sanctions were doing little to prevent Saddam Hussein from his aggressive strategy, and on the contrary, he intended to show much power. So the attack of September 11, supplied the second Bush with the chance to remove Saddam and end his regime by the adoption of the policy of “preemptive strikes” against any country, group or organization that causes threat to US. Bush declared “a global war on terrorism” and revealed his own policy of “preemptive act” in his speech on September, 17, 2002:

United States will act against . . . emerging threats before they are fully formed. [W]e will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively against such terrorists We must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction We must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (14)

objectives of today's adversaries To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively.¹⁴

So soon, US accused Iraq of having Weapon of Mass Destruction (henceforth WMD) as it is stated on February 5, 2003, by Collin Powell, Secretary of State in his description to the Security Council, saying:

What the United States knows about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.... These are not assertions. What we are giving you are facts and conclusions based on solid evidence.... Iraq's weapons of mass destruction pose . . . real and present dangers to the region and the world....Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 500 tons of chemical weapons agents....a massive clandestine nuclear weapons program.¹⁵

Here-upon, US worked to build a coalition to attack Iraq. This coalition obtained the green light to invade Iraq in September, 2002 when UN granted a resolution authorizing force against Iraq. Few days before the attack of Baghdad, exactly on March 6, 2003 president Bush linked the decision of the invasion of Iraq with the attack of September 11:

Saddam is a threat, and we're not going to wait until he does attack....If the world fails to confront the threat posed by the Iraqi regime . . . free nations would assume immense and unacceptable risks. The attacks of September 11, 2001, showed what enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what . . . terrorist states could do with weapons of mass destruction.¹⁶

On March 18, 2003 President Bush gave Saddam Hussein a 48-hour deadline to leave his position and depart Iraq. Saddam refused to leave Iraq, and US, UK and the allied forces attacked Baghdad in the morning of March 20, 2003. Exactly at the hour of first explosion in Baghdad, US president George W. Bush publicized in a televised address:

At this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operation to disarm Iraq, and free its people and defend the world from grave danger.¹⁷

Though the Fedayeen and the Republican Guard , who were the strongest power in Iraq, presented some resistance, US troops rapidly defeated Iraqi military and paramilitary forces and took a control on the international airport of Baghdad. Within three weeks, the coalition of US

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (15)

forces collapsed Saddam's regime and on April 8, 2003, the statue of Saddam Hussein was toppled and the capital Baghdad was captured by US forces. Although the coalition and US forces did not capture the Iraqi ruler himself, they were able to announce the end of his regime on April 9, 2003.

Following the collapse of Saddam's regime, Iraq's major cities were destroyed by a hot wave of looting that targeted all government offices and the public institutions. The violence became the common language of communication at this period, and special criminal violence was used against the former ruling clique. Moreover, the great pain that affected the curing of Iraq from such critical conditions was the sectarian violence. Though Iraq was covered with a bleak cloud, there were highly enthusiastic and national figures who caused death for several hundred soldiers from US and other coalition, part of the attempt of liberation.¹⁸

With the observation of the declining level of violence in 2007, and with much control for Iraqi parliament on the case of chaos, US- Iraq governments made an agreement that set the legal framework for US military activity in Iraq in addition to situate a timetable for the final retractility of US forces. Then the new elected US president Barrack Obama announced that US forces would be withdrawn from Iraq by August 31, 2010. Consequently, a great celebration was done in Baghdad on December 15, 2011 as ceremony of statehood.¹⁹

March 20, 2003 - April 9, 2003 is the first brief phase of US-Iraq War but the second phase April 9, 2003 - December 15, 2011 is the longer one which refers to US led occupation of Iraq characterized by many scandals like killing, raping and abusing detainees in the Abu Ghraib prison. Such scandals reveal the meaning of the power of violence that is well documented in the photographs of the abuse in Abu Ghraib which shows how media makes an exposure of terror and torture. The media enables the world to witness the trauma and violence of US-Iraq War.²⁰

Iraq war, its prelude and the consequences of this invasion have been dramatized in *Stuff Happens* (2004) by prominent English playwright, screenwriter and film director, David Hare (b.1947). *Stuff Happens* traces the origins of the Iraq War, and tackles all the attempts and the procedures that were followed by Bush and his administration's team to invade Iraq, and show their own power and strength. *Stuff Happens* "offers a fairly adequate portrayal of how the general public perceived the historical situation leading to the war in Iraq, and how inseparable the state of war is from state propaganda".²¹

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (16)

The play opens with an unnamed character addressing the audience directly about the title of the play, “Stuff Happens”, which has been taken from the US Secretary of State’s, Donald Rumsfeld’s, response to a journalist’s question concerning the looting that took place after the fall of Baghdad widespread.²²

AN ACTOR: (steps forward) Stuff Happens. The response of Donald Rumsfeld, the American Secretary of Defense, when asked to comment on the widespread looting and pillaging that followed the American conquest of Baghdad - Friday April 11th, 2003:

JOURNALIST: What's your response, sir? Mr. Secretary, how do you respond to the news of looting and pillaging in Baghdad?

RUMSFELD: I've seen the pictures. I've seen those pictures. I could take pictures in any city in America. Think what's happened in our cities when we've had riots, and problems, and looting. Stuff happens! But in terms of what's going on in that country, it is a fundamental misunderstanding to see those images over and over and over again of some boy walking out with a vase and say, "Oh, my goodness, you didn't have a plan." That's nonsense. They know what they're doing, and they're doing a terrific job. And it's untidy, and freedom's untidy, and free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things. They're also free to live their lives and do wonderful things, and that's what's going to happen here.²³

The assembling statement that is reflected in the title of the play and the above quote with actual public speech that are dramatized in a form of the interviews with politicians is done by Hare to create a “familiarizing” upshot on the audience and at the same time to cope with the demands of verbatim theatre strategy that generally produces political drama. Hare’s collages the actual speeches with fictional statements to make his play befit the category of “post- September - verbatim”.²⁴

The term verbatim was first coined by Derek Paget in 1987 in an article that refers to British plays from 1970s and 1980s that used materials from interviews conducted for the purpose of writing a given theatre play. It is defined by Chris Megson in his “Verbatim Practices in Contemporary Theatre: Symposium Report” as “Theatre of actuality that uses spoken testimony as its primary source”.²⁵ Many critics and scholars

dig deep in the real foundation of such form of theatre. Derek Paget is one of those scholars and he defines verbatim theatre as:

A form of theatre firmly predicated upon the taping of and subsequent transcription of interviews with ‘ordinary’ people, done in the context of research into a particular region, subject area, issue, event, or combination of these things. This primary source is then transformed into a text which is acted, usually by the performers who collected the material in the first place.²⁶

Stuff Happens whose events have been “authenticated” from different sources and which covers a very recent history, has been studied according to different approaches due to its richness as a play. It is presented in two acts; each with twelve scenes that consist of stuff meetings, backroom deals, public addresses, dissenters, backdoors diplomacy and fabricated evidences. The play “ combines documentary realism with imaginative reconstruction of the agreements behind the publicity known facts”.²⁷

Nevertheless, Stuff Happens can also be examined in relation to a post colonial approach that reveals the following perspectives: the invasion of Iraq in 2003 is part of the achievement of Bush’s colonial private agenda for The Middle East whose major goal is the occupation of Iraq for various interests. According to Henry Michaels, “Bush’s war plans are driven by political aims, to terrorize and democratize the Iraqi people and the Arab masses and send a message of violence and intimidation to the entire world”.²⁸ On August, 25, 2002, New York Times published an article “ Cheney Says Peril a Nuclear Iraq Justifies Attack” whose second paragraph quoted Cheney’s saying: “ [Saddam Hussein would] seek domination of the entire Middle East, take control of a great portion of the world’s energy supplies, directly threaten America’s friends”.²⁹ The other reason is that Saddam Hussein was internationally known as courageous leader and brutal dictator in the Middle East, so removing him would give US the chance to invade any country in the region. “BUSH: The policy of my government is the removal of Saddam”(SH,sc.10, p.30) and the invasion will be accompanied with less resistance and less difficulty, “WOLFOWITZ: Take out Saddam we blow fresh air into the Middle East” (SH,sc.7, p.13). In addition, there has also been a history of conflict between Iraq and the US since the First Gulf War in the 1991, when the US operated Desert Fox as a reaction to Iraq’s invasion of his neighbour Kuwait. Some political critics think that “ the war in Iraq is an unfinished

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (18)

business left over from the first Gulf War”.³⁰ And many can expect that president George W. Bush Junior, invaded Iraq in 2003 as part of his “quasi patrimonial desire to finish what his father had started”. “POWELL: This is a problem with deep historical roots” (SH, sc.4,p.7)

The other reason that is declared by president Bush is the attempt to bring democracy to Iraq which means bringing democracy to the whole region. As it is expected by Toby Havnden, the adaptation of democracy in Iraq can reshape the region of the Middle East as a whole and make it easier to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Such idea is comprehended by Havnden after his reading of Powell’s word on February 6, 2003:

I think there is also the possibility that success could fundamentally reshape that region in a powerful, positive way that will enhance US interests..., we are also able to achieve progress on the Middle East peace.³¹

In the Middle East, Bush speeded his imperialistic expansion which was programmed by his father’s strategy, who both wear the mask of saviors. Bush Am.Br. Junior calls himself a war president: “BUSH: I’m a war president”(SH, Sc.11, p.35), and he declares that he tries to end terrorism in the whole world in general, and the Middle East in particular. That is why it is called a “war on terror”. The latter is a phrase first used by U.S. President George W. Bush on September 20, 2001. It specifically refers to the ongoing military campaign led by the U.S., U.K. and their allies against organizations and regimes identified by them as terrorists.³²

BUSH: Sure. (BUSH nods) You know, Colin, finally this is a war on terror. And at some point we may be the only ones left. That's fine with me. (SH,sc.7, p.16)

After the attack of September 11, and in his January 2002 State Union address, Bush announced “ Iraq, Iran, and North Korea as the “axis of evil”.³³“BUSH: Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility towards America and to support terror. States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world.” (ST,sc.10,p.22). He and his administration adopted the false intelligence report to convince other European countries that Iraq has nuclear weapons with which he can attack any European country within a few moments:

BUSH: Now let's move on. Iraq.

RICE: The CIA director's going to brief us, get us up to speed on the latest intelligence.

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (19)

TENET: I'm going to ask you all to take a look at this photograph.

RICE: The real danger to the region ...

RICE: Correctly analysed, when you correctly analyse the region, the real threat is destabilisation.(SH, sc.4, p.7)

Destabilization, as they claim is the real threat that is caused by Iraq and his leader Saddam Hussein due to the production of weapons of mass destruction. Such product, as they claim, works against American and European interest and security. But this is a false one and even there is no need to send weapon inspectors ,since there is no WMD in Iraq and such a thing has been reported since 1991, but Bush and his team insisted on the opposite.³⁴

TENET: There's the water-cooler. This was taken by surveillance planes, so the quality is kind of grainy ... I think the CIA believes ...This might well be a plant which produces either chemical or biological materials for weapons manufacture. (Everyone is crowded around the photograph)

BUSH: Yeah. Yeah. (SH, sc.4, p. 7-8)

Bush and his administration made up a lie and believed it and did try to force others to accept it as a truth, while the history of weapons in Iraq is quite familiar for UN. During the 1980s, many Western companies primarily in Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, sold Iraq the key technological materials for its chemical, biological, missile and the nuclear programme.³⁵

And after Iraq' the invasion of his neighbour Kuwait in the first Gulf War, on April 3rd, 1991, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) started in its Resolution 687that "Iraq must destroy its presumed stock pile of WMD, and the means to produce them".³⁶But in August, 2002, in a very cunning way that has a Machiavellian schema, President Bush states that:

The Iraq regime has plotted to develop anthrax and nerve gas and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens, leaving the bodies of mother huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspection then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.³⁷

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (20)

on November 8th, 2002, The UN Resolution 1441 claimed that “ Iraq was still in material breach of other UN resolutions and gave Saddam one more chance to comply”.³⁸ Hence, the weapon inspectors, by the UN decision, reentered Iraq, and although the latter did not find any WMD, the US announced that Saddam was hiding WMD and had an active programme and production. As a matter of fact, US was gaining the power of propaganda that supported US when it was “gearing up” for war. Such propaganda gained global acceptance due to the appearance of terrorist organizations and the attack of September, 11th.

It is the power of propaganda that made many countries with the majority of their population, all go along with such “ill-conceived” decision of US-Iraq war. But the clue that can solve such exclamation is that Bush succeeded in his holding for the power of propaganda. He exploited the attack of September, 11th to rage the national anguish against Iraq when he fabricated the relation between Saddam Hussein’s regime and Al-Qaeda.³⁹ The claimed relation with Al-Qaeda and the announcement of the manipulated evidence for having WMD, did agitate more of the international anger against Iraq. Bush had gained great support for his “premeditated war” on Iraq.⁴⁰

BUSH: What kind of war plans do you have for Iraq? How do you feel about the war plan for Iraq? Let's get started on this. Get Tommy Franks looking at it. (SH, Sc.9, p.20)

“Don’t tell anyone else” is a statement that indicates Bush’s manipulation of power and his coercive diplomacy. The latter is “ the attempt to get a target, a state, a group (or groups) within a state, or a nonstate actor , to change its objectionable behavior through either the threat to use force or the actual use of limited force”.⁴¹ Bush’s coercive diplomacy is the major issue in *Stuff Happens* and it is examined in relation to Iraq, UN, Blair, Powell, and other characters.

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare who adopts verbatim principle, “ puts [characters] under microscope and invites the audience to learn for themselves”⁴², even the simplest traits (for example mention “Rice keeps two mirrors in her office”) have been highlighted in the text.

The major trait that has been focused upon is a coercive strategy and its major user is President George Bush, the junior. He is the top of the top men in his administration: Dick Cheney, Vice-president; Collin Powell; Secretary of State; Condoleezza Rice, National Security Advisor; Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense; Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense; as well as Tony Blair, the British Prime Minister,

Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the UN, and Hans Blix, the UN chief inspector.⁴³

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare introduces three types of character: the first type is the politicians who are the major world figures and they are the main characters whose presence formulates the base directions of the play's events. The second type is the narrator-actors who are the different nameless characters who occupy Shakespeare's chorus like position. This type of character is employed metatheatrically⁴⁴ to reveal the historical context of events, impart the character's background, to encapsulate the roles of the real politicians in the play, to give more flexible nature to the play in the sense that this character facilitates the transition between different scenes despite the variety and quake changeability of the setting. Moreover, these characters, meta narrators, who stand mid way between the politician and the audience, are interwoven in the scenes in order to offer extra information or an opinion that adds more to the understanding of the discussed issue.

BLAIR: It was late before I had any politics at all.

AN ACTOR: Tony Blair will go on to become the most successful Labour leader of all time, leading his party to three unparalleled election victories. (SH,sc.3, p.4)

The Third type is the fictional characters who are the five nameless figures who are thrown among the scenes: the angry journalist(in sc.5), the labour party politician (in sc.9), Palestinian academic(in sc.12), Briton in New York(in sc.18), and an Iraqi exile(in sc.24).

These fictional characters who are named by their social and functional design are employed to achieve a sort of equilibrium in the play by presenting many objective views that help the audience get the veiled truth dis-uttered by the real politician characters and also support the role of the narrator-actor by providing more information that cannot be left to the major characters since the play depicts real politician figures. As a matter of fact, such method of characterization explains the meta-theatrical world of the play that ascertains all the characters even the real political figures are just actors whose roles are predetermined by Bush (and dramatically then by Hare) as it is stated by the narrator-actor:⁴⁵

AN ACTOR: These are the actors, these are the men and women who will play parts in the opening drama of the new century.(SH,sc.3,p.4)

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (22)

Bush “utilizes” religion and power for his own ends. He claims that the decision of war springs from his Christian faith: “My faith frees me. Frees me to put the problem of the moment in proper perspective. Frees me to make decisions which others might not like... I am here because of the power of prayer.”(ST,sc.3,p.4) Bush also makes use of his authority and the power of his position to take any decision and no one can defy him or find an alternative option.⁴⁶

BUSH: I'm the commander - see, I don't need to explain. I don't need to explain why I say things. That's the interesting thing about being president. (SH,sc.3,p.5)

Bush's arrogance and his snappish behavior make him disregard the significance of the Secretary of State, Powell and his experience. Bush pays no attention to Powell's warning against the decision of invasion. But Powell's views are overwhelmed and conquered by Bush's power. In other words, the first one(in the play) who goes under Bush coercive diplomacy and his approach of “try and see” is Collin Powell.⁴⁷ “All of his life's experiences have shaped Collin Powell into the extraordinary leader, father, and man he is today. Through his humility and acts of honor and bravery, Colin Powell shows he deserves to wear the title ‘hero’.”⁴⁸ Such title is manipulated dramatically by Hare to be the tragic hero of *Stuff Happens*, but politically speaking he is the victim to Bush's sinister administration. He is the only person who observes the quack developing steps of Bush's administration ship toward war with worry and fury. He insists to obtain the international consensus and UN support, since he believes that the Middle East is a “tinder box”. He is a man of war, man of experience whose speech is a reflection of his skill:⁴⁹

POWELL: If we go into Iraq without a coalition and without the UN, then we're going to find ourselves in trouble. The whole region is a tinderbox. (SH, sc.11, p.36)

Truly, Powell advocates for peace pleas which have been overlooked by Bush who determinedly goes for war. Powell is the character whose war experience empowers him with moral power which is disrespected by others. He is like the Roman soldier whose sense of loyalty to his commander cannot be denied or forgotten at any condition. With full obeyed conduct, Powell makes the presentation before the UN (on the 5th of February, 2003) against the Iraqi WMD program.

(There is a silence. BUSH does not seem to be going to speak)

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (23)

POWELL: You want me to make this presentation?

BUSH: Sure. Sure I do, Colin. After all, remember? You told me you were on board. (SH, sc.20, p.76)

This presentation is a turning point in the dramatic growth of Powell's character: it is the real change in the fortune of this 'tragic hero'. The only rational and moral voice that shouts loudly to avoid war, now endorses that war. He shares others the case of deception. He follows Bush's intention of war and his wicked plan since there is no other choice. This case reminds the audience of Shakespeare's Othello(1603): Othello's insight is blackened by blind jealousy "that converts human nature into chaos, and liberates the beast in man".⁵⁰ Such situation may be experienced by anyone, regardless of time, race and culture since all human beings have the same structure. Man's areas of light like reasonableness, sincerity, humanity, and self-control easily extinguish if they are invaded by the surrounding darkness. So soon the structure falls down, as Othello whose destruction is mocked by Iago: "where's that Palace!".⁵¹ Othello could not defeat one Iago, so how Powell can resist and defy many Iagoes. But this character utters the truth during his private meeting with Bush and he intends to highlight the element of hypocrisy.

POWELL: There's an element of hypocrisy, George. We were trading with the guy! Not long ago. People keep asking, how do we know he's got weapons of mass destruction? How do we know? Because we've still got the receipts. (SH,sc.11, p.38)

Powell who is the play's spokesperson of reason, insight and logic, criticizes the rushing and uncontrolled behavior of Bush whose desire to grab hold of power will turn him into an idiot. Moreover, such arrogant diplomacy will lead America into loss, at least the loss of friends in such critical times.⁵²

POWELL: No. I want my country to be less arrogant...Three thousand of our citizens died. They died in an unforgivable attack. But that doesn't licence us to behave like idiots. If we reach the point where everyone is secretly hoping that America gets a bloody nose, then we're going to find it very hard indeed to call on friends when we need them. (SH,sc.11, p.38)

Focusing on the quote above, one can get an idea about Bush's hypocrisy which is his own policy as well of his father's, who only

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (24)

yesterday provided Saddam with weapons, money, and military intelligence during Iraq's war with Iran, and today tries to attack him.

The frank and sharp argument of Powell's presentation to prevent Bush from the decision of invasion has failed, and has proved no value. Consequently, he stresses the impossibility of invading Iraq without true allies who support America to get the sustain of UN:

POWELL: It'd be nice to pretend we even have a choice. It would be great to say we can invade Iraq unilaterally. Except we can't. We need access to bases, facilities. Overflight rights. For that you need allies. Not allies you buy, not allies you bribe: allies you can actually trust, because they believe in what you're doing and they're signed up to it. We need a coalition. And if that takes time, amen. And the only place to do it is at the UN. With the help of a new UN resolution.(SH,sc.11, p.38)

First, Powell stands against Tenet, as one of Bush's men, who uses an aerial photograph and tries to convince his colleagues that Iraq is having "a plant which produces either chemical or biological materials for weapons manufacture"(ST,sc.4, p.8). Powell believes that Tenet's saying is false since it is based on no evidence:

POWELL: I can see. But, to be frank, with you, I've seen an awful lot of factories around the world that look an awful lot like this. What's the evidence, what's the evidence of what this factory's producing?(SH,sc.4, p.8)

Tenet pursues his discussion and shows president Bush a dossier which contains "up to date information about terror organizations" and then ends his speech by this phrase: "this is a war on terror". The latter is welcomed most by Bush and also recommended by his alleged Rumsfeld and Cheney, who believe in their end that justifies their means, war.⁵³

RUMSFELD: I like what you said earlier, sir. A war on terror. That's good. That's vague.

CHENY: It's good.

RUMSFELD: That way we can do anything. (SH, sc.10, p.23)

"The War on Terror", Bush's slogan and the phrase with which he convinces all the members of his cabinet and then he succeeds in convincing the Congress with his decision of invasion: "Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists" (SH, sc.10 ,p.26)

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (25)

Unlike his father, George W. Bush, the 43th president of the United States, has a very apparent vision about his own foreign policy. "He asserted that the United States had a great and guiding goal: to turn this time of American influence into generations of democratic peace."⁵⁴ Bush as a quite rich eloquent character is able to convince all the cabinet members of his decision of the attack, but with Powell, Bush re-articulates his phrase once more to persuade and stimulate him forward in his mission of getting other countries to the subject of coalition.

BUSH: Sure. (BUSH nods) You know, Colin, finally this is a war on terror. And at some point we may be the only ones left.
(SH.sc.7,p.16)

But Powell is quite aware of such fabricated phrase that is used to cover the unfair motive for the invasion of Iraq. The conflict between Powell and Bush goes on, and Hare employs various means to clarify this conflict; one of which is the last monologue of Iraqi Exile, who also illuminates American diplomacy of coercion.⁵⁵

IRAQI EXILE: My family left Iraq 17 years ago. I longed for the fall of the dictator. In exile, I worked for it. Then Donald Rumsfeld said "Stuff happens." It seems to me the most racist remark I ever heard ... And now the American dead are counted, their numbers recorded, their coffins draped in flags. How many Iraqis have died? How many civilians? No figure is given. Our dead are uncounted. (SH, sc.24, p.86)

The Iraqi Exile who has been in exile for seventeen years, criticizes American war in Iraq objectively. The Iraqi citizen who describes his exile as a terrible experience, longs for "the fall of the dictator". He also explains satirically those who have led the war on Iraq, Bush and Blair: "They came to save us, but they had no plans". (SH, sc.24,p.86) He also criticizes Rumsfeld's "Stuff Happens" as a racist mark, then he comments on the death that visited both sides, with one difference, American dead are counted but the Iraqi's are not.

The Iraqi Exile tries to help others understand the meaning of loss, particularly that of human agency. He laments the death of Iraq who has been crucified twice: by Saddam's sins and the occupation.

Iraq suffers from many wounds and all Iraqi people resist the bitterness of failure since they have trusted the wrong persons, Saddam first and Bush second. Iraqi Exile tells the truth that the golden future is a mere dream that would not be fulfilled; hence, one has to be aware of the ugly reality after the invasion which embraces merely loss, death,

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (26)

ignorance, brutality and violence. People all over the world should see what Iraq Exile sees, and get more about Bush's coercive diplomacy against Iraq: 56

IRAQI EXILE: .. I mean, Iraq has been crucified. By Saddam's sins, by ten years of sanctions, by the occupation and now by the insurgency. Basically it's a story of a nation that has failed in only one thing. But it's a big sin. It failed to take charge of itself. And that meant the worst person in the country took charge. A country's leader is the country's own fault. I mean, people say to me "Look, tell America." I tell them: "You are putting your faith in the wrong person. Don't expect America or anybody will do it for you. "If you don't do it yourself, this is what you get."(SH, sc.24, p.86)

"[T] his is what you get.", all those who work for or deal with Bush, suffer and go under his coercive diplomacy like Powell who tries to imitate such coercive strategy with France's De Villepin who finds unclarity of purpose in the US's decision of invasion, then he expresses France's readiness to stand with US decision if the purpose is disarmament but not attack:57

DE VILLEPIN: "To work towards the disarmament of Iraq ... Forgive me, but there's a confusion here, isn't there? I listened attentively to your president's speech yesterday and I found this same confusion. It's as if, yes, you've decided to go through a process, but you haven't quite decided what the purpose of the process is.(SH,sc.15,p.49)

Powell stands against De Villepin's logic expression with a coercive style, and interrupts the discussion with few words. As he goes under the coercion, Powell is now practicing coercion on De Villepin and recurrently and in an arrogant style, celebrates the power of his country.

POWELL: Yes, America's a great power. In France, I don't know, you may wish for the day when it's no longer so. But with the best will in the world, I don't see that day arriving in the next few months. (POWELL reaches across and touches DE VILLEPIN'S wrist) Oh and by the way - About working together. If we do go for two resolutions - if - one for proof of disarmament, the other for war - I warn you now, don't vote for the first unless one day you're going to be ready to vote for a second. We'd take that very badly. (SH, sc.15, p.54)

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (27)

From the quote above, Powell is so fully coerced and now speaking with the same style that is used by Bush earlier. He advocates for war though he is against Bush's view of the war. Such passive "capitulation" as he says "I don't disagree"(SH, sc.p.32) represents the tragic flow in Powell's character as a tragic hero which is affirmed by Brain Clover words:

Hare tries to turn Powell into something like a Shakespearean tragic hero: the battle-hardened man of experience and integrity who stands alone in Bush's cabinet, but who later, and unaccountably buckles under and joins the rest of the gang. 58

Powell is portrayed as a tragic hero , as it is stressed once more by Bushra Juhi who concludes that: Powell is the only character who realizes the real cost and stupidity of war on Iraq, but at last he has been defeated by the brutal power of Bush who coerced Powell saying⁵⁹: "I didn't need his permission". (SH, sc.13 P.42)

As Bush succeeds in his control of Powell's discussion and views by his coercive diplomacy, such success is achieved once again against the UK authority, when Bush becomes able to win the consent of Blair and his people. On this line of attack, whenever they comment on Hare's *Stuff Happens*, the majority of critics state that "this is the play that interprets the Iraq war as mainly as power struggle between the United States and Great Britain in which the attacked country appears *secudery*".⁶⁰

Most likely, the British Parliament as well as the British public know the real motives of the invasion of Iraq and it is not a matter of war on terror as it is declared by Bush and his followers. Such fact is loudly announced by a British Senate, SIMPSON:

SIMPSON: Bush will hit Iraq much the same way that a drunk will hit a bottle - to satisfy his thirst for power and oil. I must tell the Prime Minister that the role of a friend in such circumstances is not to pass the drunk the bottle! (SH, sc.16, p.55)

The Americans are ready to attack Iraq and remove Saddam and his regime, but the British cannot unless it proves legal. Blair looks for evidence even if it is a fabricated one to let Britain follow America's step in this war.

BLAIR: Real and imminent, George. If Britain is involved, we will need evidence that Iraq can and will launch a nuclear,

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (28)

biological or chemical attack on a Western country. We can't go to war because of what we fear. Only because of what we know.(SH, sc.10, p.26)

“what we know” is that Iraq has no WMD, Blix and Elbaradei assure for Blair and Bush, of this truth UN is turned into “kidnapping business”(SH, sc.16,p59.) . Blair, argues that “ It isn’t Blix’s job to find the weapons,...it’s Saddam’s job to prove they’ve been destroyed”.(ST, sc.17, p.63). Blair looks for anything that can support his stand with the American decision of attack, and he has been completely contained by Bush to the extent that when he has been asked by the journalist , Bush has answered on his:61

The prime minster and I, of course , talked about Iraq. We both recognize the danger of a man who’s willing to kill his own people harboring and developing weapons of mass destruction. This guy, Saddam Hussein, is the leader who gases his own people. (SH,sc.10 P.30)

But the British say that “ Well you haven’t found the weapons, so you can’t be going to war”(SH,sc.10p.32) Hence, the British Prime Minster is in great dilemma and he tells Bush frankly: that he “promised the British people: no war without the UN” (SH, sc.17,p.63). As a fact, Blair tries to do everything that pleases Bush and not his own British people:

BLAIR: ... I’ve worked- I’ve worked now for over eighteen months to help you on this, Georg, I’ve risked everything, I’ve been at your side from beginning to end. (SH, sc.11 P.34)

Blair’s conduct makes the audience recall Shakespeare’s Hamlet, as they find the echo of Polonius, Lord Chamberlain, in Blair’s character. Polonius says and does everything to please the cunning king, Claudius whose manipulative nature is well reflected in the following lines:

Claudius: With fiery quickness: therefore prepare thyself;
The bark is ready, and the wind at help,
The associates tend, and everything is bent
For England.62

“For Iraq”, Blair now follows the same steps to win Bush’s approval. Despite the conflict between his own loyalty to his own government and that of Bush, Blair yields willingly to the latter. Hence, Blair like Powell has been coerced by Bush, and yields into war’s decision⁶³ he recurrently stresses that “ British parliament won’t go along without UN support” (SH, sc.17 P.63).

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (29)

UN is the third party that goes under the employment of Bush's coercive diplomacy. Blair is the first thinking mind who attracts Bush's attention toward the significance of UN support in the invasion of Iraq. On the other hand, Powell adds more to this support by a kind of powerful arrogant style. "POWELL: At this table we hold the future of the UN in our hands." (SH.sc.15,p.48)

To convince the UN of his own stand against Saddam, Bush uses Cheney to negotiate with Hans Blix and Mohamed Elbaradei as a means to win the support of UN after Powell's failure in this mission.⁶⁴

AN ACTOR: Hans Blix and his colleague Mohamed Elbaradei are invited to the White House.

CHENEY: You know, we're sure there are weapons there. I don't think you're going to have any trouble finding them. And if you do have any trouble, understand, we're ready to discredit you. (SH,sc.16, p.56)

Although Cheney threatens both Blix and Elbaradei who work for the UN as members of the International Atomic Energy Agency(IAEA), yet in highly cunning way, Bush welcomes Blix and Elbaradei, and by means of "carrot and stick"⁶⁵ supports their mission that is reinforced by UN:

(BUSH gets up from behind the desk to shake hands. POWELL hovers) BUSH: It's a great honour to meet you both. I'm honoured to meet you, sir... A lot of things get said, there's a lot of noise in the air, hyperventilation, this is - you know - stuff that goes on. I tune it out. I don't listen. They say I'm a mad Texan bent on war. That's not so. That's what I wanted to say to you. I want to go through the UN and I want him disarmed.

BLIX: I'm happy to hear that.

BUSH: You can be assured, Mr. Blix, you've got the force of the United States behind you.

BLIX: Yes. (SH,sc.16,pp56-57)

"Yes", is one highly powerful tool that has been employed in this war. Blix utters the word that Bush and Blair look after while Elbaradei keeps silent. This silence indicates the passivity of Arabs who have been subjected by the western Great Powers: US and UK. The Arabs are given no role in any decisive issue in the world, even if it is that of their own life and culture. Bush, Blair and their administrations are in need for the agreement of other countries on the decision of attack and the big "yes"

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (30)

that they look for is that of UN, which apparently sets the decision of war. The war decision is Bush's, and UN must provide the signature.⁶⁶

BUSH: The only mistake you could make is to imagine that when you come to report, it's you that's making the decision. About whether to take further action.

BLIX: Of course not. I agree with you. That's not my role.

BUSH: No. It isn't you that makes that decision. It's me.

RICE: Yes. We're proposing some sort of philosophical agreement. On paper. A signed agreement. About what you're going to do. And the way you're going to do it.(SH,sc.16,p.57)

As an answer to the request of UN, Iraq sends Forty-three spiral-bound volumes of documents that contain everything that is connected with chemical industry in Iraq, at all its factories that have a role in the project of armory and its system in Iraq.

AN ACTOR: Within the required week, Iraq re-admits inspectors and commits to producing a full description of their chemical facilities within thirty days. On December 7th, General Hassam Muhammad Amin has a photo-call.

AN ACTOR: Piled on a table are 43 spiral-bound volumes of documents, containing 12,159 pages, 6 folders, 12 CD-roms.

BLIX: To be honest, I was happy for the document to go first to Washington. They have the logistical capacity to make 15 copies of 12,000 pages. We don't. (ST,sc.17,p.62)

Bush insists on his claim that Iraq has WMD and such piece of information is a fact that is based on solid intelligence. This conclusion is summed up after a long work by UN inspectors. Bush, however, does not allow the latter to complete their work in Iraq, and by such behavior, the American cabinet undermines the power of UN publically.⁶⁷

RUMSFELD: The United Nations has no power, nor is it meant to.

POWELL: Of course not.

RUMSFELD: I know why we're going to war. And so do you, Colin. Because the man is a lunatic and we can't afford the risk that one day he might team up with terrorists. (ST, sc.20,p.72)

“might team up with terrorist” is the other powerful tool that is handled by America to get the support of UN and of all members in its

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (31)

coalition but France. On February 24th 2003, France votes with sharp “no” to the decision of war on Iraq.

CHIRAC: My position is that whatever the circumstances France will vote "no," because she considers tonight that there are no grounds for waging war. (SH, sc.22, p.78) .

France insists on her front after the frank announcement of Blix of no existence of any weapon of mass destruction in Iraq. As a result of such announcement, Blix has been relieved of his position since he does not fulfill Bush’s demands, and the most significant consequence is that “ the US launches its premeditated war against Iraq”, the war that is proved to be a foolish step done by a stupid leader. It is obviously known that in the run-up to the Iraq War, the American government does act according to their own will, and pays no attention to the international law, UN or even the Security Council, and did the invasion on March 20th , 2003.⁶⁸

Later on, after the horrible war and the painful fall of Baghdad, exactly on June,4th 2003, Bush who has been set to journalistic conference, says that it is the Devine Power that motivated him to attack the terrorists like Al-Qaeda and Saddam.

BUSH: God told me to strike Al-Qaeda and I strike them, and then He instructed me to strike at Saddam, which I did. (SH,sc.23p.85)

Bush utilizes his own position and religion, and did follow his thirsty desire for power with no regard to the cost. He is the hellish image of Machiavelli. As stated by Iraqi Exile, he is the tyrannical president that does not suit the position he occupies:

IRAQI EXILE: A country's leader is the country's own fault. I mean, people say to me "Look, tell America." I tell them: "You are putting your faith in the wrong person. Don't expect America or anybody will do it for you. "If you don't do it yourself, this is what you get." (SH, sc.24, p.86)

These closing words of Iraqi Exile highlight the frustration of both the American who put the control of their state at the hands of Bush, and the Iraqis who expect him to save them from the dictator Saddam and build them a glimmering future. The image of Christ-like figure that is created by Bush is a false one. People all over the world are aware of the reality of Iraq war that is launched by Bush for the sake of his personal motives.

POWELL: We invade Iraq, the whole region can be destabilized. Friends of ours like Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan - all going to be put in danger. The oxygen's going to be sucked out of everything the United States is trying to do - not just the war on terror - every other diplomatic, defence and intelligence arrangement we have. And the economic implications are staggering - not least on the price of oil. (SH,sc.11, p.37)

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare reflects his own exercise of the historian craft whose writing exemplifies Said's Discourse of Orientalism. Hare, like many Europeans, feels he is "empowered to study the Orient from a European point of view and an intellectual template".⁶⁹ In short, Orientalism [is] a Western style for dominating a restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. Hare's *Stuff Happens* focuses on the two major western powers, the US and Britain, and how they bargained their path to war.⁷⁰

It is true that Hare in this play writes about the debate summary of the imperialistic attitude to the Middle East, and to Iraq in particular, but the appearance of Arab figures on the stage is so little or rare. For example, the character of Saddam has only one speech in the play where he apologizes for any perceived offense. On the contrary, Bush's character dominates the play world as he does in the real one.⁷¹

AN ACTOR: Saddam Hussein makes a statement on Iraqi television:

SADDAM H (speaks in Arabic, a translator renders it in English): We apologize to God about any act which has angered him in the past, and that was held against us and we apologize to the Kuwaitis on the same basis. (SH, sc.17,p.62)

Dramatically speaking, in *Stuff Happens*, Hare manipulates the techniques of verbatim theatre "which is credible platform upon which the fiction of believability is erected"⁷² in relation to the classic Aristotelian matrix.

First, *Stuff Happens* is based on the actual events that lead up to the invasion of Iraq by US and British forces in 2003, manipulates dialogue that is taken from speeches, interviews, transcripts, photographs, and parliamentary records.. In other words, *Stuff Happens* imparts history on the stage when its characters incarnate public figures authentically. They are real figures whose words realistically represent the events that occurred in real life.⁷³

Considerably, Hare quotes his play's language from an actual data, and he employs the verbatim technique in his play in a distinctive style that adopts documentary approach. More can get about Hare's verbatim style by examining the fundamental elements of the play like plot and setting.

Plot, generally speaking, means how the events of the story happen, and since this play is based on a classic Aristotelian plot, one has to know the definition of plot according to Aristotle and its aspects as well. Plot, to Aristotle, is "the structure of incidents" whose presentation on the stage is distinguished by the following aspects: magnitude (it has a beginning, middle, and a conclusion), reversals (it is a complex plot whose action is changed into its opposite), recognition (A change from ignorance into knowledge, and naturally defined in relation to good fortune or misfortune), and the last aspect Aristotelian plot is suffering which refers to the destructive and painful action like the agony, wound or death.⁷⁴

Hare's *Stuff Happens* is based on an arrangement of the incidents that incorporate well known facts leading up to that invasion. This play's plot is principally rooted in the action of a group of characters: George Bush and his team of advisors. What has been excluded from this play has raised many inquiries and at the same time adds more to the author's typical style. This play is about the invasion of Iraq in 2003, but there is no single scene in the play set in Iraq, and Iraq's leadership is absent from the play's characters. So how one can trust the verbatim sense in the play which is based on the historical record and genuine data. significantly, the disappearance of Iraq's land and its leadership is done intentionally by the author to highlight the passivity of Iraqis whose fate is controlled by more powerful nations, and also to assure that the play is not about what went on in Iraq, it is not what stuff happens.⁷⁵

According to the plot's magnitude, the play starts with the description of highly political opinions of investigating war till its arrival to the decision of going to war. As for recognition, it has been fulfilled in the play at "the moment when the audience know that the invasion of Iraq is inevitable, which is also the moment when Powell, opposed to the invasion has been defeated":⁷⁶

POWELL: In fact, there's a thousand questions nobody wants to consider, let alone answer. How will we be received? By the Iraqis themselves? And once we go, how long will we stay? If you go into Iraq, you're going to be the proud owner of

25 million people. Their lives. All their hopes and aspirations.
All their problems. Has anyone begun to think about that? (SH,
sc.11, p.37)

Stuff Happens conforms to the form of verbatim theatre in its mixture of dramatic characters with full account of what the real ones said and did in a classically constructed Aristotelian plot. But, Stuff Happens can also be enlisted under documentary theatre and not the verbatim one which is “an umbrella term for a wide variety of documentary forms that share a technique related specifically to the ‘verbatim’ nature of the origins of the text spoken in the play”,⁷⁷ one can go through the lines that Hare stated in his interview with Eleanor Wachtel of the CBC’s Writers & Company.

HARE: I hate verbatim theatre myself...in which people come in a pious sort of way and address the audience...and we’re meant to feel a sense of righteousness...

WACHTEL: Verbatim Theatre, is that what we used to call oral history...?

HARE: Yes...there’s a lot of that kind of documentary theatre, which always gives me a pain in the neck...It’s good for a writer to be rebuked by reality...to have your view of the world refreshed by actually talking to people...[it’s] a reminder of complexity....⁷⁸

In Stuff Happens, Hare creates complexity out of reality plus fiction. Hare is the playwright who uses verbatim and does not write verbatim play. In other words, “Hare’s concern is verbatim techniques, the transcripts, the interviews, are all tools, and his overall goal is to break up the form in the service of creating something unique”.⁷⁹ In Stuff Happens, Hare tries to fashion a new drama that is well clarified by Chris Megson:

A drama based on fact that resonates beyond its localized historical context. The play traces the high-octane political and diplomatic manoeuvrings on either side of the Atlantic in the build-up to war in Iraq, intermixing verbatim scenes of direct address with imagined dialogue shaped by off-the-record interviews and documentation from multiple sources.⁸⁰

The uniqueness of Hare’s style can be more realized by examining the structure of Stuff Happens. The play has an epic structure that is indicated first in the cluster of scenes that have started with the actor-

narrator who states his own point of view to the audience whom he addresses directly. The second indication is the employment of the View point characters. These characters remind the audience that what they are watching is a play and help them to realize the lesson of the play. The lesson of power that is dramatized in an epic style that explains what power offers to countries and men when it is held in a hand of Machiavellian who describes himself a war-president.

The major communication among the main characters is the narrative medium that runs through dialogue with field of multimedia: the acoustic (verbal, musical or sound scope) and the visual (set, costumes, banners), and by such kind of communication Hare follows Bush's step of the desire of enhancing the meaning in a kind of art that does not intend to express reality rather to signify it.⁸¹ Brecht in his epic theatre is primarily concerned with understanding the meaning of/and capturing the illusion of reality. In Brecht's epic theatre, breaking the illusion of reality is an essential theatricality which is "the average conception of what is artistically 'real' [depending] on the prevailing culture and temper of the times."⁸² In brief, Hare follows Brecht's step in the intention of obtaining epic realism whose major goal is to make the audience aware of the presence of the characters on the stage, and regard them as mere actors who belong to the same world where they sit. So, Hare like Brecht, seeks the effect of alienation instead of identification.⁸³

Hare finds in epic structure the best means for his treatment of the theme of power. In *Stuff Happens*, he adopts the great Shakespearean theme of power as he stated that in his interview with Eleanor Wachtel in 2010:

It's [*Stuff Happens*] the great Shakespearean theme which is that power has its own way and will always have its way, and will always have its way... you know one thing Shakespeare is not an anarchist...he imposes themselves over the person who doesn't....⁸⁴

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare emphasizes power in all its different types and matrixes, particularly that of nations, or that of freedom and security, and how all can be handed by America. In other words, there is/are certain nation/ nations that by its/their decision(s) can influence others and make more impact on the rest of the world.

BUSH: ...All nations should know: America will do whatever is necessary to ensure our nation's security. I will not

wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer. History has called America and our allies to action. Steadfast in our purpose, we now press on. We have known freedom's price. We have shown freedom's power. And in this great conflict, my fellow American's, we will see freedom's victory. (SH,sc.10,p.22)

Interestingly, the theme has been achieved by the character's ability of "meaning creation". Situations are skillfully dramatized to arrive at the main theme of the play "power will have its way", and it is the vehicle that is adopted by Hare to reveal the truth of the US's decision of the invasion of Iraq. Such truth is mediated within the dramatic text, that is rendered into a complex one.⁸⁵The complexity of *Stuff Happens* is related to the special treatment of language like that in Pinter's who gives much power to words over action. Hare is not an exception, he pays much attention to the "dialogic speech" for the sake of his search for the truth and in its both types: monological truth (the statement that is announced by pope or the president) and dialogical truth (It is the truth that emerges in the midst of undirected intersections of various characters' voices, so it involves struggle and contradiction):⁸⁶

Like Shakespeare, Hare manipulates the historical objectionable data in a clear "methodical activity" in a distinctive style that makes his history play, *Stuff Happens*, to be seen as a verbatim one. Captivatingly, the employment of historical objectivity is one of the major technique of verbatim theatre, but at the same time, it is part of the theatricality of Epic theatre where historical narrative is so important. ⁸⁷

The use of history is one of the most evident distancing conventions of techniques in Epic theatre. Moreover, the great mobility of the action of play in the progress of shifting from scene to scene, as the shift from the White House to Downing Street, to the United Nation, to many other localities and the quack 'overlapping' in dialogue within a moment mark another similarity to epic theatre and its epic structure. Due to the adaptation of epic structure, the events of *Stuff Happens* must be narrated in an epic time which is named by Aristotle as "Unbounded Time" which is achieved when the events of days, months, years and decades are experienced in "the interventions of scenes that leap forward and backward".⁸⁸ Such aspect is achieved in *Stuff Happens* that addresses the audience directly, telling them what will happen next and also narrate off stage actions. Moreover, Hare adopts epic technique of time and space to span his world play of power which is supported by

contemporary setting of The White House and Downing Street that evokes images of power in their being.

Interestingly, the scope of Iraq war is so wide, broad, and complex that no text can possibly cover its details and no author can introduce “an overarching perspective”. David Hare did his best to focus on US-Iraq war: the war that is based on power and it is set for the sake of power.

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare who tries to introduce a unique political play that springs out the mixture of various schools of drama: Aristotelian, Shakespearean, epic, absurd, meta theatre, documentary and the verbatim one, presents a debate summery of the US-Iraq war. He tackles US imperialistic attitude to the Middle East in general, and to Iraq in particular. This play shows US attempts to achieve the global power and achieve the American dream of being “the solo pole of power”.

Dramatically *Stuff Happens* contextualizes history in dramatic form and interprets US-Iraq War as mainly a power struggle. It revolves around the powerful impact of certain political figures, like Bush, Blair and their administrations on the private lives. In brief: *Stuff Happens* is built to show how Iraq and Iraqis are put in the center of power competition.

ملخص البحث

وصفت الدراما الحربية المعاصرة بأنها رد فعل على المعاناة العميقة التي نشأت عن الحرب التي، لسوء الحظ، أصبحت اللغة العليا للاتصال في العصر الحديث. وبالتالي، فإن المسرح السياسي الانكليزي المعاصر قد أظهر ترابطاً فريداً بين الدراما والسياسة: فالاهتمام بالحرب بين الولايات المتحدة والعراق ليس استثناء في الواقع. الكاتب المسرحي البريطاني، ديفيد هير، ينتمي إلى اتجاه الدراما الحربية التي تمكن العالم من رؤية الحقيقة والصدمة والعنف في الحرب الأمريكية في العراق. الأشياء تحدث تساعد وبمهارة لتبين كيف أن الولايات المتحدة وظفت الدبلوماسية القسرية لتلاعب الدول الأخرى لتحقيق المذهب الجديد: “القرن الأمريكي الجديد”. في الأشياء تحدث، هير يتوثق تاريخ العراق المأساوي الأخير في مثل هذا النهج الذي يمزج الفيلم الوثائقي مع الخيالية لعرض الأحداث من عام ٢٠٠٠، حتى الغزو الفعلي للعراق في آذار ٢٠٠٣. المسرحية تتبع أصول الحرب الأمريكية في العراق وتكشف النقاب

عن كل المحاولات والإجراءات التي اتخذها بوش وفريق أدارته لغزو العراق. وتركز هذه الدراسة بشكل رئيسي على عنصر القوة الذي يميز دوافع القادة الأمريكيين والسعي المتواصل للسلطة. أن الأشياء تحدث لهير، ومع ذلك، تضع سياقه لإستراتيجية بوش القسرية فيما يتعلق بالعراق، فضلا عن التلاعب به من الأمم المتحدة، بلير، باول، وشخصيات أخرى للمساعدة في تحقيق أهدافه.

NOTES

- 1Frederick Douglass, *Autobiographies : Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, (Newyork: Library of America, 1994) , 33.
- 2Goerge Orwell, *Third World Traveler*, Part Three, (New York: Plume printing, 1984), 234.
- 3 Cited in Partick A Palmieri, Susan M. Lee, & Jean Watson, *Global Advances in Human Caring Literacy*(New York: Springer Publishing Company,LLC, 2016), 180.
- 4Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary &Thesaurus.(Cambridge University Press, 1988).s.v. "power".
- 5.Robert A. Dahl, *The Concept of Power*, (Yale University, Department of Political Science, 2007), 16.
- 6 Joshus C.Goldstein, *International Relations* (New York: Peason Longman, 2005), 107.
- 7Raymond Hinnebusch, *The US Invasion of Iraq: Explanations and Implications* (Scotland; St. Andrews University, 2007), 213.
- 8Ibid, 214.
- 9Ibid, 224.
- 10Shareef Mohammed Jalal Majeed, *President George W. Bush's Policy Towards Iraq: Change or Continuity?* Published (Ph.D dissertation, Durham University, 2010), 66.
- 11Hinnebusch, 224.
- 12Ibid, 290.
- 13Ibid, 210.
- 14 Quoted by Gabriel Palmer Fernandez, *Case Study: The Iraq War of 2003*, (Youngstown State University, 2005), 61.
- 15 (Quoted by)Ibid, 62.
- 16(Quoted by)Ibid, 61.
- 17(Quoted by)Ibid, 65.
- 18 Raymond W. Copson, *Iraq War: Background and Issues Overview Updated April 22, 2003.*, Report for Congress Received through the CRS Web Order Code RL31715, 4.
- 19 Fernandez ,64.

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (39)

- 20 Kelly Oliver, *Women as Weapons of War: Iraq, Sex, and the Media*.(New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 153.
- 21 Julia Boll, *The Unlisted Character: On the Representation of War and Conflict on the Contemporary Stage*, Unpublished (Ph.D Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2011), 91.
- 22 Ibid, 168.
- 23 David Hare, *Stuff Happens* (London: Faber and Faber, 2004), (sc.2 P.1) All the textual references of this play within this study are taken from this edition and will be cited within the body of the study.
- 24 Marjie Chud, *Stuff Happens: Study Guide* http://naccnaca-education-pdf.s3.amazonaws.com/9824-stuff_happens_-_study_guide.pdf accessed on 2-8-2016, 4.
- 25 Chris Megson, *Verbatim Practices in Contemporary Theatre: Symposium Report*, (Royal Holloway, University of London, 2016), An e-mail copy was sent by the author Chris Megson on February 18,2016, 32.
- 26 cited in Ibid, 33.
- 27 John B. Alterman, “Stuff Happens and reconstructing the past”www.theatre_studies_stuff_happens.com accessed on 22-9-2016.
- 28 quoted by Khaled S. Sirwah, *Coercive Diplomacy in David Hare’s Stuff Happens* (2004), in *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, vol.62, Sc. Press Ltd. Switzerland, 2015. 74.
- 29 Quoted by David Dadge, *The War in Iraq and Why the Media Failed Us*, (London, Praeger Publishers, 2006), 13.
- 30 Ibid, 74.
- 31 Cited in Toby Harnden, *Democracy in Iraq “Could Reshape the Middle East”* (2003)[online]. The Telegraph, Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/1421386/Democracy-in-Iraq-could-reshape-the-Middle-East.html> [Accessed 26-8-2016].
- 32 Chud,8.
- 33 Quoted by Copson, 7.
- 34 Joy G. Jakobsen “the Game Is Over: Why did the United States Invade Iraq in 2003?” www.iraq_war_study_game_violence.com .accessed on 2-7-2016.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 News Archive , GerogeW.Bush speech on August,2002. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/08/> accessed on 24-9-2016.
- 37 Ibid
- 38 Cited in Jakobsen.
- 39 Chud, 8.

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (40)

- 40 Paul R. Pillar, "The Iraq War and the Power of Propaganda" <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/the-iraq-war-the-power-propaganda-5887> accessed on 12-7-2016.
- 41 Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, s.v. "Coercive Diplomacy" https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/coercive_diplomacy accessed on 23-9-2016
- 42 Chris Megson and Dan Rebelato, Theatre and anti –Theatre :To David Hare and Public Speaking, August 12, 2007, An e-mail copy was sent by the author Chris Megson on February 18, 2016 , the same copy is posted latter on www.CUUK1117B-Boon.com.
- 43 E.G. Salih, H. Kaur, M.F. Hassan, David Hare's Stuff Happens: Dramatic Journey of American War on Iraq in International Letters of Social and Humanistic Science, vol. 67, 2016, 59.
44. 'metatheatre' is a dramatic genre which does not necessarily involve plays within plays or other sorts of direct theatrical self-reflexions, but instead has characters engage in their own dramatization, acting as playwrights, directors and/or actors within the play. It describes the aspects of a play that draw attention to its nature as a drama or theatre, or to the circumstances of its performance.
Tobin Nellhaus, Theatre, Communication, Critical Realism, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 59.
- 45 Iris Winston, "Stuff Happens: A Well-supported Production Worth Seeing" in Capitol Critics' Circle (CCC): Reviewing Theatre in Canada: Capitol Region. February 9, 2015.
- 46 Jay M. Gipson-King, "The Path to 9/11 vs. Stuff Happens: Media and Political Efficacy in the War on Terror", in Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism. vol. xxiv, no.2, Spring 2010, 156.
- 47 Sirwah, 79.
- 48 Cited in Jacobs Robert. "Colin Powell." Great Lives From History: The Twentieth Century: 1. Biography Reference Center, (London: Saleem Press, 2008), 67.
- 49 Bushra Juhi, "Stuff Happens: David Hare's Iraq War Drama", in Al-Mustansiriya Journal of Arts. September 22, 2011, Issue 55, 18.
- 50 A.C. Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy. (New York: St. Martin's Press. 1966), 144.
- 51 Clifford Leech & T.W. Craik ed. The Reveals History of Drama in English vol. III 1570-1613. (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1975), 411.
- 52 Sirwah, 82.
- 53 Dudge, 54.
- 54 Majeed, 72.
- 55 Sirwah, 82.
- 56 Ibid, 83.

Dramatic Responses to US-Iraq War (41)

- 57 Winston.
- 58 Brain Clover, "'Stuff Happens' :Curtain Up" The Internet Theatre Magazine of Reviews, Features, Annotated Listing. 6th November 2004, Retrived June 18, 2012.
- 59 Juhi, 12.
- 60 Clover.
- 61 Karolina Golimowska , "Transatlantic Miscommunication in David Hare's Drama Stuff Happens" in COPAS- Current Objectives of Postgraduate American Studies, vol. 13, 1-14, Retrieved June 20, 2013, 7.
- 62 William Shakespeare, Hamlet,(New York: Bartleby Press, 2001), (IV,iii,48-51)
- 63 Sirwah, 84.
- 64 Ibid,
- 65 "Carrot and Stick" is the idiom which belongs to the traditional motivation theory. It describes the realist concept of 'hard power' and refers to "the policy of offering a combination of rewards and punishment to induce behavior".
Cambridge Idioms Dictionary, 2nd ed.(Cambridge University Press 2006).s.v. "Carrot and Stick".
- 66 Paul Stuart "The Power of Yes: A Serious Indication of Capitalism/ David Hare at the National Theatre" in International Committee of the Fourt International (ICFI), vol.12, no.5, 22 December 2009.
- 67 Copson,16.
- 68 Kirstin Innes, " Ongoing Iraq Drama with Real-Life Characters" in Traverse Theatre, list.co.uk , July 21, 2009.
- 69 Boll, 55.
- 70 Sirwah,75.
- 71 Ibid, 76.
- 72 Laurie Fyffe , Political Theatre Post 9/11: The Age of Verbatim, of Testimony, & of Learning from Fictional Worlds. published (MA Thesis,Canada, University of Ottawa :November, 2010), 44.
- 73 Ibid,33.
- 74 Ibid,42.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid,43.
- 77 Suzanne Little, In and Out of Tune with Reality: Opposed Strategies of Documentary Theatre, published(M.A. Thesis, University of Otago, 2010)13.
- 78 Eleanor Wachtel, An Interview with David Hare. CBC's Writers & Company ,7 February,2010
http://www.subversivetheatre.org/productions/Stuff_happens/related_hare_interview.htmaccessed on 23-8-2016.

79 Ibid.

80 Megson, 371.

81 Mark Fortier, *Theatre Theory: An Introduction*. (Routledge, 2005), p.29.

82 John Gassner, *Direction in Modern Theatre and Drama: Form and Idea in Modern Theatre*, an expanded edition (New York: Holt Richard and Winston Inc, 1966), 113.

83 Eric Bentley (ed.) *The Theory of Modern Stage: An introduction to Modern Theatre and Drama*, (New York: Penguin Books, 1984), 91.

84 Wachtel.

85 Fyffe, 58.

86 Philip Auslander, *Theory for Performance Studies*, (New York: Taylor & Francis LTD, 2008), 41.

87 Ibid. 44.

88 Ibid, 54.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alterman, John B. *"Stuff Happens and reconstructing the past"* www.theatre_studies_stuff_happens.com accessed on 22-9-2016.
- Auslander, Philip . *Theory for Performance Studies*, New York: Taylor & Francis LTD, 2008.
- Bentley, Eric (ed.). *The Theory of Modern Stage: An introduction to Modern Theatre and Drama*, New York: Penguin Books, 1984.
- Boll, Julia *The Unlisted Character: On the Representation of War and Conflict on the Contemporary Stage*, Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2011.
- Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. New York: St.Martin' Press.1966.
- Chud, Marjie. *Stuff Happens: Study Guide* http://naccnaca-education-pdf.s3.amazonaws.com/9824-stuff_happens_-_study_guide.pdf accessed on 2-8-2016.
- Clover, Brain. *"'Stuff Happens' :Curtain Up"* *The Internet Theatre Magazine of Reviews, Features, Annotated Listing*. 6th November 2004, Retrived June 18, 2012
- Copson, Raymond W. *Iraq War: Background and Issues Overview* Updated April 22, 2003., Report for Congress Received through the CRS Web Order Code RL31715.
- Dadge, David. *The War in Iraq and Why the Media Failed Us*, London, Praeger Publishers, 2006, 13.
- Dahl, Robert A. *The Concept of Power*, Yale University, Department of Political Science, 2007.
- Douglass, Fredrick. *Autobiographies : Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, New York: Library of America, 1994.

- Fernandez, Gabriel Palmer. *Case Study: The Iraq War of 2003*, Youngstown State University, 2005.
- Fyffe, Laurie. *Political Theatre Post 9/11: The Age of Verbatim, of Testimony, & of Learning from Fictional Worlds*. Published MA Thesis, Canada, University of Ottawa :November, 2010.
- Fortier, Mark. *Theatre Theory: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2005.
- Gassner, John. *Direction in Modern Theatre and Drama: Form and Idea in Modern Theatre*, an expanded edition ,New York: Holt Richard and Winston Inc, 1966.
- Gipson-King, Jay M. “The Path to 9/11 vs. *Stuff Happens*: Media and Political Efficacy in the War on Terror”, in *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism*. vol. xxiv, no.2, Spring 2010, 156.
- Goldstein, Joshus C. *International Relations* ,New York: Peason Longman, 2005.
- Golimowska, Karolina. “Transatlantic Miscommunication in David Hare’s *Drama Stuff Happens*” in *COPAS- Current Objectives of Postgraduate American Studies*, vol. 13, 1-14, Retrieved June 20, 2013.
- Hare, David. *Stuff Happens* .London: Faber and Faber, 2004.
- Harnden, Topy. *Democracy in Iraq “Could Reshape the Middle East”* (2003)[online]. The Telegraph, Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/1421386/Democracy-in-Iraq-could-reshape-the-Middle-East.html> [Accessed 26-8-2016].
- Hinnebusch, Raymond. *The US Invasion of Iraq: Explanations and Implications* .Scotland; St. Andrews University, 2007.
- Innes, Kirstin. “ *Ongoing Iraq Drama with Real-Life Characters*” in *Traverse Theatre*, list.co.uk , July 21, 2009.
- Jakobsen, Joy G. “the Game Is Over: Why did the United States Invade Iraq in 2003?” www.iraq_war_study_game_violence.com .accessed on 2-7-2016.
- Juhi, Bushra. “*Stuff Happens: David Hare’s Iraq War Drama*”, in *Al-Mustansiriya Journal of Arts*. September 22, 2011, Issue 55.
- Leech, Clifford & T.W. Craik, T.W. ed. *The Reveals History of Drama in English* vol.III 1570-1613. London: Methuen &Co Ltd,1975.
- Little, Suzanne. *In and Out of Tune with Reality: Opposed Strategies of Documentary Theatre*, published M.A. Thesis, University of Otago, 2010.
- Majeed, Shareef Mohammed Jalal. *President George W. Bush’s Policy Towards Iraq: Change or Continuity?* Published Ph.D dissertation, Durham University, 2010.
- Megson, Chris. *Verbatim Practices in Contemporary Theatre: Symposium Report*, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2016, An e-mail copy was sent by the author Chris Megson on February 18,2016.

- Megson, Chris and Dan Rebelato, Dan. *Theatre and anti –Theatre :To David Hare and Public Speaking*, August 12, 2007, An e-mail copy was sent by the author Chris Megson on February 18, 2016 , the same copy is posted latter on www.CUUK1117B-Boon.com.
- Nellhaus, Tobin. *Theatre, Communication, Critical Realism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Oliver, Kelly. *Women as Weapons of War: Iraq, Sex, and the Media*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Orwell, George. *Third World Traveler*, Part Three, New York: Plume printing, 1984.
- Palmieri, Partick A. , Lee, Susan M., & Watson, Jean. *Global Advances in Human Caring Literacy*. New York: Springer Publishing Company LLC, 2016.
- Pillar, Paul R. “*The Iraq War and the Power of Propaganda*”<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/the-iraq-war-the-power-propaganda-5887> accessed on 12-7-2016
- Salih, E.G. , Kaur, H. , Hassan, M.F. *David Hare’s Stuff Happens: Dramatic Journey of American War on Iraq in International Letters of Social and Humanistic Science*, vol. 67, 2016, 59.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*, New York: Bartleby Press, 2001.
- Sirwah, Khaled S. *Coercive Diplomacy in David Hare’s Stuff Happens* (2004), in *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, vol.62, Sc. Press Ltd. Switzerland, 2015.
- Stuart, Paul. “*The Power of Yes: A Serious Indication of Capitalism/ David Hare at the National Theatre*” in *International Committee of the Fourt International (ICFI)*, vol.12, no.5, 22 December 2009.
- Wachtel, Eleanor. An Interview with David Hare. CBC’s Writers & Company ,7 February,2010 http://www.subversivetheatre.org/productions/Stuff_happens/related_hare_interview.htmaccessed on 23-8-2016.
- Winston, Iris. “*Stuff Happens: A Well-supported Production Worth Seeing*” in *Capitol Critics’ Circle (CCC): Reviewing Theatre in Canada: Capitol Region*. February 9,2015.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary &Thesaurus. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- *Cambridge Idioms Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press 2006.
- *News Archive* , GerogeW.Bush speech on August,2002. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/08/> accessed on 24-9-2016.
- Wikepeadia, The Free Encyclopedia, s.v. “Coercive Diplomacy” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/coercive_diplomacy accessed on 23-9-2016 .