



ISSN: 1999-5601 (Print) 2663-5836 (online)

Lark Journal

Available online at: <https://lark.uowasit.edu.iq>



*Corresponding author:

Researcher Hamza Al-Duraib
University of Wasit / College
of Education for Human
Sciences

Email:

hamzaaliraqi096@gmail.com

Keywords: Key Words :
Machiavellianism, David Hare,
Stuff Happens, Niccolo
Machiavelli, "The Prince".

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 Aug 2022

Accepted 15 Nov 2025

Available online 1 Oct 2025



Machiavellianism in David Hare's Play "Stuff Happens" (2006)

Abstract

The play "Stuff Happens" (2006), written by a contemporary British writer, David Hare, addresses the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 under the pretense that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. However, the events that followed the invasion revealed that the US had actually invaded Iraq for the purpose of imposing its power and control over the country by using Machiavellian tactics like misleading, manipulation, and deception. The play also deals with another issue related to the Machiavellian theory, which is the issue of hegemony and tyranny with regard to the United States and its relationship with the distant world (the East) and the other near (the West), which illustrates the American authoritarian tendency on both (the others). When the decision is in your hands, it can mislead many of those around you, both locally and globally. The sequence of events in this play in which the writer Hare presents a true picture of the planning process by presenting the conversations that took place between officials in the United States government and their allies during the planning of this occupation by transposing the words of these officials literally in the text of the play, thus emphasizing that the process of occupying Iraq happened after the United States clearly applied everything found in this theory of Machiavellianism in the planning process for the occupation of Iraq to prove that the principle of "the end justifies the means" was clear in the style of the US administration headed by "Bush" in addition to the other personalities represented by Cheney, Rumsfeld, Powell and the ally British Prime Minister Blair.

This study concludes that the reliance on the Machiavellian theory, which can be summarized in the phrase "the end justifies the means," and the reliance of the United States on methods such as manipulation and deception of others while planning the occupation of Iraq in order to achieve its goals in the end

© 2025 LARK, College of Art, Wasit University

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.31185/lark.2812>

الملخص

تتناول مسرحية "مثل هذه الامور تحدث" (2006) للكاتب البريطاني المعاصر ديفيد هير موضوع الاحتلال الامريكي للعراق عام 2003 بذريعة امتلاك العراق اسلحة الدمار الشامل ، وهو مالم تثبت صحته بعد الاحتلال ، وتبين ان السبب الحقيقي لهذه الحرب هو لغرض فرض قوة وسيطرة للولايات المتحدة على هذا البلد والمنطقة من خلال استخدامها اساليب التضليل والتلاعب والخداع بالدول الاخرى من اجل الوصول الى اهدافها حيث كان تطبيق مبدأ النظرية الميكيافيلية " الغاية تبرر الوسيلة" واضحا في عملية التخطيط لهذا الاحتلال وتنفيذه فيما بعد. تتناول المسرحية ايضا مسألة اخرى متعلقة بالنظرية الميكيافيلية وهي مسألة الهيمنة والطغيان فيما يخص الولايات المتحدة وعلاقتها بالعالم الاخر البعيد (الشرق) والآخر القريب (الغرب) التي توضح النزعة التسلطية الامريكية على كلا (الاخرين). عندما يكون القرار بأيد تستطيع تضليل الكثيرين ممن حولها على الصعيدين المحلي والعالمي.

ان تسلسل الاحداث في هذه المسرحية التي يقوم فيها الكاتب هير بعرض صورة حقيقية لعملية التخطيط من خلال عرض المحادثات التي جرت بين المسؤولين في حكومة الولايات المتحدة وحلفائهم اثناء التخطيط لهذا الاحتلال من خلال نقل كلام هؤلاء المسؤولين حرفيا في نص المسرحية ، مؤكدا بذلك على ان عملية احتلال العراق حصلت بعد ان قامت الولايات المتحدة بتطبيق واضح لكل ماهو موجود في هذه النظرية في عملية التخطيط لاحتلال العراق لكي يثبت ان مبدأ "الغاية تبرر الوسيلة" كان واضحا في اسلوب الادارة الامريكية التي يرأسها "بوش" بالاضافة الى الشخصيات الاخرى المتمثلة بتشيني ورامسفيلد ورايس والحليف رئيس الوزراء البريطاني بلير.

تتوصل هذه الدراسة الى ان الاستناد على النظرية الميكيافيلية والتي يمكن ايجازها بعبارة "الغاية تبرر الوسيلة" واعتماد الولايات المتحدة على اساليب مثل التلاعب وخداع الاخرين اثناء التخطيط لاحتلال العراق وصولا الى تحقيق اهدافها في نهاية الامر.

الكلمات المفتاحية : الميكيافيلية ، ديفيد هير ، مثل هذه الامور تحدث ، نيكولو ميكيافيلي ، الامير.

Machiavellianism as a theory and a theme in this study, means generally someone who views and manipulates others for his own needs and who works according the phrase "The ends justify the means" which refers to the use of cunning and duplicity in statecraft and in general conduct (Christie and Geis,1970).

It is derived from Niccolo Machiavelli's work "The Prince" (1513) which reflects his cynical views and distrust he had of others. Machiavelli's "The Prince" contains a set of rules of how a new ruler should maintain and lead his followers which include the use of exploitation and manipulation. In his work, Machiavelli, a Renaissance writer and diplomat advises the new ruler to be ready to use tactics such as deception and to act in immoral ways if necessary (Abell,2016).

The play *Stuff Happens* (2006) was based on true stories, real individuals, and their actual words. Donald Rumsfeld "gives the play its title and its theme." Starting with the title, *Stuff Happens* was his response to Baghdad's postwar massive looting (Stohard, 2004). The play belongs to the verbatim theatre. Heddon (2008) states that one aspect of verbatim plays is that the majority of the dialogue is directly copied from politicians and political personalities.

Based on this line of argument, according to Paget (1987) verbatim theatre is:

A form of theatre firmly predicated upon the taping 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. The primary source is then transformed into a text which is acted, usually by the performers who collected the material in the first place.

In this regard, Hare has employed this form of theatre to portray political subjects on stage. He has combined verbatim techniques by employing real people as the characters and providing an accurate account of what they did and said in order to provide knowledge that is different from what the media portrays (Kaur & et al, 2016).

The title was taken verbatim from a statement made by former American defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld. He made a well-known comment when he addressed the theft and looting that followed the American invasion of Baghdad on Friday, April 11, 2003. He simply responded that "stuff happens":

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!(Hare, 2004, S. H, 3)

Machiavellianism in *Stuff Happens*

Hare's *Stuff Happens* explores the nature of the 2003 Iraq invasion and reveals all the methods used by George Bush (2001-2009), the president of America, and his administration to invade Iraq. However, Hare's play places Bush's coercive tactic in connection to Iraq and contextualizes his manipulation of the United Nations, Blair, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2007 ,Powel United States Secretary of State from 2001 to 2005, and other characters to further his agenda. Hare describes his play saying (S. H, Author's Note, 2004):

Stuff Happens is a history play, which just happens to center on very recent history. The events within it have been authenticated from multiple sources, both private and public. What happened is happened. Nothing in the narrative is knowingly untrue. Scenes of direct address quote people verbatim. When the doors close on the worlds' leaders and on their entourages, then I have used my imagination (Hare, 2004).

Machiavellians are first and foremost manipulative: they use, deceive and shortchange others. They always take and even seek the opportunity to benefit from misleading others (Sutton & Keogh, 2000). They are highly callous, selfish and malevolent in their relationships. It is not surprising that Machiavellian leaders like Bush were found to have detrimental effects on others (Bereczki,2018). The best representations of Machiavellianism are clearly reflected in *Stuff Happens* as the current analysis reveals.

In Hare's *Stuff Happens*, there is a discussion of the American policy of war in Iraq. The play looks into Hare's technique of dramatizing the American invasion of Iraq by combining documentary realism with imaginative reconstruction of the

arguments. *Stuff Happens* is a verbatim theatre play about history and politics. Many writers around the world have questioned the United States' approach and its manipulation of facts to justify their claims as a result of the terrible. As a result, there were many political publications about these events during the first ten years of the twenty-first century. Within the verbatim style, *Stuff Happens* addresses these political challenges. Based on this level of argument the importance and power of the political theatre flows from the attempt to show the opposition between what is intended to be said or claimed and what has happened or done. It presents a staged interpretation of facts and events as Hare did in his play *Stuff Happens*. Hare clarifies this significance in the *Obedience* (Kaur & et al., 2016):

I would suggest crudely that one of the reasons for the theatre's possible authority, and for its recent general drift towards politics, is its unique suitability to illustrating an age in which men's ideals and men's practice bear no relation to each other [...] The theatre is the best way of showing the gap between what is said and what is seen to be done [...]. (Hare, 2005, 115)

Actually, the main motivation for the war against Iraq was the ambition for imperialistic exploitation. In this regard, Machiavellians' behaviour is motivated by the need to avoid being exploited rather than by their own independent goals. In sum, these people are simultaneously characterised by passivity and activity, resignation and goal-orientation. They strive to exploit all situations; at every moment, they seek the opportunity to deceive others. At the same time, they actually consider themselves the plaything of circumstances. They believe that their fortune is in the hands of others who scheme against them, therefore their only chance is to get ahead of others (Bereczki, 2018).

On March 19, 2003 Bush announced the start of war against Iraq. While the Bush administration aimed to always project the image of being engaged in a moral conflict therefore America had to invent the justification for its invasion of Iraq by

pretending to liberate the Iraqi people beside the issue of chemical weapons as Bush claimed to the journalist in Hare's *Stuff Happen* (Juhi,2010):

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. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger (Hare act 10, p.26).

However, it would be incorrect to assume that Machiavellians are continuous and skilled liars. Instead, they see lying as a necessary tool to be employed in a world where others are unreliable, rather than as a necessary or unavoidable tactic. Another issue is the fact that their initial act of evil intent led them to judge others as unreliable. In any case, when they believe the truth would not be advantageous, they decide to lie (Bereczkei,2018). Accordingly these features can be found in the *Stuff Happens*. What is said by involved politicians can be listed under Machiavellian thought of the end justify the means, the main core of Machiavelli's work.

Stuff Happens is an illustration of the political theatre experiments that appeared after the attacks of September 11, 2001. In September 2004 the play had its world premiere at the National Theatre of Great Britain. It is a dramatized account of how the United States and Great Britain headed toward their invasion of Iraq. Hare has created a story about history as well as a drama about people dealing with the troubles of power and the limitations of diplomacy. The drama depicts the post-September 11th attacks dialogue on war. The British and American governments' plans to go to war in Iraq are directly dramatized in *Stuff Happens*. Reinelt mentions in his review of the play that (Kaur & et al, 2016):

Hare provides a version of how we got into the war. It is his version, because although he uses many verbatim speeches and other public-record utterances, he also imagines scenes behind closed doors at the highest levels of government—

between Tony Blair and George W. Bush, between Colin Powell and Condi Rice, between Hans Blix and Bush, Rice, and Paul Wolfowitz. (2005, 303)

For the sake of raising the political consciousness of the audience and shedding light on the ways used by politicians to achieve their purposes regardless the means, this argumentative play portrays the theme. It reflects Hare as a well-known dramatist for his style which is characterized by viewing two viewpoints and let the audience to make their decision without any bias.

The American invasion of Iraq is a significant worldwide event that is included in the plot of *Stuff Happens*. The order of the episodes strongly matches the actual incidents of the invasion process. It also involves making up justifications and false pretenses for going to war for special ends. Some individuals, such as Colin Powell, understand the significance and negative effects of the war choice for both American soldiers and Iraqis. In act three, Powell reveals his opinion concerning war of Vietnam saying “politicians start wars; soldiers fight and die in them” (S. H, 2004) and also he says “War should be the politics of the last resort”.

Hare says on Powell’s character that he “was presented as a hero, I admired him as a man who understands what collateral damage is ,who understands what a military operation is, and who knows what it’s like to see people’s lives destroyed by bombs”. By using actual characters and giving an exact account of what they did and said, Hare has merged the verbatim techniques. Another technique Hares uses to emphasize the choices made in the American invasion of Iraq is characterization (Hare,2005).

The political figures and advisers who supported Bush and Tony Blair as they were planning the war are discussed in Hare's plot of the play. With names like Collin Powell, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, and Kondeliza Rice, the characters in Hare's play talk in a combination of their real and imagined voices.

Taken from government records, speeches, interviews, transcripts, and images, according to the play's description is a historical account of how the effects of power abuses reflected on a global level (Fyffe, 2010,p. 23). One characteristic of verbatim play is that the majority of the discourse is taken directly from the political figures and politicians. For instance, on January 29, 2002, Bush famously labeled Iraq as part of the "axis of evil"(Kaur & et al, 2016):

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. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger(S. H,p.3).

Mostly, Machiavellians justify their actions by some rational reason, in many cases claiming that others would do exactly the same in their shoes. They employ a wide variety of means to deceive others: they may flatter, be intrusive or pretend cooperation and understanding as required by the situation Manipulation has a multifaceted connection with lying. Machiavellians often lie and they lie convincingly and effectively (Bereczki,2018).

The triangle containing the play's events is Bush, Blair, and Powell. While Powell was portrayed by Hare as a man of conscience who argues against war, the first two represent the two poles of power: the United States and Great Britain, who formed a coalition to attack Iraq. Hare creates a different class of individuals to contrast the hypocrisy of politicians. They are depicted as 'Actors,' or external narrators. Their function is to step in and offer further details or a viewpoint on a particular matter. Golimowska(2012), for instance, an actor says, "It is 72 days after September 11th," when Bush asks Rumsfeld, the former Secretary of American Defense about his strategy for Iraq. (S. H, 31) (Sara ,2008)

By employing these real-life characters' words and hypothetical private discussions between the characters, respectively, Hare distinguishes between

character speech and asides. These people are referred to as "voices of conscience" by Mary Luckhurst (2008, p.213). Like the chorus in the play, the actors give some supporting details while letting the figures speak for themselves. Although the phrase "stuff happens" is an American slang, Hare uses it to describe how the decision to enter a war—a decision of great significance and with far-reaching effects—just "happens" (Juhi, 2010,p. 20). Hare classifies his play as belonging to the history of political documentary theatre. Bush was one of the characters he introduced, who was first seen in the play by an outside actor:

Actor: These are the actors; these are the men and women who will play parts in a defining drama of the new century. And at their head is a snappish young man, seeking his fortune in the oil-rich Permian Basin of West Texas, who will, one day, like forty-six per cent of his fellow Americans, say he has been born again. (S. H,p. 9)

It "paints a picture of a man with a hateful agenda, powerful, who has a narrow vision of the world and not to be trusted" to say that Bush is a man "seeking his fortune" in oil (Fyffe, 2010,p. 32). He had a forceful and arrogant persona:

I am 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 the President. Maybe somebody needs to explain to me why they say something. I don't feel like I owe anybody an explanation. (S. H,p. 10)

Bush did not mind or keep away of war because he was power-obsessed. The most crucial point of *Stuff Happens* is that "Bush's acts must likewise be treated seriously since the effects of his decisions are terrible" (Boon, 2007, 10). In order to give the media an explanation and quick solutions to frequently difficult inquiries, he employed words as a military tactic. In this sense, he could use a morality story to contrast good and evil or right and wrong in any political or

military circumstance or action. As he did when he made up a story of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and the "axis of evil" in regard to Iraq to cast the American invasion in a moral light meant to secure the safety of the entire world from serious threat. He was thus an evil figure who employed language as a tool to gain public support with untrue arguments.

Machiavellians are known for their cold, callous, and uncaring behavior. They distance themselves from the emotional side of situations, are unconcerned with the emotions of others, and instead adopt a logical viewpoint on both people and things. They prioritize their own interests while ignoring those of others because they are goal-oriented rather than people-oriented (Christie & Geis 1970; Hawley 2006). A particular cognitive orientation is frequently present along with their lack of emotional investment in people: Machiavellians are logical thinkers who approach possibilities with a cool mind (Pilch 2008). With this method, people are able to make an impact over the current circumstance; they firstly concentrate on their objectives, analyze incoming information, consciously sort choices, and attempt to select a course of action that will benefit them. (Bereczkei,2018)Accordingly, anyone can notice the similarity between Machiavellians tactics and the commander in chief, President George W. Bush's behavior.

Blair rejects to support an invasion without a United Nations resolution and sincere diplomacy when Bush meets with him in Texas to discuss Iraq before they attend a press conference. He provides a detailed justification for his choice (Juhi,2010):

If Britain is involved, we will need evidence that Iraq can launch a nuclear, biological or chemical attack on Western country. We can't go to war because of what we fear. Only because of what we know...Now plainly, if you choose you

can set out on your own. That's your choice. But frankly, I wouldn't advice it. (S. H, p. 39).

Machiavellians detach themselves from the emotional aspects of situations, do not concern themselves with others' feelings and rather take a rational perspective on things and people. They are goal-oriented rather than person-oriented, focusing on their own interests and ignoring those of others (Christie & Geis 1970; Hawley 2006). However, later on, under American pressure and despite the UN's reply, Britain joined the conflict for colonial reasons. Paul Smith compared the transatlantic relationships in the 21st century to a master-slave relationship in his essay "Why 'we' love hate 'you' " He makes the claim that "European powers, rights and responsibilities as 'slaves' are to no longer love and to stay ambiguous towards the "narcissist," as he refers to the U.S., obsessed with its hegemonic goals." (Smith, 2004). Similarly, Hare employs the metaphor of a "umbrella" to illustrate how Europe is subordinate to the United States. He said: "On Rumsfeld's tongue (Reinelt,2005):

What you can say about these people in Europe except that they live their lives under the American umbrella? Every time it rains they come running for shelter. And yet they still think that they're entitled to say, "Hey you're not holding that um-brella right." Or more often, "I want a share of that umbrella. Or even," you are not allowed an umbrella because not everybody's got one. (S. H, p.102)

Blair was uncertain of the details of the agreement upon his return to London. "You don't know exactly what has been agreed. You don't know where you are" (S. H, p.44).It serves as an illustration of "Bush's cunning personality, which allows him to mislead and surprise Blair. They talked about how decisions are made. But it was obvious that Bush made the final decision alone and was the one who portrayed the actual dialogue in the play. The following simple exchange reflects the ridiculousness of the decision-making: (Ghani & Chellab, 2018)

Bush: Huh.

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

Cheney: It's good.

Rumsfeld: That way we can do anything. (S. H, p.24)

"The War on Terror", the phrase with which Bush convinces all the members of his partners 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). Machiavellians use a wide range of techniques to deceive people, including emotional manipulation, opportunistic behavior, and simulating collaboration and understanding when needed. At this point, though, it is important to distinguish between Machiavellians and psychopaths, who represent an even darker aspect of human nature. Callousness toward others is a trait shared by both, whereas psychopaths have no sense of guilt. In their interpersonal interactions, Machiavellians are less harsh and aggressive and more strategic.

Their imperial aims are shown in this quotation, along with the relationship between the war on terror and the current state of exception. The argument that America performed the role of judge in the so-called war on terror is the main point of discussion. The most crucial qualities of judgment are independence and impartiality, but this was not the case with the war in Iraq. In reaction to Iraq's role in the fight on terror, America assumed unparalleled powers. Both the personality and the evilness of their judgments about war were present (Kaur & et al, 2016).

The choice to go to war in Iraq is an embodiment of an exception to the rule. Bush's claim was obviously intended to defend his invasion of Iraq as part of the "axis of evil" as he used to say (S. H,p.33) Understanding Powell's character was essential to comprehending the play's various themes. His piece theatricalized a historical event primarily using characterization and verbatim techniques. Powell, a

soldier of the Vietnam War, was the only member of the War Cabinet to recommend the need for negotiations (Kaur & et al, 2016).

Powell was extremely critical of Bush's strategy and wished "his country was less manipulative" (S. H,p.53). Powell, in contrast to Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz, showed concern for the ethics of war. This contradiction gave the play a dramatic strain. The dramatist was able to develop a form that could depict conflict and struggle. He used the conflict between the politicians and their conflicting views on war to build the dramatic tone in his play. This dialogical mode of truth deception is demonstrated in the following exchange (Boon, 2007):

Powel: I want us to go about this in a different way.

Bush and Rice wait for Powell to calm.

Three thousand of our citizens died. They died in an unforgivable attack. But that doesn't license 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.

The other two are silenced by the depth of Powell's feelings. Then Bush speaks.

Bush: I've said before: this isn't a popularity contest, Colin. It isn't about being popular.

Powel: No, it isn't. You're right.

Personal competition aimed at winning against a partner elicits intense emotions for Machiavellians. Such emotions, being related to beating the partner, reaching victory, the joy of victory and the accompanying anxiety, often make people forget about the importance of rational consideration.(Bereczki, 2018).

This war, which is similar to the issue of "The Prince" by Niccolo Machiavelli, was a multi - dimensional event that allowed contradiction. Despite being imaginary, this argument between Bush and Powell had Rice listening in,

and it was dramatic. It gave him an ambition and power. Powell, a soldier, was the only one who understood the price of war. He thought that protecting his country from needless wars was part of serving it. He attempted to prevent conflict but was unsuccessful. Powell was the advisor, but no one will pay attention to him. When those of conscience or men who have experienced war are not listened to, the play's logical meaning might be explained that "still more war or evil is the result. And the outcome is not pleasant when a strong nation displays evil. Powell argued that Bush didn't listen only to those who supported the start of the war like Rumsfeld: (Loomba,2005)

Powell: It should never have happened at all! Rumsfeld cut my legs off. There is an angry silence. Bush shifts again, uncomfortable.

Powell: Ok, so I've had this experience, and now I'm looking at the current planning - planning for Iraq - and all I can see is a group of people getting a hard-on about the idea of war, and no one giving a damn for the reality. Ten times more excitement about going in than there is about how the hell we get out!(S.H,p.52)

Powell's ultimate failure to accomplish his goal was shown by Hare as a tragic hero. "Powell's fate is the fate of any tragic hero: determined to be just and moral in an evil world. But we, the public, are made aware of some of the forces opposed against him, which is again essential to the development of a tragic hero (Hare, 2005). *Stuff Happens* argues that sending in troops and American and British relations are more significant to each party than the nation and people they are targeting. America was portrayed as a bloody minded and its moral courage was shown by Powell who said:

Powell: If anyone's stupid enough to think this is payback time for whatever grudge they happen to be nursing against the US...then what they'll be doing in effect is condemning Iraqi women and children to the sort of bombardment which is going to make them wish they'd never been

born. And possibly civil chaos after. That's what I'm trying to avoid.
(S. H,p.76)

Bereczkei (2018) mentions that a lack of empathy is one of the most important Machiavellian characteristics, if not the most important one. It is very likely that they are unable to put themselves in others' shoes, that is, they cannot emotionally empathise with others. Numerous studies have demonstrated that in contrast with other people, Machiavellians show far poorer abilities to attune themselves to the joy, pain or disappointment of others around them.

Powell predicted the pain of the Iraqi people, the needless deaths of soldiers, and the rebellion of violence. Powell protested against war, but the play demonstrated that he had a soldier's professionalism to his leader, who ordered him to create a report surrounding the Iraqi WMD Program before the UN on February 5, 2003. According to the play, Powell was likely aware that what he was about to say in the report would be misleading which is another type of Machiavellianism. He spoke about chemical weapons hypocrisy at one point in the play. "There's some hypocrisy there, George. With the man, we were trading! Mr. Saddam Hussein not very long ago People continue to question, how do you know he's got weapons of mass destruction? How do we know? (S. H, 53-54)

As a means of Machiavellianism, the selfishness and self-centrism of the United States and Great Britain were attacked and satirized in *Stuff Happens*. They had a tendency to neglect the needs of the rest of the world in best interest of their own goals, giving little thought to the potentially disastrous effects of their choices. They only cared about their reciprocal relationship. The Roman Empire, a symbol for exceptionalism in power and hubris, did a good job of capturing this image. Powell brought up this saying to Bush (Murphy,2004):

Bush: We need to show these people that we mean business.

Powell: The Roman Empire. I'm familiar with the analogy. The Romans would always go out of their way to make an announcement: 'You are now dealing with the Roman Empire'. So if you pricked a senator in Rome, if you just pricked him through his toga with a pin, then Roman soldiers would seek out the village you came from [...] and they would kill all your family and burn down your house just to make a point. But Sir, we're not Romans. And last time I looked at the constitution, we were still a republic, not an empire. (S. H,p.51)

Bush had the disposition of an emperor who desired to occupy and dominate the entire world. These are Machiavelli's strategies for controlling the other world through power struggle. The White House does represent a kingdom that is occupied and shining to serve as a representation of endless authority. The US's war against Iraq to advance its Machiavellians goals in the Middle East is a good example of this hegemony which is also another sort of Machiavellianism.

In the *New York Times*, Hare said, "I wanted to write the story of how a presumed foolish man absolutely got his way with two supposed smart men." "And continues to triumph. Tony Blair and Colin Powell are the "eggheads" being humiliated by the commander in chief, President George W. Bush. (2006) Makinley They are meant to be the most sensible and enlightened characters in the play, as is evident from the language they use. But Bush's cunning and ambition overwhelms them.

Palestinian: Why Iraq? The question has been asked a thousand times. And a thousand answers have been given. Why was the only war in history ever to be based purely on intelligence – and doubtful intelligence at that – launched against a man who was ten years past his peak of belligerence ? Why Iraq ? Why now ? It was all about oil!" For us, no. For Palestinians, it's about one thing : defending the interests of America's three-billiondollar-a-year colony in the Middle East. (S. H,p.59)

The ends for the American invasion of Iraq was explained properly in this chapter since "the ends justify the means", it was neither of all the mentioned purposes. An imperial discourse was taking place. They were lying when they said they had freed the nations of the third world. In the case of Iraq, the US's direct governmental control over the country was very clear.

Unidentified Iraqi exile gave the final soliloquies, expressing his difficulty to "recognize how they, speaking of Bush and Blair, came without schemes to save Iraqis !!. He considered the untold, unrecorded war losses in Iraq as well as the results of countries that "placed faith in the wrong person" (S. H, p.120). The result of America's behavior, which exclusively supports its imperial and colonial ends, was the violence of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi citizens and harmful conflict. The exiled Iraqi said:

"Iraqi Exile: A vacuum was created. Was it created deliberately? I cannot comprehend. They came to save us, but they had no plans. 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.... I mean, if there is a word, Iraq has been crucified.. 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.....people say to me "Look, tell America." I tell them: "You are putting your faith in the wrong person." (S. H, 120)

Conclusion

The play comes to the conclusion that Hare emphasized Machiavellian principles in the play through his reflecting of the invasion of Iraq by using verbatim techniques, or documentary technique, in his play *Stuff Happens*, offering a fresh and new perspective on the causes and outcomes of this conflict. This work introduced a new real story of the historical narrative of the Iraqi war, which was

popularized by Hare in his play *Stuff Happens* with the aid of the Machiavellianism framework. The investigation comes to the same conclusion as before: Hare exploited historical documentaries and dramatic representation in his play to shock the public's conscience with the American policy's manipulation of the Iraq War narrative in order to justify their ends. *Stuff Happens* portrays political topics by offering fresh information that is apart from what is shared on social media. It tells the story of how the world's two poles manipulated their positions of power to advance imperial goals and show the best examples of the reflection of Machiavellianism in its content as a theme

References :

1. Amera, A.(2020).Theatre as Testimony:A Critical Analysis of David Hare's *Stuff Happens*. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net Volume 11, Issue 7, 653
2. Bereczkei, T. (2018). *Machiavellianism; The Psychology of Manipulation*. London and New York. Taylor & Francis Group.
3. Boon, R. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to David Hare*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Bull, J.(1984).*New British Political Dramatist*. MacMillan, London.
5. Christie,R. & Geis,F.(1970) *Studies in Machiavellianism*. Academic Press. New York.
6. Hare, D. (2004). *Stuff Happens*. United States. Faber and Faber.
7. Hare, D.(2014).*Writing Left – Handed*. Faber & Faber. London.
8. Homden, C. (1995). *The Plays of David Hare*. Great Britain. Cambridge University Press.
9. Machiavelli, N. (2005).*The Prince* Translated by W.K. Marriott. ICON Group International. USA
10. Mayer, S.(2019). *Making Mischief: David Hare and the Celebrity Playwright's Political Persona*, *Persona Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2
11. Mohammed, S. (2015). *Morality Politics with Reference to Machiavelli's The Prince*. *European Scientific Journal* June 2015 edition, vol. 11, No. 17 ISSN: pp. 354-365. (print) e-ISSN 1857 – 7431.
12. Wu, D.(1996).*Six Contemporary Dramatists*. MacMillan. London.