T. C.

İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI
ANABİLİM DALI

AMERİKAN KÜLTÜRÜ VE EDEBİYATI
BİLİM DALI

DOKTORA TEZİ

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICS AND THEATER IN AMERICAN DRAMA

GIZEM BARRETO MARTINS

2502070005

TEZ DANIŞMANI:
PROF. DR. HÜRRİYET ÖZDEN SÖZALAN

İSTANBUL-2020

ABSTRACT

This study claims that certain radical dramatic texts have ideological relations with the audience and the historical period with which the text concerns itself, that they become a means of ideological and cultural involvement, and therefore have possible subversive social and political effects. The interactions of politics and dramatic theatre will be examined with a historical-materialist method which considers the historical/political context of the texts with their connections to theories of theatre and literature. The main question directing the analysis of the theatrical language of dramatic texts is: How do these dramatic texts constitute a subversive action, a style uncontaminated by the performative aspects of everyday life and therefore by dominant codes and systems of representation? With the purpose to search for an answer to this question the study claims that theatrical language can be subversive in the face of dominant ideology; and therefore, may be an active component of social change. To prove this claim, the research offers a reading of selected plays through the model of semiotics developed by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICS AND THEATER IN AMERICAN DRAMA

GIZEM BARRETO MARTINS

Keywords: American Drama, American Theater, Politics, Race, Gender, Class, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, bazı radikal dramatik metinlerin izleyiciyle ve metnin ilgilendiği tarihsel dönemle ideolojik ilişkileri olduğunu, ideolojik ve kültürel katılımın bir aracı haline geldiklerini ve bu nedenle olası yıkıcı sosyal ve politik etkilere sahip olduklarını iddia ediyor. Politika ve tiyatronun etkileşimi, metinlerin tarihsel / siyasal bağlamını tiyatro ve edebiyat kuramlarıyla olan bağlantılarıyla ele alan tarihsel-materyalist bir yöntemle incelenecektir. Dramatik metinlerin teatral dilinin analizini yönlendiren ana soru şudur: Bu dramatik metinler, gündelik hayatın edimsel yönleriyle ve dolayısıyla baskın temsil kodları ve sistemleriyle kirletilmemiş bir tarzı olan yıkıcı bir eylemi nasıl oluştururlar? Bu soruya bir cevap aramak amacıyla çalışma, teatral dilin egemen ideoloji karşısında yıkıcı olabileceğini ve bu nedenle sosyal değişimin aktif bir bileşeni olabileceğini iddia ediyor. Bu iddiayı kanıtlamak için araştırma Gilles Deleuze ve Felix Guattari tarafından geliştirilen göstergebilim modeli üzerinden seçilmiş oyunların bir okumasını sunuyor.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICS AND THEATER IN AMERICAN DRAMA
GIZEM BARRETO MARTINS
Anahtar kelimeler: Amerikan Dramatik Metinleri, Amerikan Tiyatrosu, Politika, Irk Sorunu, Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Sınıf İlişkileri, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari

PREFACE

Rising crime rates, social-economic injustices, people being dehumanized and exposed to systematic violence because of their race, ethnicity, religion, and gender... Is there an effective way to cry out in the face of injustice, oppression, and persecution? Is there a way to express our feelings and thoughts against all these in the form of art, and would it make social change possible? How can theatre be that specific form of art? Pondering over these questions and trying to carve my theatre and life practice accordingly, I began to shape my PhD research a long time ago.

After finishing my MA thesis on American theatre, I was quite sure to pursue my PhD research on theater. Due to my engagement with acting, theatre, rather than being a mere source of fun, had become a way of life for me through which, I believed, ideals of a just and equal society could be materialized. In that sense, theatre has always been a political act in my practice. Considering theatre's political potential, I believe the politics is unavoidable; as Joe Kelleher states in his work on *Theatre and Politics*, theatre's political potential lies in its liveliness and sociality, in its capacity to propose alternative realities, and to represent us, in other words speak 'for' us and 'of' our worlds, and finally in its power to make a difference to what is going on in the world if the response is tuned right (Kelleher, 2009: 10-11). This final potential is specifically what has triggered my research on theatre and politics.

This thesis is the outcome of a long journey of resilience and perseverance for my part besides its joy. I would like to thank to people who have helped me through this journey. I am grateful to my advisor Prof. Dr. H. Özden Sözalan for her support and belief in me, this study would not have been possible without her guidance. I am also thankful to my committee members, Prof. Dr. Hasine Şen Karadeniz and Prof. Dr. Bedia Demiriş for their contribution. I owe a lot to the librarians at Özyeğin University for their great assistance in finding my sources. I also give my special thanks to my friends Saadet Şahin, Azer Doğan, Cristina Sabio, Volkan Yosunlu, and Serhat Uyurkulak for their moral support. I am also grateful for the help and support of my

parents. Finally, I owe a special debt to my son, David Derin Barreto Martins, who has tolerated me during this process; this thesis is dedicated to him with the hope that he never gives up what he loves doing in life.

GİZEM BARRETO MARTINS

İSTANBUL-2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Scope, Hypothesis and Questions of the Research

The question that forms the base of this PhD project is "how theatricality and theatrical texts can be thought in relation to politics?" that is; "What elements and formal devices does a theatrical text bear that make it political?" Here it is necessary to mention that the term politics is conceived of its broader sense that refers to the processes by which power is distributed in society among different groups, classes or interests. For the rest of the study, the terms 'politics in theatre' or 'political theater' will be used as defined by David Hare, which is theatre is political so long as it is intended to make a case for societal change (Hare, 2005: 22).

The intention underneath the question that forms the core of the study is to prove the hypothesis that theatrical language –the 'language' refers not only to the text but to all the other formal devices that are hidden/given in the text—along with its political content, can be subversive in the face of dominant ideology and therefore may be an active component of social change. The very first questions of the research appeared while studying M. M. Bakhtin's theory of dialogism. Bakhtin defines dialogism as a characteristic peculiar to a single genre which is novel. But it is also possible to adapt his theory to theatrical texts because the language of the theatre is fundamentally based on dialogues rather than narration, and even when there is a narrator s/he is actually in a dialogue with the audience/reader. And within this theatrical language lots of other languages, which is to say discourses of different groups/classes/interests are in dialogue or in conflict, and this is the point where politics starts. In other words, rather than being monologic, theatre is dialogic by its own nature. Thus, this thesis posits that certain alternative dramatic texts have ideological relations with the reader/audience and the historical period with which the text concerns itself, that these texts become a means of ideological and cultural involvement, and therefore have possible social and political effects. The aim of this research is to study samples of such dramatic texts in American theatre and work out

which literary devices and forms that make the text political are used by the writer, and also search the effects of historical-political developments on dramatic texts.

The interactions of politics and American dramatic texts will be examined with a historical-materialist method which considers the historical/political context of the texts with their connections to theories of theatre and literature. Selected modern and post-modern American dramatic texts will constitute the scope of the project. The study will be formed of three main parts; the first chapter will consider "the Representation of Class" in the context of a choice of plays that introduce class relations as a defining element in the formation of American societies; chapter two will discuss "Politics of Gender in Drama" to study through selected plays on how gender is constructed within politics of power; and the final chapter "The Racial Conflicts on the Stage" will analyze how the selected texts offer insight into the operation of racial conflicts in American societies.

In each chapter there will be one early/modern and one post-modern text so that the chapters provide an overview of formal and contextual differences in the elaboration of politics of class, gender and race. The plays are chosen as each of them are both placed within the American theatrical canon and also are representative for their political stance. The selected plays for the research are: *The Hairy Ape* (1922) by Eugene O'Neill, *Glengarry Glen Ross* (1983) by David Mamet, *Trifles* (1916) by Susan Glaspell, *Angels in America: A Gay Fantasia on National Themes* (1991) by Tony Kushner, *A Raisin in the Sun* (1959) by Lorraine Hansberry, and *Funnyhouse of a Negro* (1969) by Adrienne Kennedy.

Theoretical Framework

According to existentialists "theatre is the prime art form, i.e., the one that best allows the artist to use his or her freedom to create a virtual world that simultaneously appeals to the audience's own freedom (regardless of how we define that freedom, theologically or politically)" (Deranty, 2019). Jean-Paul Sartre appoints a political role to theater. While formulating his ideas on theater Sartre focuses on

action and situation, and situations always have social and political contexts: “The situation is always a specific one, particularly a specific social and political circumstance, with its specific conflict of rights” (Deranty, 2019). Therefore, the reason why existentialists regard theater as the prime art form is because they see theatre as the most political art form compared to other forms of art. This is an apt classification probably because of the dialogic nature of theatre; the language of the theatre is fundamentally based on dialogues rather than narration and even when there is a narrator s/he is actually in a dialogue with the audience/reader. Within this theatrical language lots of other languages, which is to say discourses of different groups/classes/interests are in dialogue or in conflict, and this is the point where politics starts. Stefan Collini defines politics as “the important, inescapable, and difficult attempt to determine relations of power in a given space” (Collini, 2004: 67). And in the Foucauldian sense power relations are exercised through the production and exchange of signs; and it is not easy to separate them from goal directed activities that permit the exercise of a power (Foucault, 1994: 338). Throughout this study, politics will be accepted as a process of working out relations of power through discourse. Discourse is a particular knowledge about the world which shapes how the world is and the way we act on the basis of that thinking (Rose, 2001: 136). As a particular language it has its own rules and conventions and the institutions within which the discourse is produced and circulated (Lynda Nead quoated in Rose, 2001: 136). As it is related to knowledge, every discourse inscribes power since it is capable of disciplining thoughts and attitudes. Therefore racial, sexual, and class relations will be regarded as discursive creations which are socially constructed, and which therefore should be analyzed contextually.

Theatre is fundamentally a political art form because communication is at the core of performance (Salutin, 2005). Performance exists in the moment of energy between audience and actor(s); for this reason, it is an intrinsically social phenomenon (Kirby, 1975: 129). Thus, throughout history, performance has been used as a tool for protest and propaganda (Bogad, 2005: 2). Therefore, it is not surprising that since antiquity theatrical activity has tried to be banned. Plato, for instance; when discussing performance in his dialogues, tended towards pointing out the threat that performances

of a theatrical sort pose to a well-ordered society, and he recommended that politics and theatre be kept as far as possible (Kelleher, 2009: 45). Patristic writers, on the other hand, tried to impose a prohibition on theatrical activity, believing it to be a threat to social morality and by extension political integrity (Fischer-Lichte, 2005: 253). Continuing this tradition, in the 18th century Jean Jacque Rousseau warned that "the constant outbursts of different emotions to which we are subjected in the theatre, disturb and weaken" our rational capabilities, rendering us unable to be effective in the political domain (Rousseau, 1750).

On the other hand; there were some critics and directors who were against the "integration of politics" into theatre/performance from a different perspective. They thought that politics tainted theatre and destroyed art. For example; at the beginning of his career Constantin Stanislavski had been against the amalgamation of politics and theatre, and he had despised such attempts: "[...] many attempts were made to drag our theatre into politics, but we, who knew the true nature of theatre, understood that the boards of the stage could never become a platform for the spread of propaganda, for the simple reason that the very least utilitarian purpose or tendency brought into the realm of pure art kills art instantly" (Stanislavski, 1948: 353). But later in 1905, after the Bloody Sunday massacre, Stanislavski changed his views about politics and theatre, and started to share the opinion that the theatre-maker has a social role: "theatre cannot and does not have the right to serve pure art alone" (Stanislavski quoted in Stourac and McCreery, 1986: 7).

Literature, Reality, Power

Theater, as a form of art that has close and visible connections with the society and culture it is produced in, is crucial to understand the social processes at work; and it is the responsibility of intellectuals to analyze and clarify socio-political structures within a particular context to understand them thoroughly so as to offer new and better possibilities of reality for the future of humanity. As Raymond Williams indicates:

> there is normally a very wide gap between, on the one hand, general history and the associated general history of particular arts, and, on the other hand, individual studies.

> It is then, by learning to analyze the nature and the diversity of cultural formations—in close association... with the analysis of cultural forms—that we can move towards a more adequate understanding of the direct social processes of cultural production. (Kershaw, 1992: 4)

The relationship between the social processes and cultural production were even mentioned in Plato's work in antiquity; art and literature were regarded as dangerous for being of two kinds as true and false. Affected by Socrates's philosophy, Plato defended that there must be a censorship of stories to be told to the youth such as Homer's or Hesiod's whose stories were seen as immoral as well as false: “a young person cannot judge what is allegorical and what is literal; anything that he receives into his mind at that age is likely to become indelible and unalterable; and therefore it is most important that the tales which the young first hear should be models of virtuous thoughts” (Plato, 2018*:* 58). Here it is important to note that the subject of politics within cultural productions was an old issue discussed even among the philosophers of antiquity. Hence, Plato suggested they had censorship applied for some stories such as the mythological ones since the young were seen incapable of understanding allegory. For instance, Zeus's story was seen dangerous since it might encourage the young to beat their fathers by his example. Therefore; Plato designated an authority of legislators laying down the principles of what tales were to be allowed, and which books were to be written: “Then the first thing will be to establish a censorship of the writers of fiction, and let the censors receive any tale of fiction which is good, and reject the bad; and we will desire mothers and nurses to tell their children the authorised ones only” (Plato, 2018: 57). Opposition and defiance have always been regarded as dangerous throughout history because they entail the debilitation of authority and power, though the reaction against it taking different forms. Knowledge is power, and it is a known phenomenon by the authorities, as seen in the example of ancient philosophers or the holy books, which condemn humanity to life on earth for seeking knowledge. Hence, literature has been seen as a threat against the authorities having the power to provoke 'ordinary people' to defy with the power of 'false knowledge' that is not approved by the authorities. For that reason, throughout history philosophers and thinkers such as Plato, who tried to preserve the status quo, suggested the control of this 'weapon' which is the most precious knowledge.

Plato suggests the youth to be moderate and self-restraint, always obeying the authorities. Therefore; Homer is acceptable for him in such cases where he teaches obedience such as when he tells, “The Greeks marched breathing prowess, … in silent awe of their leaders” (Plato, 2018: 67). However; Plato criticizes Homer's use of language when he writes, “O heavy with wine, who hast the eyes of a dog, but the heart of a stag” (Plato, 2018: 68), for this kind of language does not impress self-control on the minds of the youth. Plato, through Socrates, has his say also about the style to be allowed in his ideal State, he defines all poetry as narrative of events, and narrative, according to him, is of three kinds, the simple, the imitative, and a composition of the two. The simple style consists only of pure narrative; on the other hand, the imitative style is the dialogue which corresponds to the mimetic element of theater. Imitative style has no place in Plato's ideal State because the citizens of the State have their own business that is to take care of freedom, and if they imitate, they should only imitate the good. The representation of slaves, bullies, cowards, etc. which Plato defines as inferior parts should not be performed by a good or wise man (Plato, 2018: 72-73). That is; Plato suggests the descriptive style (narrative) with as little mimetic element in it as possible for the good man. In his theory, he approves of the descriptive style since narrative represents 'the Truth' with a few changes, but the imitative (dramatic) style changes it a lot. His ideal man in his ideal State plays only one part, and there is no place for confusion. In Short; Plato defines the acceptable terms for literature, and leaves drama out as it is deceptive, while leaving some room for poetry as long as it is in accordance with the laws of the State: “For we mean to employ for our souls’ health the rougher and severer poet or story-teller, who will imitate the style of the virtuous only, and will follow those models which we prescribed at first when we began the education of our soldiers” (Plato, 2018: 75). To him, there are essential forms of the virtues, and all arts should be a means of tracing these forms in life (Plato, 2018: 79).

Is a truly mimetic representation of reality in art/theatre possible?

Plato handles this question in terms of morality, and his answer to it is not in favor of theatre. Plato gives his answer setting up an analogy, a poet who holds a mirror to the objective world around him and assumes himself as a creator even though what he does is the mimetic representation of the world he sees. However; according to Plato what this poet creates is merely appearances. In Plato's justification, there are two dimensions of reality as the ideal forms and the phenomenal objective world. In between these two realities, there is the Poet [poietes] subverting the utopic Republic's ideals by corrupting its citizens. Plato, through his character Socrates in *The Republic*, mocks the figure of the artist as 'craftsman' who changes the world of objects that have already been once removed away from their 'original source,' the world of Ideas, into incoherent images (Plato, 2018: 235). The mirror which the craftsman holds upsets "the vital order of objects" (Diamond, 1997: i), and since a mirror reflects through light that comes from the Sun, it unseats the position of the Sun as the real source of Power. Moreover; the mirror deters his sight and the passerby, which means both the producer and the receiver of the object of art are delusional according to Plato. Plato's analogy 'the mirror upsetting the vital order of objects' stands for the subversion of reality by the artist. And when he 'unseats' the Sun as the ultimate source of power, he actually subverts the power relationships endangering the source. Through this analogy, Plato becomes the first philosopher who discusses the poet's position in creating his artifacts in relation to reality. Putting the very first bricks of literary and artistic theory, Plato claimed it was simply impossible to represent reality in mimetic terms.

Even though Plato's concern was seemingly moral in seeing art as dangerous for presenting an incoherent version of the world around us, his theory has become significant in handling the relationship between art and politics, because clearly what he sees as moral corruption of citizens is actually a political concern for the future of his Republic. To put it differently, the 'corruption' of his guardians [the citizens were described as the guardians who would protect/guard the Republic] would mean the

corruption of the ideals of the Republic. Making the guardians busy with 'unimportant things' that are not real and thrice removed from the world of Ideas, would keep them away from doing their solely important mission, guarding the Republic, which in turn is merely a political concern for Plato.

The ultimate aim of the governors of the Republic is described by Plato as the pursuit of happiness, which is possible only through the grasp of the world of Ideas that is not possible to see by observing the world of objective reality, let alone its representation through art. According to Plato, this is a gift given only to the philosophers whom therefore should be the governors of the Republic to govern it the best way possible, to 'herd' its citizens toward the ultimate goal of the world of Ideas (Plato, 2018: 172-174). In such a political case, it is obviously impossible to allow the artist to 'corrupt' the citizens with subversions of the objective world. It would mean that the artist hinders the governors do their duty by subverting their 'ideal,' their reality with his work; in other words, he would subvert their power over their citizens. Exactly at this point is where Plato's concern is political, making the relationship between art and politics obvious.

Plato's theories of art presented in *The Republic* are invaluable for the future discussion of the relationship between art and real life. First of all; thousands of years ago he claimed that a true representation of reality is simply impossible, an idea without which the later modern, post-modern, and post-structural theories that further our understanding of 'reality' would be non-existent. Plato's initiation of the question of mimesis later made it possible to understand the concept of reality with its social and political connotations as no single reality is represented, but different subjective versions of reality making even science and history questionable as narratives, and the official versions of them as the narratives of those who hold the positions of power. The claim to represent reality will simply become a claim for power by the construction of those 'grand narratives.'

Aristotle sharing the same basic premise as his mentor Plato, considered poetry and performing arts as 'modes of imitation' in *Poetics*. His aim was also, like his

teacher's Plato, to achieve a mode of political containment for a well-ordered city-state. However; Aristotle saw the element of 'catharsis' useful for this aim; he thought emotions of pity and fear could be evocated by theatre, and he offered certain types of stories or deeds that were more likely to produce one emotion than another (Aristotle quoted in Kelleher, 2009; 49). Unlike Aristotle, who was Plato's disciple, Plato had warned against the element of fear in the stories told by the poets, he had suggested banishing fear since it discouraged people to be brave and had reminded the poets that their stories were untrue and discouraging (Plato, 2018: 64). Whereas in his theory of the tragedy Aristotle promoted the element of fear as the most important tool to teach morals. In other words, Aristotle did not see theatre and politics as harmful, but instead he developed a theory to show the ways of utilizing from performing arts to achieve an ordered society. He suggested that theatre taught through pleasure and imitation, and became a tool to control people for the sake of the common political good, a means for the permanence of the status quo, as Kelleher observes: "Theatre, in this account, would be a means of running off, as if through a drainage channel or short-circuit, any generative charge, any static electricity in the politics of performance that threatens the status quo" (Kelleher, 2009; 50). By this way, even the most 'subversive' forms can become a means to preserve the dominant system; and one can see that happening if they analyze the cultural mainstream assimilating everything which was regarded as 'threatening' before. Although this might cause some despair in the case of social change, the situation is not that hopeless.

The connection of art to life is what Plato feared, and what Aristotle sought to regulate. The mere fact that seeing mimesis as a thing to be feared by Plato is actually the recognition of the political relationship of art and life, though in the form of negation/prohibition. On the other hand; Aristotle's concerns to regulate mimetic representation is an explicit confirmation of the connection of art to life and politics. In other words, art and theater is a political-ideological tool in every way, the question for a truly revolutionary art; therefore, is how to make this tool an opponent one that provides an alternative to the truth conception of the status quo. What are the ways to a representation that does not take 'reality' as reference, that does not reproduce the 'given', but aims a change in that very 'reality'? A representation that explains the

subjective and ideological projections which are claimed to be universal truths, but at the same time that does not create its own truth versions. A representation that shows the particular situations in their material-historical connections to each other and to other social formations. A truly alternative political theater is revolutionary in that sense.

One of the most prominent figures in the 20th-century theatre, Bertolt Brecht regarded art and theatre as a means of social change rather than a means of affirming the social reality. Forged as a means of transforming society, art was understood by Brecht to be more than simply a superstructural affirmation of reality. Brecht defined its role as active and critical appropriation of reality, with the artist confronting, exposing and acting upon real societal contradictions with a view to bringing about social change (Rechtien, 1998). Brecht presented a non-Aristotelian view of theatre and replaced the emphasis on pity and fear with 'historicism' and causality; while rejecting catharsis he was not totally against empathy and imitation, but he offered '*Verfremdungseffekt*' (alienation effect) as a sort of estrangement to help the audience make social criticism; and thus, becomes social change possible. Joe Kelleher presents an accurate explanation of Brecht's 'historicism' and the possibility of change it suggests:

> [...] not only is the past remembered in the present, but also a future – the future of the spectators – is somewhat made available to these figures from the tragic past. This future is the possibility of a new human relation, a relation to the future of the world that was not available *then* but could be available now, at least as an idea, if only in the theatre (Kelleher, 2009: 53).

What Brecht aims with identification is not the audience's identification with the characters but the understanding of how power dynamics and ideologies work within society. Therefore, Brecht uses identification when necessary, only for his characters and situations that do not hold or perpetuate power relations. Bertolt Brecht is a realist in that he presents a bleak portrayal of the corruption of human relationships; however, he also displays the process of how reality is constructed. He sees a kind of "alienation" in Aristotelian "identification," and he minimizes his use

of narration and leaves the play full of gaps to let the audience/reader draw their own meaning. And unlike the traditional realistic theatre, his very choice of not reproducing reality emphasizes the constructed nature of reality. Brechtian theatre does not provide the audience with easy solutions, and clear-cut endings, but wants the audiences to leave the theatre with questions in their minds. In other words, it makes the audience realize the constructed nature of meaning/reality, and see reality from a different perspective, allowing for new interpretations. Terry Eagleton defines this as a characteristic of "modernist literary works" in which the "act of enunciating" becomes the "content" so that the work is not taken as the reality itself, instead the readers are encouraged to produce their own critical accounts and by that way construct their own version of reality (Eagleton, 1983: 170). Similarly, Elin Diamond draws attention to the relationship between representation and the represented, and the ways in which 'reality' itself is constructed by the realistic forms: "Realism is more than an interpretation of reality passing as reality; it produces "reality" by positioning its spectator to recognize and verify its truths[. . .]" (Diamond, 1997: 4). Another theatre critic, David Sauer distinguishes modernist realism on the stage from "postmodern realism" – or "new realism" as other critics call it:

> At the end of the modernist realistic play there is closure and full revelation of the hidden or inner realities. [However in a postmodern work] there is no distinction between appearance and reality; both are the same, since everything is on the surface. There is no conflict between art and nature: nature is not a separate thing but, rather, a part of the artificially constructed human idea of reality—formed largely by mass media presentations of nature in books, films, television, and photographs. As a consequence, there is no closure as in modernist realism—no full revelation of the buried secrets so that the audience feels it knows the full truth as it has interpreted it by reading the signs all along (Sauer, 2004; 204).

After Brecht, classic realism is regarded as a form that reflects specific class interests and patriarchal, heterosexist values. Sue-Ellen Case, for instance, suggested that present-day practitioners should put realism aside because "its consequences for women are deadly" (Case, 1988: 71). However, feminist theoreticians later also added some feminist perspectives on traditional dramatic concerns of realism, narrative, and mimesis. Elin Diamond was one of those theoreticians who brought a feminist approach to Brecht's theory and presented 'gestic feminist criticism.' Diamond argues

that Brecht's alienation effect, when performed by a female, produces a "female body in representation that resists fetishization" (Diamond, 1997: 44). Diamond argues that defamiliarization "challenges the mimetic property of acting" by defamiliarizing us from a familiar object that is seen on the stage, and this technique can be 'powerful' if it is used theatrically as a critique of gender (Diamond, 1997: 45).

The conceptualizations of gender, race, ethnicity, and class are necessarily related to the concept of culture and it is useful here to explain the approach of the study to the concept of culture. The research will apply the syncretic notion of culture which values interaction, dialogue and negotiation and refuses any national and geographical boundaries to define it. The transcultural identities which are inscribed in the contemporary phase of globalisation are forms of syncretism at the core of culture and subjectivity (Brah, 1996: 208). In accordance ethnicity, gender, and class are accepted as social and economic constructions. According to Fredrik Barth ethnicity is not a primordial and essential concept but it is a construction formed through time depending on the social conditions. To Barth, ethnicity is not a fixed element of cultural identity and ethnic identity is formed as a result of the reciprocal interaction between the ideas and beliefs of individuals or groups about themselves and the ideas and beliefs of the *'other'* about those individuals or groups (Barth, 1996). Also, pointing out to the constructed nature of gender, Elin Diamond says, "Gender provides a perfect illustration of ideology at work, since feminine or masculine behaviour usually appears to be a natural-and thus fixed and unalterable-extension of biological sex" (Diamond, 1997: 46). Yet "the body is itself a construction; (that is) bodies come into being in and through the marks of gender" (Diamond, 1997: 46).

It has been long since the production of realistic/naturalistic forms in drama to explore the social relationships which are mostly based on power rather than solely on single instances of one-to-one relationships. Dramatic forms had to change to present an adequate picture of social relationships consisting in the hidden levels of emotional and psychological experience, or the social and historical construction of subjectivity. Besides, dramatic forms have to change constantly even in the process of mimetic representation as the social and historical composition of the society changes

constantly. Cultural materialism, even if not a conscious choice, as a method in drama is inevitable since as Raymond Williams says, “the methods or conventions of drama are not just technical preferences; they are at the same time, ideas of reality or ways of seeing life that have been shaped by the interests and assumptions of a particular culture” (Williams quoted in Regan, 2000: 50).

When it comes to cultural products, societies describe them with different categories such as minority, folk or popular, however those definitions are also social constructs which societies produced and in time the definitions themselves outstrip the societies, and culture in return start to define society itself. Cultural products become representations or misrepresentations of society. As Raymond Williams suggests the real dynamics of socio-cultural processes can be seen if the transformations of “popular” are observed. Raymond suggests popular culture emerges out of late forms of folk culture, more accurately the folk becomes the new and the urban popular, and finally it becomes the production of the bourgeois market which permeates into state education and political systems. For this reason, innovatory forms of art/culture constitute alternatives to the dominant general system defined and shaped by the bourgeois ideology (Williams quoted in Terence, 1997).

Similarly, in Deleuze and Guattari's account of the dominant cultural ideology there are forces and potentials capable of escape. Deleuze and Guattari formulates a cultural politics through the cultivation of a political and materialist semiology. Deleuze and Guattari consider the general theory of society as flows (or flux) : “the general theory of society is a generalized theory of flows; it is in terms of the latter that one must consider the relationship of social production to desiring-production, the variations of this relationship in each case, and the limits of this relationship in the capitalist system” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 262). In their formulation life is a desiring machine constituted of flows and cuts.

> It is at work everywhere, functioning smoothly at times, at other times in fits and starts. It breathes, it heats, it eats. It shits and fucks. What a mistake to have ever said the id. Everywhere it is machines—real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary

> couplings and connections. An organ-machine is plugged into an energy-source-machine: the one produces a flow that the other interrupts. The breast is a machine that produces milk, and the mouth *i* machine coupled to it. The mouth of the anorexic wavers between several functions: its possessor is uncertain as to whether it is an eating-machine, an anal machine, a talking-machine, or a breathing machine (asthma attacks). Hence we are all handymen: each with his little machines. For every organ-machine, an energy-machine: all the time, flows and interruptions (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 1-2).

In Deleuze and Guattari's semiology, semiotic flows are considered real as the material ones, and the material flows are just as semiotic as the semiotic productions. Therefore, in their conceptualization they describe a "non-signifying" semiology that eludes representation. Their concept of "assemblage" defines the different types of semiotics in connection with material processes. Hence, an assemblage is created where an asignifying lines of flight become possible. Asignifying signs are signs that do not signify: "It is not the figures that depend on the signifier and its effects, but the signifying chain that depends on the figural effects—this chain itself being composed of asignifying signs— crushing the signifiers as well as the signifieds, treating words as things, fabricating new unities, creating from nonfigurative figures configurations of images that form and then disintegrate" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 244).

In Deleuze and Guattari's formulation desiring-machines and social machines coexist. "Social production represents, at a molar level, what is produced, by desiring-production, at a molecular level" (Smith, 2011:41). While desire flows, social machine tries to represent and repress. "As a result, desiring-production comes to be crushed by the requirements of representation, and comes to desire its own repression" (Smith, 2011:41). Desiring machines provide the chance to create lines of flight. Social formations go between 'lines of flight' and representation: "Social formations can therefore oscillate between two poles, depending on whether desiring-machines have a chance of causing their immanent connections to pass into the regime of the social machines (the active schizophrenic line of flight), or by contrast the social machines overcode desire through the transcendent syntheses of representation (the reactionary paranoiac investment)" (Smith, 2011: 41).

According to Deleuze and Guattari's theory subjectivity, race, gender discriminations, exploitation of labor are all constructs of the capitalist machine that territorialize human societies. However, deterritorializing mechanisms provide the chance to escape these constructs. Deterritorializing flows and territorializing machines coexist in Deleuze and Guattari's analysis of the capitalist system.

> there is the twofold movement of decoding or deterritorializing flows on the one hand, and their violent and artificial reterritorialization on the other. The more the capitalist machine deterritorializes, decoding and axiomatizing flows in order to extract surplus value from them, the more its ancillary apparatuses, such as government bureaucracies and the forces of law and order, do their utmost to reterritorialize, absorbing in the process a larger and larger share of surplus value (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 34-35).

'Deterritorializing mechanisms' is central to Deleuze and Guattari's theory as a concept. 'De-territorialization,' is the tendency of the capitalist mode of production. "The decoding of flows and the deterritorialization of the socius thus constitutes the most characteristic and the most important tendency of capitalism" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 34). And this tendency is defined as schizophrenic and has the power to surpass capitalism:

> It continually draws near to its limit, which is a genuinely schizophrenic limit. It tends, with all the strength at its command, to produce the schizo as the subject of the decoded flows on the body without organs—more capitalist than the capitalist and more proletarian than the proletariat. This tendency is being carried further and further, to the point that capitalism with all its flows may dispatch itself straight to the moon: we really haven't seen anything yet! (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 34).

Capitalism holds the schizophrenic accumulation at its limit: "For capitalism constantly counteracts, constantly inhibits this inherent tendency while at the same time allowing it free rein; it continually seeks to avoid reaching its limit while simultaneously tending toward that limit" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983: 34). In Deleuze and Guattari's formulation, the capitalist mode of production can be surpassed if its processes of deterritorialization are accelerated to a point that capital cannot recover them anymore. Asignifying signs, 'lines of flight,' are also produced by the processes of deterritorialization. These lines of flight have the tendency to multiply so fast that

the capital cannot control them. For this reason, to be able to create an alternative to the system these processes of escape, lines of flight, are crucial. Similarly, art and literature can be part of that praxis and constitute an alternative to the system by creating lines of flight. “To make the sequences vibrate, to open the word onto unexpected internal intensities —in short, an asignifying *intensive utilization* of language” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986: 22) is an example of how Kafka created these lines of flight in Deleuze and Guattari’s analysis. Thus, this research will focus on and analyze the ‘lines of flight’ and ‘deterritorializing mechanisms’ produced by the dramatic text which make it an alternative to the mainstream cultural products.

Methodology

This study claims that certain radical dramatic texts have ideological relations with the reader/audience and the historical period with which the text concerns itself, that they become a means of ideological and cultural involvement, and therefore have possible subversive social and political effects. The interactions of politics and dramatic theatre will be examined with a historical-materialist method which considers the historical/political context of the texts with their connections to theories of theatre and literature. The main question directing the analysis of the theatrical language of dramatic texts is: How do these dramatic texts constitute a subversive action, a style uncontaminated by the performative aspects of everyday life and therefore by dominant codes and systems of representation? Raymond Williams who paved the way for radical theoretical criticism on drama and performance is the starting point of this research on the theoretical analysis of drama as cultural production:

> Despite the fact that *Drama in Performance* predates the impact of such theoretical movements as semiotics, indispensable to any contemporary method of performance analysis, its flexible and enterprising articulation of dramatic texts, theatre history, particular contexts of performance, and the performance potentialities implicit in the texts, can still point to necessary directions in the theoretical analysis of drama as cultural production (Williams, 1991;10).

The intention underneath the question that forms the core of the study is to prove the assumption that theatrical language can be subversive in the face of dominant

ideology and therefore may be an active component of social change. With this aim, the research will offer a reading of the model of semiotics developed by Deleuze and Guattari, and it will propose a cultural materialist analysis of the selected dramatic texts.

CHAPTER I

1. Representation of Class

1.1. “The Hairy Ape” by Eugene O’Neill

1.1.1. Plot:

The Hairy Ape starts in the forecastle of a cruise ship sailing from New York across the Atlantic. In the first scene firemen are seen off duty and drunk. Yank is the strongest of them all and he sees himself most compatible with the job and the times they are in. Yank does not like Long for his socialism and Paddy as he misses the old days in seamanship. Later the steel tycoon’s daughter Mildred Douglas, whose father also owns the ship, comes to visit the ship with her aunt. Mildred wants to see the ship for her social work so that she understands how the lower classes live. Two other men help Mildred and her aunt to go down to the stokehole. In the stokehole while Yank and the other firemen are working, Yank does not see the women entering as his back has been turned. Yank shouts at the other stokers so that they keep putting coal. All the others see the women and stop, only after that Yank turns around and sees the women. Mildred, appalled by Yank’s words and behavior, calls him a ‘filthy beast’ while fainting with shock. Later Yank is seen thinking about what has happened. He is seen very angry at Mildred for comparing him to a hairy ape, and he decides to take revenge. Three weeks later Yank is with Long in New York in Fifth Avenue. Yank waits for the rich churchgoers to leave the church and then goes near them shouting. The people ignore him, Long runs away, but the police arrests Yank for disturbing people. In the next scene Yank is in prison for his offence. While talking to the other prisoners he learns about the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) as an organization that fights against injustices lower classes go through. With his anger towards Mildred, Yank decides to join IWW and bends the bars of the cell with his hands, but the guards restrain him. After that Yank is seen at the IWW office to join them. However, Yank talks about blowing things up and other radical ideas; therefore, the people in the organization think that Yank is a government spy; so, they dismiss him. The next morning Yank visits the zoo and wants to be friends with an ape whom he thinks is similar to himself. He lets the ape out of his cage and wants to shake his

hands. With his approach the ape attacks Yank and crushes his ribs with his arms, and then Yank dies in the ape's cage where he is thrown by the gorilla.

1.1.2. Analysis of "The Hairy Ape"

"People come to the theater to forget their troubles, not to be reminded of them. What are you trying to do—send them home to commit suicide?" (J. O'Neil quoted in Bowen, 1959: 114). Although pleased with the play's and his son's theatrical success, Eugene O'Neill's father James O'Neill, a well-known actor of his time notorious for his life-long part in the famous melodrama *The Count of Monte Cristo*, uttered these words after seeing his son's play *Beyond the Horizon*, which brought Eugene O'Neill his first Pulitzer Prize in June 1920. There was a clash between the father and son's understandings of theatre as Eugene O'Neill was in strong opposition to the cheap melodramas of the period and wanted drama to have a philosophical and artistic statement. Eugene O'Neill's plays are considered to have a "predominantly American quality" while frequently depicting New Englanders characterized by "search for a home" (*Bound East for Cardiff*, *Strange Interlude*, *Mourning Becomes Electra*), "break up of the family as a social unit" (*Long Day's Journey Into Night*, *Ah, Wilderness*, *Welded*, *Beyond the Horizon*), and "disintegration of belief in the institutionalized Christian God" (*Bound East for Cardiff*, *Days Without End*, *Long Day's Journey Into Night*) (Going, 1976: 390). Although some critics claim that his plays are autobiographical, the stories pertaining his own life can rather be regarded as a tool to capture the American mindset in the modern period dramatizing the evolution of the nation. The truth value of the autobiographical material within the plays is of no account compared to the 'realistic' depiction of the social and psychological issues of the modern American people. However, O'Neill was trying new forms and ways of expression in his literary realism as opposed to "a lifeless, imitative style," an unquestioned reproduction of life conventionally understood by 'realism. In a letter to drama critic George Jean Nathan, O'Neill wrote, "Damn that word, 'realism'! . . . I [mean] something 'really real,' in the sense of being spiritually true, not meticulously life-like—an interpretation of actuality by a distillation, an elimination of most realistic trappings, an intensification of human lives into clear symbols of truth"(O'Neill quoted in Cunningham, 1996: 108). It is exactly Eugene O'Neill's this innovative and experimentalist approach of 'representing reality' in the dramatic texts and through form that makes his work political and alternative to the

mainstream ideology. As aptly put by Frank R. Cunningham, “Throughout his long career as a dramatist, O’Neill exerted enormous effort in attacking artistic and social assumptions held by the ever-powerful “party of reality”; he continually challenged orthodoxies wherever he found them, in an attempt both to create a more “really real” dramatic literature by subverting commonly accepted literalist notions of dramatic form, and to affect his society by mounting frequent challenges to its complacency, particularly in matters concerning class discrimination and the burgeoning commercialism and materialism in the new American century” (Cunningham, 1996: 108).

This part within the chapter deals with the connection of class struggle with the issues of sense of fragmentation as a consequence of the changes in the conditions of the period, reckoning with the past, moral collapse, uncertainty, frustration, identity and sense of belonging in Eugene O’Neill’s 1922 play *The Hairy Ape: A Comedy of Ancient and Modern Life*. *The Hairy Ape* focuses on the industrializing of the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century and the oppressive, exploitative and overwhelming effects of capitalist ideology on individuals. Faced with discrimination and othering, the stoker Yank loses his sense of belonging and seeks a quest to find himself. In this context, it is seen that there are researchers who deal with Yank as a tragic hero that results in death, or as exemplary of Darwinian human evolution. While Eugene O’Neill considers the position of the self-alienated individual in the order of capitalist exploitation, he does not have a ‘vulgar’ Marxist perspective and present a propaganda play; however, the playwright explicitly addresses the story of the hero who experiences the individual reflections of class problematics and social change, and by using realistic and expressive techniques, O’Neill problematizes the art of representation itself and opposes the creationist, essentialist, idealistic forms of representation; in this context, the play is an example of alternative political theatre and this point will be emphasized while reviewing the play.

In a letter to Kenneth Macgowan in 1921 O’Neill describes the form of his play *The Hairy Ape* as having features of both “extreme naturalism” and “extreme expressionism,” and expresses his intention in writing the play as: “I have tried to dig

deep in it to probe in the shadows of the soul of man bewildered by the disharmony of his primitive pride and individualism at war with the mechanistic development of society" (O'Neill quoted in Egri, 1984: 77).

In the introduction of the play O'Neill provides a long description of the setting warning that "the treatment of this scene, or of any other scene in the play, should by no means be naturalistic" (O'Neill, 1966: 137). The description he provides is a highly distorted claustrophobic image of a firemen's forecastle in a transatlantic liner by which he wants to create the effect of men "imprisoned by white steel" (O'Neill, 1966: 137). The place is so confined that the "ceiling crushes down upon the men's heads" (O'Neill, 1966: 137), and the stokers cannot even "stand upright" (O'Neill, 1966: 137) but stay in the "natural stooping posture" (O'Neill, 1966: 137) which all emphasize the difficult and constrictive conditions of their labor loaded on their shoulders by the modern world. Not only the setting but also the characters are described in distorted shape:

> The men themselves should resemble those pictures in which the appearance of Neanderthal Man is guessed at. All are hairy chested, with long arms of tremendous power, and low, receding brows above their small, fierce, resentful eyes. All the civilized white races are represented, but except for the slight differentiation in color of hair, skin, eyes, all these men are alike (O'Neill, 1966: 137).

Distortion in Yank, being presented as the most powerful of all the sailors, is reinforced and exaggerated even more as a character:

> Yank is seated in the foreground. He seems broader, fiercer, more truculent, more powerful, more sure of himself than the rest. They respect his superior strength – the grudging respect of fear. Then, too, he represents to them a self-expression, the very last word in what they are, their most highly developed individual (O'Neill, 1966: 137).

The distorted image of the characters through expressionistic stage formation and style enhances and lays bare the inner psyche of the characters. The tormented soul and body of the workers with the advancement of industrialism is represented

through O'Neill's long, descriptive stage settings. The image drawn by these characters who are resembled to 'Neanderthal Man' indicates humanity's backward movement towards the initial phase of evolutionary chain, to a state where they look and act like hairy apes.

The psychological state of the characters pressured by the challenging conditions of capitalist exploitation is also further reinforced by the use of sounds in the text as Peter Egri explains in detail:

> The arrangement of sounds embodies the auditory equivalent of sense: tentative and dispersed parallels of consonants, vowels, and diphthongs converge in the crescendo of cumulative violence. In the sentence "The room is crowded with men, shouting, cursing, laughing, singing—a confused, inchoate uproar swelling into a unity, a meaning—the bewildered, furious, baffled defiance of a beast in a cage," the inchoate murmur in the [r] of "room" is increased by the [r] of "crowded," snarls and growls in the onomatopoeic "uproar," and becomes reinforced by the [r]-s of "bewildered" and "furious." The initial explosion heard in the [k] of "crowded" is repeated and stepped up in "cursing," "confused," "inchoate," and "cage." [...] The level of noise represented by "shouting" is audibly heightened by the sequence of "cursing," "laughing," and "singing," not only because of the meaning of the words but also on account of the similarity of their sound pattern: two syllables, initial stress, -ing ending. The hissing [s] in "cursing" is echoed by "singing," swells in "swelling," and returns in "furious," "defiance," and "beast" (Egri, 1984: 79).

Due to Christopher Caudwell's theory, the 'truth' of poetry lay in its ability to render and alter emotional attitudes and relationships to reality, either through a mimetic or symbolic language (Pawling, 1989: 43). Here, it is possible to say that in the audience O'Neill creates the same feelings of constraint and burden that these men feel by using the expressionist setting and language. The representation of the compelling conditions of capitalist economy through the stokers' hell like degrading environment constricted by the modern steel constitutes feelings of suffocation, and imprisonment like a captured wild animal. But how does language do that? According to Caudwell poetry originated in rhythmical collective expressions of primitive man's emotions (Pawling, 1989: 44). Similarly, Jane Harrison says rituals gave expression to a desire for something to happen, thus imagination seemed to be able to enrich nature. When a desire, like hunting an animal, could not find an utterance in the actual act, it broke out into a mimetic anticipatory action. Ritual then imitated not altogether

for a practical but emotional end (Pawling, 1989: 44). To Caudwell, collective emotion was necessary in the face of potential dangers of nature and for the demand of the consistency of social life when no danger to it was visible. This is how poetry originated from the economic life of a tribe, and how illusion grew out of reality (Pawling, 1989: 45). This emotional meaning attribution to language is a social action and has intensified in the course of history. Therefore, the language of a literary work bears the emotions and meanings loaded to it during its social-historical course throughout. Hence, it has the potential to social action.

In the fireman's forecastle of the transatlantic liner "[t]he lines of bunks, the uprights supporting them, cross each other like the steel framework of a cage" (O'Neill, 1966: 137). From the very beginning steel appears as a powerful metaphor of imprisonment by the social and economic conditions, and remains so until the end of the play:

> In spite of the transatlantic's promise of limitless mobility and progress, the world constituted in the scene is suggestive of enclosure and enslavement, implied by the words "imprisoned" and "cage", which stands for the industrialized world of the 1920s' America. Steel, the main metaphor of the play, dominates the stage in the opening scene and its association with prisons and cages foreshadows the incidents to follow in the rest of the play (Sözalan, 2006: 39).

The metaphor of steel is also connected with the main theme of the play: sense of belonging. Yank identifies "himself with "steel" which symbolizes motion and speed and thus symbolizes life for Yank" (Uma, 2010: 260).

> I‟m smoke and express trains and steamers and factory whistles ..... And I‟m what makes iron into steel; steel dat stands for the whole thing! And I‟m steel-steel-steel! I‟m de muscles in steel, de punch behind it! (O'Neill, 1966: 146).

Karl Marx believed that we became human through work because naturally we tended to flourish when we created. However, the capitalist mode of production alienated workers from each other and the product of their own labor. In the factories of 19th century Europe workers worked for long hours for little money under dehumanizing conditions. Yet, Marx identified that these workers were also alienated

to their own labor. The term alienation basically means the things that belong comes apart. What comes apart, according to Marx is the essence and the existence of human beings as they are not living in the way they ought to live being excluded and separated from their own labor. In 1844 manuscripts, Marx detects alienation working in four different ways. The first one is alienation from the product of the workers' own labor, which means workers produced things that they cannot afford to buy for the ruling classes' service. This is also collective alienation because not only the specific worker in the factory is alienated from the product but also the other people outside when they take a product in their hands unaware of how it is made, its processes, social conditions under which they are made. Owners of the means of production rule the workers although workers are the ones that produce. And tragically, the more the workers produce the more they produce the means of their own domination because the capital owners earn more money. The second form of alienation is from productive activity. Workers work in the production line mechanically and unconsciously like they are the dehumanized machines of the capital owners. Although human beings are essentially productive, they feel most alive when they are away from work. It is another tragic situation because people feel human when they create. The third form of alienation is alienation from species essence. Being creative is the distinctive essence of human beings. Many other animals can be creative as well, but human beings are distinctive in their ability to learn from each other and develop throughout the course of history. Yet, under Capitalism people cannot enjoy their essence. The final form is alienation from other human beings. Even though there is a division of labor and workers work as part of a big flesh and blood machine, they cannot get coordinated. Instead they are divided and ruled. In social life people rely on each other when a person goes to work, then go shopping, buy things, pay money, but they are not aware of this dependence and connection. They are separated (Marx, 1988).

Yank's attitude fits into Marx's definition of alienation. Yank has become a dehumanized machine seeing himself as 'the steel.' He has internalized this dehumanized state so much so that he has no self-awareness. He is alienated from the product of his own labor. While the rich class enjoys the transatlantic cruise to the utmost, he is at the very bottom of the ship toiling to feed the furnace, breathing coal

dust instead of the fresh ocean air. However, Yank is so alienated from nature assuming the new modern profile that not being able to reach the primary source of life, fresh air, does not bother him: "He can't breathe and swallow coal-dust, but I kin, see? Dat's fresh air for me! Dat's food for me! I'm new, get me?" (O'Neill, 1966: 145). On the other hand, Yank is also estranged from the past with no sense of history and connection to it as he discards Paddy for talking about the 'good old days':

> Paddy: [...] 'Twas them days men belonged to ships, not now. 'Twas them days a ship was part of the sea, and a man was part of a ship, and the sea joined all together and made it one. [Scornfully] Is it one wid this you'd be, Yank – black smoke from the funnels smudging the sea, smudging the decks – the bloody engines pounding and throbbing and shaking – with divil a sight of sun or a breath of clean air – choking our lungs wid coal-dust – breaking our backs and hearts in the hell of the stokehole – feeding the bloody furnace – feeding our lives along wid the coal, I'm thinking – caged in by steel from a sight of the sky like bloody apes in the Zoo! [With harsh laugh] Ho-ho, divil mend you! Is it to belong to that you are wishing? Is it a flesh and blood wheel of the engines you'd be? (O'Neill, 1966: 144).

Yank, indeed, is becoming a cogwheel of the Capitalist machine as he sees himself belonging to it with false consciousness. Without any awareness of history, alien to his own nature he sees no connection with his fellow labor man Paddy: "Yuh don't belong no more, see. You don't get de stuff. You're too old. [*Disgustedly*]" (O'Neill, 1966: 145). In fact, the false consciousness is not only Yank's peculiarity. Except Paddy and Long, all the workers in the stokehole have become a part of the machine, and Yank, in a way, coordinates them in favor of the machine instead of their own nature as they all admire him and are impressed by him. Just as Long, the only character with a class consciousness in the stokehole, starts talking, they hush him up:

> Long: They dragged us down till we're on'y wage slaves in the bowels of a bloody ship, sweatin', burnin' up, eatin' coal-dust! Hit's them's ter blame – the damned capitalist clarss! [There had been a gradual murmur of contemptuous resentment rising among the men until now he is interrupted by a storm of catcalls, hisses, boos, hard laughter.]
>
> Voices: Turn it off!
>
> Shut up!
>
> Sit down!
>
> Closa da face!
>
> Tamn fool! [Etc.] (O'Neill, 1966: 141-2).

Representation of the Long character and the reactions of his fellows to his Leftist ideas, on the other hand, reflects O'Neill's own political stance in real life. O'Neill, unlike some of his Leftist friends who supported and got excited with the Bolshevik Revolution, was suspicious of the idea of revolution itself and was against governments as he thought that they restricted the individual liberty. Although in his last years he became a conservative, during 1920s he had supported "the radical Left, an anarchist in opposition to all authority, whether of church or state, the rebel against the materialist culture of capitalism and the tyranny of pettiness stifling bourgeois society" (Diggins, 2007: 52). Isolation of the class conscious Long among his coworkers is, thus, a deliberate choice as O'Neill did not believe in revolution and the Marxist idea of progressive historical development. He was instead presenting a more realistic portrayal of working-class characters who are self-oppressed and unable to reach awareness, and who live with acceptance of their situation, or worse with resentment not changing anything. O'Neill was considering anarchism more viable and moral as a political stance:

> Most anarchists had little use for Hegel's dialectical reasoning, and thus they looked to the people themselves to bring reason and justice into the world, without the redemptive illusions of science and philosophy and without the predictable stages of history. From this perspective people are as much the problem as the solution. O'Neill's pessimistic outlook resonated with the anarchist dictum that there are no tyrants but only slaves and that if there were no subjects there would be no state. [...] the problem might be that the masses whom the Marxists assumed would carry out the "mission" of history remained obedient subjects. That the many allow themselves to be ruled by the few troubled O'Neill as much as it did Rousseau and Nietzsche. Marx promised that humanity could break free of its chains. O'Neill saw that it was more than chains that kept the masses in subjugation (Diggins, 2007: 64).

Yank is at ease with the conditions he has been presented. He is strong, "more powerful, more sure of himself than the rest" (O'Neill, 1966: 137), and his sense of belonging to this order is intact, "We run de whole woiks. All de rich guys dat tink dey're somep'n, dey ain't nothin'! Dey don't belong. But us guys, we're in de move, we're at de bottom, de whole ting is us!" (O'Neill, 1966: 146). What was it then that kept the working-class as obedient subjects? Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony explains how lower classes are kept in subjugation despite inhumane conditions with

the claim that human beings are not only ruled by force, but also by ideas. In fact, he explains the survival of western civilization with this ideological factor. "Not that ideas were powerful enough to eliminate class struggle, but they were obviously capable of muting it sufficiently to allow class societies to function" (Bates, 1975: 351). Gramsci developed his theory of hegemony while studying the role of intellectuals in the society. He thought of the concept of superstructure by Marx as having two 'floors': 'civil society' and 'political society.'

> Civil society is composed of all those "private organisms" –schools, churches, clubs, journals, and parties—which contribute in molecular fashion to the formation of social and political consciousness. Political society, on the other hand, is composed of those public institutions—the government, courts, police, and army—which exercise "direct dominion." It is synonymous with the "state." The ruling class exerts its power over society on both of these "floors" of action, but by very different methods. Civil society is the marketplace of ideas, where intellectuals enter as "salesmen" of contending cultures. The intellectuals succeed in creating hegemony to the extent that they extend the world view of the rulers to the ruled, and thereby secure the "free" consent of the masses to the law and order of the land. To the extent that the intellectuals fail to create hegemony, the ruling class falls back on the state's coercive apparatus which disciplines those who do not "consent," and which is "constructed for all society in anticipation of moments of crisis of command ... when spontaneous consensus declines" (Bates, 1975: 353).

O'Neill once said that the mysterious death of his friend Driscoll who was a tough coworker from his seamanship days inspired him to create Yank. Apparently, Driscoll committed suicide jumping into the ocean, and no one knew the reason to it.

> Driscoll's curious death puzzled me. [...] I concluded something must have shaken his hard-boiled poise, for he wasn't the type who just give up, and he loved life. Anyway it was his death that inspired the idea for the Yank of 'The Hairy Ape' (O'Neill quoted in Alexander: 1962: 246).

Inspired by this character, O'Neill thought about what might have shaken the integrity of such a strong character and crashed his sense of belonging. Yank's sense of belonging is similarly strong in full submission to the order he exists in. However, his illusion is suddenly destroyed when Mildred who is the granddaughter of a steel tycoon wants to pay a visit to the stokehole to "discover how the other half lives" (O'Neill, 1966: 149). As soon as Mildred enters the stokehole, she witnesses Yank, whose back

is turned to her, shoveling coal, growling, grunting, and insulting the other workers. Yank realizes a while later that the other workers have stopped shoveling, and he turns around when he suddenly sees Mildred. As his eyes catches Mildred's, Mildred, before fainting, says, "Take me away! Oh, the filthy beast" (O'Neill, 1966: 157). After this one single gaze, Yank's existential journey starts; he will never be the same:

> The play's title itself suggests the kind of taxonomic confusion under which Yank exists: in addition to his given name and nickname, he is violently named (and then renamed) in a crucial scene where his antagonist, the young steel heiress Mildred Douglas, calls him a "filthy beast," and another foil, the melancholy sailor Paddy, rephrases the insult in zoological terms, coining the troubling moniker "hairy ape." The rest of the drama consists of Yank's attempts to come to terms with these interpellations and their implications and consequences. By staging the power of the "imperialist gaze," the authoritative look that categorizes difference according to hierarchies of race, class, and species, O'Neill evokes the practices of nineteenth-century ethnographic display, where Yank/Robert Smith becomes at once a "savage" (nonwhite, nonwestern, and nonhuman) and an actor (surrogate, symbol, and sacrifice), shackled to the violently constitutive performances such roles have traditionally required (Rundle, 2008: 51).

O'Neill brings forth an existential crisis, and as Yank starts questioning who he is; and thus he, also through him the audience, starts questioning his subjugation. His existential journey becomes a means through which the audience/reader questions the politics of identity, class conflicts, false consciousness of the proletariat, humanist ideals and orthodox Marxist assumptions. O'Neill points out to the importance of existential crisis as the subject, which he believes is based in the problem that the modern man has lost his sense of harmony with nature:

> *The Hairy Ape* was propaganda in the sense it was a symbol of a man, who has lost his old harmony with nature, the harmony which he used to have as an animal and has not yet acquired in a spiritual way. Thus, not being able to find it on earth nor in heaven, he's in the middle, trying to make peace, taking the "woist punches from bot' of'em." . . . Yank can't go forward, and so he tries to go back. This is what his shaking hands with the gorilla meant. But he can't go back to "belonging" either. . . . The subject here is the same ancient one that always was and always will be the one subject for drama, and that is man and his struggle with his own fate. The struggle used to be with the gods, but is now with himself, his own past, his attempt to "belong" (O'Neill quoted in Diggins, 2007: 76).

The modern man's problem, the lost sense of harmony with nature and his attempt to belong, in O'Neill's words suggest Deleuzian approach to representation. Deleuze's work regarded life as desire itself; and to him humanity, language, or culture was not the ground of life, and thinking was just another flow of desire like others. Deleuze was against fixed images of desire, and in his work with Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus,* he aimed to free desire from fixed images. "The rest of Deleuze's work, in very different ways, sought to free life from fixed and rigid models, such as the image of the rational subject, the image of 'man', or even the ideas of thinking as information and communication" (Colebrook,2002: xvii). Therefore; reading it through Deleuzian philosophy, it is possible to claim that O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape* is an example of 'minor literature' as it questions humanism and the idea of the rational man suggested with the frequently appearing image of Rodin's Thinker, fixed identity roles, and class roles as fixed and rigid models, and meta-textually puts representation itself forward as a problematic.

Even though Yank goes through an existential journey and starts questioning his identity after his labeling as a 'beast', the outcome of this journey, what Yank and as a result what the audience/reader finds in terms of identities, goes against the tenets of Existentialism. "Existentialism [...] argued that we needed to overturn the idea that there are ultimate and unchanging essences, such as human nature; rather, human beings are nothing other than processes of decision; at each moment of our lives we are 'radically free'" (J. P. Sartre quoted in Colebrook, 2002: xxxvi). According to this, human identity is produced through people's free choices. "There are no rules, meanings or essences other than those that we produce through our existence" (Colebrook, 2002: xxxvi). "Phenomenology [...] also argued that the human world was only possible because human life produces or constitutes the world as a meaningful project; there is no 'world' outside the human project of sense and meaning" (E. Husserl quoted in Colebrook, 2002: xxxvi-ii). Deleuze, on the other hand, was against existentialism and phenomenology, and he claimed that forces beyond people's free decision shape their actions and subjectivity. "While there may not be timeless and static 'essences,' in the sense of meanings lying behind our representations, there are nevertheless essential powers or forces which make any act of thought or

representation possible" (Colebrook, 2002: xxxii). Deleuze insisted that we need to look at these forces, and art does not just represent those forces but also produce them. "We can, and should, intuit the forces of desire that produce representations. Doing so, Deleuze argued, will take us out of our dogmas of common sense and into entirely new ways of thinking" (Colebrook, 2002: xxxii). To be able to address this issue Deleuze insisted on the pre-human problem:

> What are the forces, differences, processes or (to use his term) 'syntheses' which produce recognisable entities such as human beings or political classes? In terms of structuralism we might phrase the problem this way: what are the forces of difference that produce the structures of language, culture and politics that allow us to live an ordered and meaningful world? In political terms, what are the forces and powers that have produced the various political terrains of history, including capitalism and the image of the free human agent? (Colebrook, 2002: xl).

Common sense or representational thinking assumes that there is a world outside as a foundation (transcendence) and human thought copies or represents the 'real' world. In that sense thought would be judged according to its accuracy, to how well it reflects the external 'reality', which explains the occurrence of 'common sense', the description of how human beings should act. However, Deleuze regards this type of thinking as exclusionary which ignores other forms of thought such as stupidity or creativity. "Representational thinking assumes that there is an ordered and differentiated world, which we then dutifully represent; it does not allow for thought itself to make a difference, and it does not see difference as a positive and creative power to differentiate" (Colebrook, 2002: 3). Yet, thought does not always represent truth and change is only possible by showing different alternatives to common sense. Deleuze says "the world of representation is characterised by its inability to conceive of difference in itself" (Deleuze quoted in Colebrook, 2002: 3). There is no subjectivity in control of thought, there is thought and within thought we assume a subject position or truth. We do not represent truth by our thoughts, "thinking, Deleuze insists, is an event that happens to us" (Colebrook, 2002: 3). Deleuze asks how is it that the common sense view of the world occurred. How is it that we assumed thought as truth, acceptable and suitable to conform to? Deleuze attributes this to a renunciation of difference.

Structuralists based this difference on language; according to them we differentiate the world through language. The idea that there could be no identity without difference was originally Hegel's idea. Hegel established his theory of identity on negative difference: "What something *is* is defined through its other, its negation, or what it *is not*" (Colebrook, 2002: 6). The primacy of difference and its negative character in Hegel was taken and extended by Structuralists; however, what was mostly idealistic in Hegel obtained a material framework in Structuralism as they claimed that difference took place within the system of language. Human beings could have meaning only because there were different sounds and script within the structure of the language. "Structuralists argued that there were not some beings or identities that then differentiate themselves through time from some point of genesis, there are only things or origins because of the systems of structural difference" (Colebrook, 2002: 11-12). There was no essence or genesis where the meaning occurred. Structural psychoanalysis attached subjectivity to a lost origin and claimed that through language we tried to represent our desire for connection with this origin.

> For structural psycho-analysis, it is this experience of language as a lawful order that produces a myth or fantasy of oedipal subjection: I imagine that there was some pure presence prior to differentiation (maternal plenitude); I imagine that 'I' abandoned this origin and submitted to this system for some end or law (the phallus, social recognition, or what can only be held by another and never presented in itself). However, 'I' am nothing outside this oedipal fantasy; 'I' am an effect of the speaking system. Subjectivity is an imagined presence behind signification that is necessarily lost, lacking, alienated and absent (Colebrook, 2002: 26).

Deleuze, on the other hand, regarded difference as essential in his philosophy; however, he also claimed that there is the origin of difference, but it was itself already differentiated:

> Deleuze thought that great philosophy, art and thinking were attempts to confront the 'genetic element', but this genesis or power of difference and creation could not be traced back to either a system (language or structure) or a being

> (consciousness or origin). Rather, difference is groundless, anarchic, constantly creating and never the same as itself (Colebrook, 2002: 12).

Deleuze's philosophy is therefore unique in that it both accepts an idea of origin and difference. He claimed that there were not only differences but an origin where this difference emerged. He questioned the origin of language and subjectivity, and he regarded difference positively. Common sense tries to label and reduce difference to representation; it sees an ordered, differentiated world represented and copied by human thought. However; for Deleuze difference is the air we breathe, it constantly creates and produces different forms of life in a never ending process; therefore, contrary to Structuralist view difference is positive: "difference is not just imposed by language on the world; difference is not a single system or structure to which we, as speaking subjects, must 'submit'" (Colebrook, 2002: 18). While developing their theory, Deleuze and Guattari made use of Levi-Straus's structuralist anthropology as they explained the origin of human individuals with tribal systems (social structures) and the production of human interest through social structures of exchange. To them desires begin pre-personally; they precede and organize interest and persons (Colebrook, 2002: 19). In life there is constant flow of difference, and desire causes these flows to connect and form other flows of difference. Deleuze and Guattari justify the origin of difference and explain its repression which also created the thought of human subjectivity with forces that they call 'syntheses': "Synthesis is the becoming of life itself, the connection of creative differences into further lines of creation" (Colebrook, 2002: 38), to them what is repressed is actually the creative, productive, dynamic difference by the human individual.

> Both capitalism and psychoanalysis explain desire from the individual, but the individual is the outcome of a reduction and homogenisation of difference. The concept of the individual is itself repressive or reactionary, reactionary because it grounds all desires on some prior value of the self. This is why Deleuze and Guattari historicise the individual's emergence from desire, and in so doing hope to provide a political theory of difference, rather than one based on the emancipation of identities (Colebrook, 2002: 40).

Deleuze and Guattari divide the history of desire into forms of synthesis or production in *Anti-Oedipus* and detect three different stages of synthesis in history. There is also a pre-synthesized plane which they call 'the body without organs,' or 'the plane of immanence.' The first form of synthesis is connection where flows of desire intersect with one another. It is also a form of territorialisation in which members of a tribe gather or connect with each other and are marked by scars or tattoos as part of a collective ritual. The second stage of synthesis is disjunction where intensities are opposed to each other. Here the connection of the tribe members is tied to the law of a despot who marks the bodies of the members accordingly, it is a sign of submission to a power. It is not a collective ritual anymore, but the power of an upper body imposed on the tribe members. The second stage is also a form of deterritorialisation because the occupied territories are regulated by an external law maker, it is a transcendent power. The final stage of synthesis is conjunction. The intensities, the flows are defined by the law of nature. The subordinating power of the despot has shifted and has been internalized by the people. All life is reduced to one single intensity, which is the flow of the capital.

> The third synthesis of conjunction refers all the flows back to some general abstract essence, such as the flow of capital. The order of connections is not imposed from without (the body of the despot terrorising the tribe); it is produced from the ground—all connections and disjunctions, all differences or flows, are read as instances of, as signs or expressions of, some underlying whole. It is through this third synthesis that we can imagine that virtual whole of difference which possessed the tendencies from which difference emerged: the body without organs, the chaosmos, the plane of immanence, life, virtual difference (Colebrook, 2002: 108).

It is striking that in the third synthesis, in modernity, it is no longer a source of power that controls human beings, but the law in power is internalized within each subject. "We have become self-disciplining precisely because we have repressed the historical and political syntheses that produce bodies and individuals" (Colebrook, 2002: 111). In the first synthesis there is only the flow of life, desire to connect, and power is immanent in all beings. Difference occurs as each being connects with each other, each are considered as a flow, and flows connect with each other. In disjunction

power shifts from immanence to a transcendent becoming that controls the territory from outside. This is the beginning of the law and state, and they emerge for economic reasons in order to hold control of the surplus value. The tyrant controls desire with the threat of pain. And in the third synthesis the force that controls as law and politics is the capital. Political power is not the State or the law maker anymore, but it is rather immanent, it is the capital that controls the distribution of power.

> Desire assembles into tribes, states and persons; through synthesis and production it forms assemblages. But it is after the event that we imagine that there must have been some substance or ground which was assembled, some substance in itself. In modernity this is the myth of capital (Colebrook, 2002: 125).

In Capitalism human beings subject themselves to the system internalizing it thanks to the third stage of synthesis. Within the conjunctive synthesis, human beings explain connection and disjunction with subject or essence.

> According to Deleuze and Guattari, the homogenisation, subordination and subjection of difference to identity have characterised the process of human history leading up to capitalism and psychoanalysis. We now imagine only one system of difference—the subjective signification of the world (or the social construction of reality)—and have an Oedipus complex to explain it (Colebrook, 2002: 39).

Capitalism is the reduction of all difference to one flow, the flow of capital. Similarly, according to Deleuze and Guattari explaining subjectivity with one system of signification, language, is reductive.

> Like psychoanalysis and the fantasy of the individual, capitalism also reduces difference to the figure of 'man', erasing the ways in which difference emerges from pre-human and collective processes of territorialisation. In capitalism we locate difference within one system of exchange—the economy—with 'man' or the individual being the agent of a uniform exchangeable and quantifiable labour. Difference is again reduced to a system to which we submit and within which we are located (Colebrook, 2002: 40).

We criticize capitalism from a humanist position, but for Deleuze and Guattari the problem is this reduction of all difference to the system of labor and exchange. There is a tendency of deterritorialising in capitalism and psychoanalysis, and to be able to overcome this we need to push its limits. There are flows and differences in life all over, and rather than seeing this difference negatively, as part of a lack and a system of signification, Deleuze and Guattari suggest we see subjectivity as an effect of endless number of positive becomings.

> For Deleuze and Guattari, though, the problem with capitalism is its 'humanity' and 'personality', for it relies on seeing all difference as reducible to the system of labour and exchange, to some general notion of the human worker. At the heart of capital is the unit of the oedipal individual, the self whose desires can ultimately be explained and translated through one single, quantifiable and exchangeable value. What is repressed is not our humanity and individuality; it is the idea of the human individual that represses chaotic, inhuman and dynamic difference (Colebrook, 2002: 40).

In *The Hairy Ape*, Eugene O'Neill depicts the topic of identity and human beings' attempt to belong through a backwards evolutionary journey to focus on the lack of harmony of collective primitive life with individualism. Yank's existential journey becomes an allegory of humanism and search for an identity as he moves towards an absolute deterritorialisation. "It is no coincidence that the action of the first half of the drama unfolds in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean, a liminal territory halfway between the "New" and "Old" worlds, signifying an American identity in limbo, still coming to terms with its past and imagining its future" (Rundle, 2008: 51). It is curious that the play's theatrical concerns about representation merge with the political concerns of American society regarding differences of race, class, and ethnicity. And there is a focus on animal difference throughout the play which starts at the opening scene as a chorus of stokers' "inchoate uproar" (O'Neill, 1966: 137) and their "appearance of Neanderthal man" (O'Neill, 1966: 137) suggest a connection between humans and beasts. The stokehole is suggestive of disjunctive synthesis at first sight where the workers strive under the law and brutal conditions of savage capitalism that marks/blackens their face with coal like the African American slave. The expressionistic style with ape like figures in a stooping posture behind the steel

bars emphasizes the deterritorialisation of humans as they submitted to an unseen transcendent power and torn apart from the connection of themselves with their labor. That is why the old stoker Paddy's laments for the loss of old days is a longing for their territory where workers could connect with each other, their labor, and the nature during connective synthesis. According to Deleuze and Guattari, in capitalism there is reduction of difference to the system of exchange and the individuals are the agents of labor, and capitalism tries to eliminate how difference emerged from pre-human and collective processes. However, life is a constant flow of immanent difference, and this difference occurs in every component of existence including nature, animals, plants, microorganisms creating endless forms of connections and therefore life itself. When O'Neill puts animal difference forth from the very beginning of the play and continues throughout the play with analogies between apes, slaves, cages, and zoos, he actually foregrounds how the human factor/capitalism represses the inhuman, dynamic difference. It is ironic that the more human beings are torn apart from their collective primitive existence and nature through dehumanizing capitalism, the more they fall apart from the modern evolved image of man and return to the primitive image. But since it is not an actual return, each of them lacks a sense of belonging. Erika Rundle compares the stokers to the Greek chorus and also takes O'Neill's use of animal difference as his subversion of humanist paradigms:

> Through his use of the animalized chorus, O'Neill subsumes the stokers' ethnic differences within a powerful "*sort of unity*" (121) signaling at the play's outset his interest in subverting humanist paradigms. Identifying the number of dehumanized choral entities that populate the play—apes, slaves, robots, marionettes, monsters, and monkeys—brings O'Neill's critique of humanism into high relief, especially when viewed against the authoritative ground of the Greek standard. We are not surprised, therefore, when survival, extinction, and particularly adaptation—the analogous site of (meta)theatricality for O'Neill—emerge as structuring forces within the play (Rundle, 2008: 129).

On the other hand, Yank stands as a more evolved version, the "highly developed individual" (O'Neill, 1966: 137) among his fellow coworkers. His strong sense of belonging is reminiscent of the conjunctive synthesis as he internalized the capitalist system and his role in it. "Capitalism is immanent and axiomatic. We become

self-subjecting—and this is because of the third or conjunctive synthesis" (Colebrook, 2002: 126). Yank identifies himself with the work he does, he is fully at ease with his time, and he even becomes one with the steel. He gets angry with Long when he criticizes being wage slaves as Yank does not mind the dehumanizing working conditions in the stokehole. He is happy where he is, and does not question much, and he has no anger towards any outside source as the creator of their conditions. "What makes capitalism so insidious and so inescapable is that we no longer posit some external authority that would organize the process of coding; we allow the abstract and uniform process of decoding to operate as an immanent limit and subjection" (Colebrook, 2002: 129).

However, as a kind of tragic hero Yank's identity is shaken with Mildred's arrival to their deck. Aptly put by Erika Rundle, there is a strict hierarchy in the ocean liner. The bottommost deck is classified as "hell" by Long; whereas, in the apex where we meet Mildred for the first time is "the beautiful, vivid sea." The bottom deck is characterized by workers covered with coal black, while the upper-class people like Mildred in the higher decks are "pale white." The higher the decks are climbed, the more effete, bloodless, and cold the characters become. In O'Neill's expressionist landscape the aesthetic heights of the promenade are bright, cold, feminine, inert, and ghostly, whereas the supernatural depths of hell are dark, hot, masculine, laborious, and beastly. Mildred's decent to the bottom deck through a series of ladders like down the ladder of social evolution is an operative metaphor of social Darwinism (Rundle, 2008: 62). On the other hand, her intention, to "discover how the other half lives" (O'Neill, 1966: 149) is an act of deterritorialisation just like the colonial explorers' intrusion in the Oriental territories and construct an identity for the people there.

> Mildred's obsession with her family's past is what motivates her interest in social work, reflecting a "trace" of "sincere" interest in "discover[ing] how the other half lives" (132), much like the colonial "ethnographers" whose travels were funded under the auspices of research or exploration, but in fact constituted opportunities for adventure, acquisition, and exploitation. Mildred's own trace of sincerity turns continually toward various social "poses" in which her interest is feigned rather than truly engaged, an attitude she projects retroactively onto her grandfather: he

> "played with," rather than worked at, "boiling steel." It is Mildred herself, in fact (a mere two generations away from the blue-collar world of her grandfather), who is an expert at "playing with" social customs, at taking on certain poses in order to maintain her mobility within the vertical hierarchy (Rundle, 2008: 65).

"Life creates and furthers itself by forming connections or territories" (Colebrook, 2002: xxii). There are forces assembling these connections. "The very connective forces that allow any form of life to become what it is (territorialise) can also allow it to become what it is not (deterritorialise)" (Colebrook, 2002: xxii). In the third or conjunctive synthesis that force is the capital. As the capital owner's daughter, Mildred has that power to intrude as well. The very same force (ruling class) that has assembled Yank into that identity (working class man) which he has internalized deeply deterritorialises him by regarding him a 'beast.' Totally disempowered, abruptly not at home in his own skin Yank's self-confidence shutters all of a sudden.

After his encounter with Mildred, Yank's 'rhizomatic' journey starts as he cannot find a fixed center or order for himself to fit into, to attain a sense of belonging. "All life is a plane of becoming, and perception of fixed beings—such as man—is an effect of becoming" (Colebrook, 2002: xx). Yank's perception of fixed identity is shaken with Mildred's blunt comment, and subsequently the audience/reader witnesses Yank's process of becoming, only seeming to reach 'absolute deterritorialisation' at the end. "By showing us that the binaries he erects in earlier scenes are not, in fact, essences, but rather *positions*—which are, like the ship itself, in constant motion—O'Neill opens up the forced perspectives of humanism to reveal the rhizomatic fields of performance and evolution, in which the possibilities of becoming constantly restructure our view" (Rundle, 2008: 69).

> *Yank's watch has just come of duty and had dinner. Their faces and bodies shine from a soap and water scrubbing, but around their eyes, where a hasty dousing does not touch, the coal dust sticks like black make-up, giving them a queer, sinister expression. YANK has not washed either face or body. He stands out in contrast to them, a blackened, brooding figure. He is seated forward on a bench in the exact attitude of Rodin's 'The Thinker'. The others, most of them smoking*

pipes, are staring at YANK half apprehensively, as if fearing an out-burst; half amusedly, as if they saw a joke somewhere that tickled them (O'Neill, 1966: 158).

For Deleuze there is a dynamic flux of life and thinking is a part of it, and it is a constant state of becoming. As Yank starts thinking, his journey of making connections starts. Although he tries to go back to a fixed center, where he was sure of his identity and not questioning it, rhizomatic, in other words, random and de-centered connections he makes during his journey appall him. Therefore, the reader/audience frequently sees him in a thinking position as the Rodin's '*The Thinker.*' It is also ironic that in this first thinker pose Yank's face is black, which is reminiscent of the ape analogy. By putting an apish figure to the center O'Neill's use of animal difference comes forth again, and he totally subverts the humanist paradigms by positing the act of thinking, which is considered to be uniquely human, to an animalized figure. When Rondin's '*The Thinker'* was built as a public statue there was a violent labor crisis in France and public protests. Because of the fact that '*The Thinker'* is a strong man with muscles and his position looks like about to act, rather than a representation of rationality, it was thought to stand for an instinctual figure much like an animal: "Go before this thinker, and first look at the face: it is a brute, a sort of gorilla; he will represent a worker in all that is vile and gross; this could be an effigy of Caliban" (A. E. Elsen quoted in Rundle, 2008: 80).

O'Neill's foregrounding the '*The Thinker'* throughout the play through different connotative references to the apes, and thereby to the evolutionary beginning of the human race, is a subversion of the absolute intellectual power of the Enlightenment subject and humanism. Unlike the Deleuzian view, the Enlightenment subject considers identity as fixed and unrelated with culture. One example is seen in Descartes' rational being who takes thought as the essence of being with his famous dictum 'Cogito ergo sum' (I think, therefore I am). The humanist philosophy puts humans and rationality to the center and assumes an essence, common sense which is reached through thinking and represented in language. Therefore, the speaking subject

also utters his/her identity when s/he thinks. However, the animalized '*Thinker'* is in absolute opposition to this rational subject.

In classical tragedy identity and essence are also ruptured through misrecognition, but there is a lesson to be taken at the end to restore order to society. In *The Hairy Ape*, O'Neill does the reverse. As the audience questions the humanist ideals, they question the Order instead of restoring it. Erika Rundle explains it in Nietzschean terms using the Apollonian 'rationality' and Dionysian 'irrational':

> O'Neill is able to demonstrate the social processes of individuation associated with humanist ideals of rationality, or, in Nietzschean terms, the Apollonian. This *gest* is repeatedly juxtaposed with a competing image, which I call "The Drinker," in which the stokers' communal reveries, as irrational as they are pleasurable, evoke Dionysian rituals. Through these opposing actions, O'Neill reveals the social conditions under which Yank and his fellow stokers labor, and the ideologies through which they are reproduced (Rundle, 2008: 93).

Subversion of comedy is similarly Dionysian in the sense that the Apollonian intends the unreachable 'ideal' and calls for order; whereas, the Dionysian relates to life with impulses which are away from rational thought, and the connection with life reminds the connective synthesis with its rituals and immanence. The use of 'comedy' in *The Hairy Ape*'s sub-heading *A Comedy of Ancient and Modern Life* can hence be explained with O'Neill's subversion of humanist and rationalist ideals, and humans' eternal search for their identity within these terms. O'Neill; therefore, both with his depiction of the chorus of drunken men and the masked, wealthy churchgoers represents dehumanized, unthinking, detached masses as the product of the industrialized, capitalized world. With drunken seamen the Apollonian wisdom of the classical chorus is gone, they act rather like animals, apes who are alienated from their work and the natural environment surrounded with cold steel. On the other hand, the churchgoers in the Fifth Avenue whom Yank sees when trying to confront Mildred are "[a] procession of gaudy marionettes, yet with something of the relentless horror of Frankensteins in their detached, mechanical unawareness" (O'Neill, 1966: 169). They

are like robots who are also alienated from each other and nature in "a background of magnificence cheapened and made grotesque by commercialism, a background in tawdry disharmony with the clear light and sunshine on the street itself" (O'Neill, 1966: 165). "Regardless of class distinctions, humanity has turned its back on nature, and what is natural in it has been enslaved in the name of a progress, which has, paradoxically, turned human beings either back into the apes—the Neanderthal man suggested in the first scene— or into the monstrous robots of the fifth scene, indicative of a frightening future of total dehumanization" (Sözalan, 2006: 51). What O'Neill's picture of these masses from two different classes suggests is that the wisdom to call for order in society is problematic itself. O'Neill uses the Dionysian wisdom of theatre to subvert the Apollonian wisdom/the order in society. This dehumanization of 'gaudy marionettes' and 'hairy apes', both marked by the modern times' representative 'steel,' is the outcome of the commercialized world. "Like Yank who fails to realize his positioning as a beast in the steel cage of industrialism, as is powerfully suggested by the scenery, they are the unaware prisoners of commercialism, the other side of the coin, visibly made manifest in the form of the skyscraper being built" (Sözalan, 2006: 52).

In their formulation of Schizoanalysis Deleuze and Guattari suggest that "most of western thought has been built on a paranoid structure" (Colebrook, 2002: xxviii), which they call 'paranoid social machine.' "Paranoia is interpretive: we always ask what things mean, attempting to find the law, ground or authority behind signs" (Colebrook, 2002: xxviii). Therefore, it is possible to say that Yank's journey is paranoid. He is trying to find a stable self in his quest to belong. That is also why as he hears the 5th Avenue people, he hears the words "Monkey fur" (O'Neill, 1966: 171) when they are looking at a window shop, Yank feels "as if he had received a punch full in the face" (O'Neill, 1966: 171). He does not see himself as the 'hairy ape,' but he does not belong where he thought he used to belong anymore. A bit of a paranoia in his attempt to define himself, he desperately attacks the group, and as a result he finds himself in jail.

> O'Neill shows his audience and Yank that the "hairy ape's physical resistance to institutional and ideological ruling class power is futile. The controlling engineer's whistle of the corporate-industrial state is now replaced by the disciplinary whistle of the police, and Yank is summarily tossed in jail (J. Pfister quoted in Sözalan, 2006: 52).

Yank's attack on the 5th Avenue people is an act of violence which comes from his powerless position as a subject in front of upper-class people. "In effect, what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action that does not act directly and immediately on others" (Foucault, 1994: 340). Yank instead acts directly on the others and executes a relationship of violence. "A relationship of violence acts upon a body or upon things; it forces, it bends, it breaks, it destroys, or it closes off all possibilities. Its opposite pole can only be passivity" (Foucault, 1994: 340). The upper-class side that is in control of the power is protected by law, and as a result Yank is once again enclosed behind steel bars.

This time behind a literal steel cell, the audience sees Yank in *The Thinker* pose once again:

> *The cells extend back diagonally from right to left rear. They do not stop, but disappear in the dark background as if they ran on, numberless, into infinity. One electric bulb from the low ceiling of the narrow corridor sheds its light through the heavy steel bars of the cell at the extreme front and reveals part of the interior.*
>
> *Yank can be seen within, crouched on the edge of his cot the attitude of Rodin's 'The Thinker'. His face is spotted with black and blue bruises. A blood-stained bandage is wrapped around his head* (O'Neill, 1966: 172).

In O'Neill's expressionistic style 'low ceilings,' 'narrow corridors,' and 'heavy steel bars' once again evoke suffocating and degrading conditions of capitalism. The infinite number of cells is indicative of the endless power of the state. The state that holds power has the right to restrict freedom in favor of the capitalist class. While thinking in his *Thinker* position, Yank realizes that he is actually not 'steel' himself,

but the owner of the steel has the power to put him behind steel bars like a hairy ape. Steel is a part of that economic system which provides its power and continuity, while restricting and demeaning the lower classes that help maintain it. "Yank's political awakening involves a move "from a metonymic individual-centered fantasy" based on an identification with steel, "to an awareness of himself as socially and economically produced"" (J. Pfister quoted in Sözalan, 2006: 54).

As his punishment is "'Toity days to tink it over'" (O'Neill, 1966: 173), Yank thinks it over and he keeps on making rhizomatic connections in his process of becoming. Thus, he begins to see the social forces that shape his class identity. However; he goes on with looking for a fixed identity to belong. When he talks with the others in the jail, he learns about I.W.W:

> VOICE [*reading*]: 'I refer to that devil's brew of rascals, jail-birds, murderers, and cut-throats who libel all honest working men by calling themselves the Industrial Workers of the World; but in the light of their nefarious plots, I call them the Industrious Wreckers of the World!'
> YANK [*with vengeful satisfaction*]: Wreckers, dat's de right dope! Dat belongs! Me for dem! (O'Neill, 1966: 175)

Yank realizes that he cannot identify himself with steel anymore since the steel, which he saw as a sign of modern age and improvement is also, as the owner of the capital, the very same force that keeps him behind steel bars. Yet, he draws another metonymic identification with fire that he thinks he will find in I.W.W.:

> [*He sits, the paper in the hand at his side, in the attitude of Rodin's 'The Thinker'. A pause. Several snores from down the corridor. Suddenly YANK jumps to his feet with a furious groan as if some appalling thought had crashed on him*.] Sure – her old man – President of de Steel Trust – makes half de steel in de world – steel where I thought I belonged – drivin' trou – movin' – in dat – to make her – and cage me in for her to spit on! Christ. [*He shakes the bars of the cell door till the whole tier trembles. Irritated, protesting exclamations from those awakened or trying to get to sleep*.] He made dis – dis cage! Steel! *It* don't belong, dat's what! Cages, cells, locks, bolts, bars – dat's what it means! – holdin' me down wit him at de top! But I'll drive trou! Fire, dat melts it! I'll be fire – under de heap – fire dat never goes out – hot as hell – breakin' out in de night – (O'Neill, 1966: 177)

Yank assumes that this fire, the force that can fight against the capitalist is in I.W.W. Therefore, he decides to join the force and find an identity for himself. Ironically, the more he tries to fit into a human identity within a group, the more the animal difference in him comes out. "*As he comes to the 'breakin' out' he seizes one bar with both hands and, putting his two feet up against the others so that his position is parallel to the floor like a monkey's, he gives a great wrench backwards*" (O'Neill, 1966: 177). Yank breaks out of prison by bending the bars with his tremendous animalistic strength, but he gets caught. Later, when he arrives to I.W.W. local a month later, the scene described by O'Neill is nothing like a powerful force but rather a boy's club: "*The interior of the room, which is general assembly room, office, and reading-room, resembles some dingy settlement boys' club*" (O'Neill, 1966: 179). O'Neil's detailed description of the room as "cheap, banal, commonplace and unmysterious" (O'Neill, 1966: 179) suggests that Yank's new "subjectivity is another imagined presence behind signification that is necessarily lost, lacking, alienated and absent" (Colebrook, 2002: 26). Here, representation once again becomes an issue in the play; in Deleuzian terms, the audience/reader can see through Yank's search that a subjectivity being built without considering difference in its immanence is problematic. However, difference is immanent, and Yank's animal difference is crucial in order to see difference as a positive becoming rather than the negative imagined presence which results in lack and absence.

Realizing that what I.W.W. aims is reform shaped by "legitimate direct action" (O'Neill, 1966: 182) rather than a radical action such as blowing places with dynamite, it becomes clear that Yank will not be able to find relief here as well. O'Neill's anarchist stance manifests itself in Yank's claim to be fire, and his disillusionment can be read as O'Neill's criticism of reformist attitude.

> Yank's critique of a reformism that aims for "tree square a day, and cauliflowers in de front yard – ekal rights – a woman and kids – a lousey vote" reveals a wisdom that sees through the tragedy of the human being who has exchanged his soul for material gains: "Dis ting's in your inside, but it ain't in your belly. [...] It's way down – at de bottom. Yuh can't grab it, and yuh can't stop it. It moves, and everything moves. It stops and de whole woild stops (Sözalan, 2006: 54).

In his own awakening Yank reaches such a point that he realizes capitalism has become an internal part of people's life. Even the reformist is among those masses that are kept in subjugation. "We can believe in any politics, but at the end of the day we go to work and sell our labour" (Colebrook, 2002: 49). In Deleuzian terms it is the third stage of synthesis; there is only one flow of essence and that's the flow of capital. "Capitalism, unlike other forms of social coding, does not need to work indirectly by constructing social objects that control difference; capitalism has mastered difference directly by managing it economically" (Colebrook, 2002: 49). Difference is immanent; there is an infinite number of intensities in the spectrum of life. "Capitalism refers all intensities to a flow of capital. [...] But all these intensities are organized to produce a 'territory' of identity" (Colebrook, 2002: 47). If difference is disregarded, emancipation of identities, finding them new representations, creating new subject positions, such as the case of some feminist movements, are just other ways of repressing difference. Therefore, when Yank, once more in '*The Thinker*' posture, cannot identify himself with I.W.W. members saying "So dem boids don't tink I belong, neider" (O'Neill, 1966: 184), his position can be read from this perspective. He cannot find relief, a subjectivity to belong, but at the end he will reach a totally different conclusion.

The final scene opens with the stage direction of a gorilla in *The Thinker* pose: "*The gigantic animal himself is seen squatting on his haunches on a bench in much the same attitude as Rodin's 'Thinker'*" (O'Neill, 1966: 186). There is a striking parallel between the openings of scene 6 and 8 that both start behind steel bars with figures sitting in *The Thinker* pose; yet one being a human the other an animal. "This taxonomical confusion, which sharpens O'Neill's unfolding critique, is upheld not only by the dramatic text but also by the play's visual rhetoric, in which human and nonhuman are united in the stage image of the Rodin pose as well as the actualization of the cage/stage trope" (Rundle, 2008: 96). This confusion in the representational plane is noteworthy to discuss the mimetic function of subjectivity and achieve the dramatic irony of difference at the end.

Originally '*The Thinker'* was built as part of *The Gates of Hell* by Rodin in 1882. It was inspired by Dante's *Inferno* in *The Divine Comedy*, and later Rodin separated the figure as an individual sculpture. The analogy between hell and the dehumanizing conditions of capitalist industrialism is also significant in O'Neill's choice of '*The Thinker*' pose in his play as well as a criticism of rationality and humanism:

> In *The Gates of Hell* and *The Hairy Ape*, both Rodin and O'Neill were crafting modern responses to their medieval predecessors, while rejecting Christian notions of salvation and sacrifice. Rodin re-envisions Dante's Hell in a particularly continental, Romantic mode, "as a metaphor rather than as dogma" (Elsen, Gates 217), with the thinking individual presiding over the scene in serious contemplation. O'Neill reanimates this Hell in the depths of twentieth-century urban industrialism and American capitalism, where the static authority *The Thinker* had previously embodied is recontextualized and eventually undermined (Rundle, 2008: 73-76).

In this final scene, Yank is at the zoo in front of the gorilla's cage. "To throw further light on the resemblance between the "hairy apes" of the stokehole or the inmates of the prison and those of the zoo, from the neighboring cages "chatterings pitched in a conversational tone can be heard," and when Yank enters the stage "a chorus of angry chattering and screeching breaks out" (Sözalan, 2006: 58). Yank starts talking to the gorilla; still desperately trying to look for an identification, he repeats the phrase "Ain't we both members of de same club – de Hairy Apes?" (O'Neill, 1966: 186) throughout the scene. The gorilla is Yank's last resort to identify himself with. As Yank talks to the gorilla and observes the animal, he first recognizes his own captivity within industrial capitalism and their differences with the animal: "She wasn't wise dat I was in a cage, too – worser'n yours – sure a damn sight – 'cause you got some chance to bust loose – but me – [*He grows confused*.] Aw, hell!" (O'Neill, 1966: 187). In his own becoming Yank also reaches an awareness about his displacement from nature: "Sure, it was great stuff. I got it aw right – what Paddy said about dat bein' de right dope – on'y I couldn't get in it, see? I couldn't belong in dat" (O'Neill, 1966: 187). Paddy had this experience in the past when he had felt a part of nature, but Yank does not have that connection. On the other hand, unable to find himself a past, he cannot make sense of his present either because he sees that he is

one of humankind, but not like them: “Yuh don’t belong wit ‘em and yuh know it. But me, I belong wit ‘em – but I don’t, see? Dey don’t belong wit me, dat’s what. Get me? Tinkin’ is hard” (O’Neill, 1966: 187).

In spite of their differences, Yank still draws a parallel between himself and the gorilla as both being in ‘a cage’ and ridiculed by the others: “Dey’ve looked at youse, ain’t dey – in a cage?” (O’Neill, 1966: 188). Thus, he breaks open the gorilla’s cage expecting a salvation to his predicament from his reunion with the ape. However, with his release the gorilla acts accordingly with his nature when “something, the tone of mockery, perhaps, suddenly enrages the animal,” (O’Neill, 1966: 188) and as a result crushes Yank’s ribs by wrapping “his huge arms around Yank in a murderous hug” (O’Neill, 1966: 188-9).

Yank cannot find himself an identity once his own illusion is shuttered at the stokehole because from the human point of view we disregard ‘chaotic, inhuman and dynamic difference.’ There are ‘forces’ outside the human existence ‘deciding’ and ‘shaping’ identities and Yank cannot see these forces:

> [...] we need to rethink the notion of the human decision; for it is less the case that we decide who ‘we’ are than that forces ‘decide’ us. Our languages, our genes, our bodies, our desires, historical forces, social forces—all these things intersect and constantly mutate, in such a way that what we are cannot be traced back to a single point of origin or intent. Far from accepting the human point of view, and explaining the world from the position of human meaning, we need to see how the processes of meaning and human life are produced from what is essentially prehuman (Colebrook, 2002: xlii).

Yank’s desire to go back to a fixed center, a stable subject position is constantly decentered with rhizomatic connections he makes during his journey and he cannot stabilize his identity. The reason to that is what we all have in life is ‘difference,’ ‘a thousand plateaus of differences,’ and trying to fit into certain identities itself is the problem. Capitalism represses the inhuman, dynamic difference. Since people are separated from their collective primitive existence in the synthesis of connection and capitalism disregards difference in the synthesis of conjunction, an identification with

a primitive self-image is not possible either. Therefore, Yank's backward evolution is not an actual return. The ape in the cage is another repressed inhuman individuality. The analogy between Yank and the ape has actually no mimetic function in life. That is why Yank cannot find his identity when he stands in front of the ape expecting it holds a mirror to himself. However, the image does not reflect back. His desire for an identity is negated because it is actually a desire for an 'image.' Yet, the inhuman body of the ape is part of the flux of differences, another intensity, just as Yank is. All we have is differences, not identities, not representations. In O'Neill's politics rather than an emancipation of identities, the reader is presented with a politics of difference where s/he questions the forces because of which we renunciate both difference and essence.

When Yank finally cannot connect with anyone or any group and dies, it looks like 'absolute deterritorialisation' which is "a liberation from all connection and organization" (Colebrook, 2002: xxiii). However; absolute deterritorialisation can only be thought or imagined. What Yank goes through is all kinds of becomings and at the end arrives 'becoming imperceptible.' "[T]his kind of becoming leads not to nothingness, nor to the total dissolution of the subject, but to the virtual state of the body without organs which proceeds by the production of intensities and affects. To become imperceptible means to disorganize the body, to dismantle the system of signification, and to renounce the subject and subjectivity" (Žukauskaitė, 2015: 8). When Yank opens the cage of the ape, he actually renounces his own subjectivity. With Yank's renunciation of subjectivity appears another form of 'becoming.' In the end, there is a constant flow of immanent difference in life, and this difference manifests itself in every form of existence including nature, animals, plants, microorganisms creating an infinite number of forms of connections and therefore life itself. Any organism after death turns into a different form and becomes a part of another becoming. Life performs itself and evolves by forming connections and territories. That is why when Yank dies, "*perhaps, the Hairy Ape at last belongs*" (O'Neill, 1966: 189).

1. 2. “Glengarry Glen Ross” by David Mamet

1.2.1. Plot:

The very first scene of Glengarry Glen Ross starts at a Chinese Restaurant. Shelly Levene, a real estate agent, tries to convince his manager John Williamson to make him give some valuable leads so that he makes better sales. Williamson accepts giving Levene the leads on condition that he pays his bribe in cash. Levene does not have the cash; therefore, he has to leave without getting anything from Williamson. Later in another scene, Moss and Aaronow, two other real estate agents, are seen complaining about the competitive environment in the workplace and the pressure they have on themselves. They have a sales competition at the agency, the winner will get a Cadillac, the second a set of steak-knives, and the losers will be fired. Moss makes an offer to Aaronow to be partners in breaking in their own company and stealing the leads to sell to another agency. Aaronow does not want to be a part of this crime and turns Moss down. Moss tries to scare Aaronow implying that just by listening he has already become an accomplice. The next scene shows another salesman, Ricky Roma, at the same restaurant in the middle of a sales to Lingk. However, Lingk is scared of his wife. For that reason, Roma uses his knowledge of Lingk’s private life and his observations in order to sell the land. Then suddenly it is learnt that the agency got robbed of its leads, and a detective is interrogating the agents. Levene enters the agency happy for selling a piece of land to the Nyborgs. After that, Lingk enters the agency and wants to cancel his sale as his wife got angry with him. In order to deceive the man and protect his sale Roma tells Lingk that the check deposit has not been processed yet. While Roma was trying to deceive Lingk, Levene helps Roma by pretending to be another happy customer of his. Then, Williamson interferes believing that he is helping Roma’s trouble with the customer, although he is doing the reverse, tells Lingk not to worry because of the theft as his check has already been deposited and secure in the bank. Learning that his check has been cashed Lingk leaves the agency. Roma gets very angry with Williamson and while he is pouring his angry words, he is taken into another office for his turn of the interrogation. Levene, already angry with Williamson for their previous encounter, keeps on pouring angry and demeaning words at him. With the heat of the argument Levene tells Williamson that

he knows the check has not been deposited yet. By doing that he gives himself up because the only way to know that is dealing with Williamson's papers in his office. Therefore, Levene reveals by mistake that he is the one stealing the leads. Levene admits his guilt and also exposes his partner as Moss. Williamson, in turn, tells him that Nyborg sale Levene thinks he has achieved is actually not true as they are just two old people who only like talking to salesmen. Williamson admits setting up Levene on purpose with Nyborgs since he wanted to punish Levene for his abusive language and disrespectful attitude toward himself. Roma comes out of the interrogation; while Williamson is going inside to talk to the detective to inform him about the thief. Not knowing anything about Levene confessing, Roma offers Levene to be partners. He invites Levene to the restaurant to discuss partnership. The detective calls Levene in his office to interrogate. As Levene is in the office, Roma tells Williamson to give him half of Levene's sales and keep his own sales for himself, and leaves. The play ends with Aaronow complaining that he hates this job.

1.2.2. Analysis of "Glengarry Glen Ross"

1947 Chicago born David Mamet began his career as a playwright in 1969 when he was teaching acting at Marlboro College. While he was working as an Artist-in-Residence in Goddard College, he established St. Nicholas Theatre Company, which was later called St Nicholas Players. Some of his recognized plays in 1970s are *Sexual Perversity in Chicago* (1971), *American Buffalo* (1975), *The Woods* (1977), *The Water Engine* (1977), and *A Life In The Theater* (1977). When 1980s arrived, he became an internationally well-known artist, and created his major works in 1980s and 1990s some of which are *Edmond* (1982), *Glengarry Glen Ross* (1983, Pulitzer Prize in 1984), *The Shawl* (1985), *Speed-the-Plow* (1988), *Oleanna* (1992), *Squirrels* (1993), *The Cryptogram* (1994), *The Old Neighbourhood* (1997), and *Boston Marriage* (1999). Along with film directing and playwriting, being quite a productive writer, David Mamet's oeuvre also stretches out to essays and screenplays which have made him reputable as an artist. The previous jobs that he did before being an artist such as real-estate business, office cleaning, window washing, taxi driving, and different factory jobs have made David Mamet sensitive "to the American vernacular unequalled by any other playwright, but they also alerted him to what he sees as the profound alienation which typifies an urban America in which activity is detached from meaning and desires are unrelated to human need" (Bigsby, 1985: 20). The alienated individuals under the reign of a ruthless capitalism, a fragmented society which has been torn apart from its values and one another, hence, have been Mamet's main issues in his writing. Therefore, what makes Mamet's work political is his criticism of brutal competitiveness of American capitalism and his exposure of its effects on society and individuals with his apt depiction of the relationship between language and power. In Mamet's moral view, having lost its sense of values that matter the society replaced them with artificial ones, the focus on humanity has been turned on to commodity, and language is insufficient to express the needs. People have lost their sense of belonging and community, and Mamet regarded the existence of theatre "to address that need for community, for trust, that perceived sense of entropy which lies at the heart of his plays" (Bigsby, 2004: 34). Indeed, Mamet provided a political role for theatre to reach the ideal society through action on the stage:

> In a morally bankrupt time we can help to change the habit of coercive and frightened action and substitute for it the habit of trust, of self-reliance, and co-operation. If we are true to our ideals we can help form an ideal society [. . .] – not by preaching about it, but by creating it each night in front of the audience – by showing how it works. In action (Mamet, 1987: 27).

Theatre is praised by Mamet as a community act and he explains its function as "to transcend the individual conscious mind, to put the spectator in a communion with his or her fellows on the stage and also in the audience, so as to address the problems that cannot be addressed by reason" (Schvey, 2001: 61).

There at the heart of Mamet's critique of capitalism stands the American dream as a metaphor for it. Strong feelings of loss and betrayal urged by the failure of the great American myth pervades his characters' existence. The American nation has lost its purpose in the hope of possessing a dream. Mamet saw the roots of the creation of the American myth in the frontier ethic:

> In America we're still suffering from loving a frontier ethic—that is to say, take the land from the Indians and give it to the railroad. Take the money from the blacks and give it to the rich. The ethic was always something for nothing. It never really existed when the American frontier was open . . . it never was anything more transcendent than something for nothing . . . The idea of go West and make your fortune, there's gold lying in the ground, was an idea promulgated by the storekeepers in the gold rush and the railroads in the westward expansion as a way of enslaving the common man and woman . . . playing on their greed. As W. C. Fields said, you can't cheat an honest man. So, because we've been rather dishonest about our basic desire to get something for nothing in this country we've always been enslaved by the myth of the happy capitalist. Familiar American pieties are always linked to criminality. That's why they're familiar American pieties (Mamet quoted in Bigsby, 1985: 111).

Hence, in Mamet's analysis, what was initially an act of invasion and a theft of the land from its rightful owners has actually followed its course by the following generations in the American land. "The supposed frontier virtues of a sturdy masculine self-sufficiency that took by force what was denied by right are echoed in his plays by people who deploy that rhetoric and dispose those myths in a world that has lost its epic dimensions" (Bigsby, 1985: 16). The existence of Mamet's characters is defined

by their constant effort to reach that dream and their disappointment in the wake of it. However, what is ironic as Bigsby points out is that even though they fail to reach the prosaic dream they choose to embrace, there is a persistence of faith beyond reason (Bigsby, 1985: 17).

The Pulitzer Prize winner *Glengarry Glen Ross*, which is generally considered to be Mamet's best play depicts such a society that is after a Dream, one that is propelled by the so-called business ethics. The way Mamet describes his play *American Buffalo* is true for *Glengarry Glen Ross* as well: [the play] "is about the American ethic of business . . . About how we excuse all sorts of great and small betrayals and ethical compromises called business" (Gottlieb, 1978: D4). In *Glengarry Glen Ross* realtors are depicted in a competitive world of one-upmanship where they find themselves in a threat of a sales competition. The world they are in is reminiscent of the conservative regime (Reagan and Thatcher) holding competition as an integral element of capitalism. As an example of the practice of brutal capitalism, the competition in the play is one in which one succeeds at the expense of another. Salesmen are under pressure as the winner will get a Cadillac, the second, ironically, a set of steak-knives, and the losers will be fired. In order to survive these salesmen have to betray, exploit others, be disloyal, manipulative and persuasive. The salesman figure that can be observed in plays such as *The Iceman Cometh* by E. O'Neill or *Death of a Salesman* by A. Miller has long been a symbol in American theatre for criticizing the American dream and capitalism. Salesman is an apt choice to portray the emptiness of American dream because the profession has the promise of great wealth in return for the hard work of any one doing it; however, a society that has the underlying tenet of ""self-improvement" through material gains is a consumer society based on materialism and has, at its heart, an emptiness that cannot be assuaged by yet more money in the bank" (Dean, 1990: 189). Their search is an endless one and as Ann Dean points out it is not just the salesmen's lives described by this search but also their clients: "Just as the salesmen's lives are fueled by the promise of happiness and contentment in return for material success, so too are the lives of their clients; the clients are as much a part of the capitalist hegemony as the men from whom they purchase their symbols of material success" (Dean, 1990: 189). Replacing the

immanent desire in life with one that is defined by need, they are Oedipal figures who internalized the Psychoanalytic definition of desire imposed on them by repressing the desire for the 'forbidden' and suffering from an eternal 'lack' as they put material success in its place. These characters identify themselves through their business and build power relationships to exploit the others so that they can compensate for their 'lack.' In *Glengarry Glen Ross*, David Mamet creates an act of resistance by presenting an iconoclastic critique of capitalism and power relationships with his versatile, experimental language and dialogue and by generating an example of schizophrenic, rhizomatic writing style which multiplies differences and deterritorializes language and social codes in the unconscious.

David Mamet told director Gregory Mosher during his previews for the Chicago production:

> "Look, this play is not a play about love. *American Buffalo* is a play about love; *A Life in the Theatre* is a play about love. This is a play about power. This is a play about guys, who when one guy is down . . . The guy who's up then kicks the other guy in the balls to make sure he stays down" (Mamet quoted in Kane, 1996: xviii).

Glengarry Glen Ross is a play highly charged with a violent language that captures "the mood and milieu, the sharklike competition, and scatological dialogue of men whose fear is camouflaged "under a wealth of blue-streaked street-talk"" (Kane, 1996: xx). It is a macho, materialistic world of cut-throat business where salesmen speak only to beguile and overreach the clients and their colleagues in order to survive. Mamet has said of *Glengarry Glen Ross* that:

> It has been suggested to me that the play concerns American cut-throat capitalism, and that its theme is the destructiveness of competition. I suppose this is a logical interpretation and is probably true into the bargain. All that I set out to do was write about my experiences in a real estate office, and I assure you that as bizarre as the behavior in the play might seem the behavior in the office itself made it look tame (Bigsby, 1985: 122).

Writing through his own experience, representation of the American cut-throat business world, in Mamet's words, cannot even catch the 'real' bizarreness of the 'real'

business environment. Like his contemporaries David Rabe, Sam Shephard, and Lanford Wilson, David Mamet is a realist who subverts the traditional understanding of realism. As in his representation his characters belong to a spiritually lost culture with alienated people who have lost their sense of self and gotten disconnected from their nature and community, Mamet is a realist. However, his characters never fully acknowledge their corruption and their language is limited to express their desires. Some critics deem Mamet as a moralist as he also frequently mentions truth and reality, and values and social responsibilities in his essays. Yet, the characters in his plays are not such; indeed, as is the case in *Glengarry Glen Ro*ss, they are deceptive characters with no sense of values. Therefore, it is possible to say that Mamet is a moralist as he raises awareness in his audience by creating corrupted characters who are unable to reflect on themselves. In his untraditional approach to realism Mamet does not "offer us a faithful reproduction of reality, but rather fragments of that reality as it can be perceived, for instance, through a keyhole, or through a window whose frame, together with the walls that surround it, makes it impossible for us to see the complete picture of the subject observed and forces us therefore to imagine the rest, the invisible, the unseen" (Piette, 2004: 81).

In *Glengarry Glen Ross*, Mamet's representation of reality in fragments indicates his rhizomatic style in Deleuze and Guattari's terms, and the fact that his characters are not able to 'communicate' their desires is self-reflective on language's inability to represent and therefore, it is a deterritorialization of language's function as a communicative device. His unique approach which focuses on Oedipal characters with no identity outside the culturally coded power of domination also deterritorializes the social codes that reside in the audience's unconscious. This schizophrenic writing also creates contradictory receptions of his writing, such as the critics who regard him a misogynist for his non-representation of women and the masculine language he deploys, as well as multitudes of readings of the play, which reinforce the fact that his writing style multiplies differences.

According to Deleuze and Guattari's theory, a rhizome is an a-centered multiplicity, which means that different multiplicities are brought together without a

certain definite pattern or structure. Rhizomatic style of writing has no center; therefore, there are no essences; it is a non-linear and non-hierarchical way of multiple expressions where there are no roots or centers that serve as a source. Rhizomatic writing, as a result, helps question hierarchies and binaries, and shows that everything can be multiple and interrelated. Rhizomes are a schizoanalytic method used to deterritorialize the codes of the tree-shaped Western thinking tradition. It is a rebellious method subverting all the products of Western rational thinking and a total rejection of its products while affirming the immanence of life on the schizoanalytic plane. Root-tree thinking structure of Western rationalization explains everything basing on a certain origin and invalidates any different thought or way of life that do not comply. Schizoanalytic approach goes against Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis as it similarly explains everything basing on one origin, which is Oedipus Complex. Root-tree structures establish teleologic connections between two ideas or points looking for causality in them; rhizomatic thinking, on the other hand, does not seek a causal relationship in order to forge a link between two ideas. As a result, rhizomes resist being reduced to singularities or multiplicities since they can form a variety of connections with different sign systems.

> A rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo. The tree is filiation, but the rhizome is alliance, uniquely alliance. The tree imposes the verb "to be," but the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, "and. . . and.. . and. . ." This conjunction carries enough force to shake and uproot the verb "to be" (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 25).

A rhizome is an immanent process that helps question hierarchical organizations since there is no central root or origin to it. Things form infinite number of differences, they are not this or that, but always ‘and. . . and. . . and. . .’ It is neither a beginning nor an end; it is in the middle of everything in a plateau. It is desire produced in a countless number of connections not starting from any certain point. And the multiplicities it creates are bound neither in the subject nor in the object. The plane to which these multitudes are connected is the producer, the positive desire in the unconscious.

As a reaction to Psychoanalysis, Schizoanalysis aims to eliminate authoritative psycho-political structures to assist the existence of a society in which desire is not repressed or neglected or reduced to lack. Schizoanalysis considers psychoanalysis as another systematic authoritative way reducing identity and desire to lack. The way people express themselves is also conditioned by the environment. Negation and obstruction of desire might lead to the support of authoritarian policies. Social and historical factors develop into pathologies, and psychoanalysis fails to assess these factors. Psychoanalysis is repressive itself:

> And everybody knows what psychoanalysis means by resolving Oedipus: internalizing it so as to better rediscover it on the outside, in social authority, where it will be made to proliferate and be passed on to the children. "The child becomes a man only by resolving the Oedipus complex, whose resolution introduces him into society, where he finds, within the figure of Authority, the obligation to relive it, this time with no way out. Nor is it by any means certain that, between the impossible return to that which precedes the stage of culture and the growing malaise that this stage provokes, a point of equilibrium can be found."24 Oedipus is like the labyrinth, you only get out by re-entering it—or by making someone else enter it. Oedipus as either problem or solution is the two ends of a ligature that cuts off all desiring-production. The screws are tightened, nothing relating to production can make its way through any longer, except for a far-distant murmur. The unconscious has been crushed, triangulated, and confronted with a choice that is not its own. With all of the exits now blocked, there is no longer any possible use for the inclusive, nonrestrictive disjunctions. Parents have been found for the (orphan) unconscious (Deleuze, et. al., 1983: 78)!

Schizoanalysis is revolutionary in that it critiques the models of control on the individual psyche. Schizoanalysis emphasizes therapeutic becoming as a healing environment for individuals. Therefore, unsuppressed desire is put forward; desire is production:

> If desire produces, its product is real. If desire is productive, it can be productive only in the real world and can produce only reality. Desire is the set of passive syntheses that engineer partial objects, flows, and bodies, and that function as units of production. The real is the end product, the result of the passive syntheses of desire as autoproduction of the unconscious. Desire does not lack anything; it does not lack its object. It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire, or desire that lacks a fixed subject; there is no fixed subject unless there is repression. Desire and its object are one and the same thing: the machine, as a machine of a machine.

> Desire is a machine, and the object of desire is another machine connected to it (Deleuze, et. al., 1983: 26).

New ideas, semiotic chains, and symbolic linkages are constantly and incessantly created by people. And Schizoanalysis wants to embrace this incessant production. A schizophrenic creation is based on breaks, flaws and disruptions within the psycho-political order. The ability to create this is based on the 'split' in the mind of the schizophrenic who is able to manifest a multitude of broken experiences of reality. Unlike authoritative explanations such as Oedipus, Schizoanalysis aims to uncover where these disruptions take place and create a new kind of production of subjectivity that does not ignore desire. Schizoanalysis encourages a new individuality based on the flaws of desire and a freedom to create, express, and create art.

Glengarry Glen Ross starts with Shelly Levene who is in his fifties and Williamson, the office manager in his forties, sitting at a Chinese restaurant booth, Levene pleading Williamson for better leads to make better sales. In their office success is based on the amount of crappy land they can sell to gullible customers, and lately Levene has been falling behind the sales expectations and the line of "self-improvement" that is solely based on material improvement in the capitalist society. Therefore, no matter how hard he tries he cannot make it to the all-important sales 'board' in the office where they write the names of the salesmen who make the highest sales every month. Levene is both a victim and victimizer in this system as he suffers as a salesman in his office, but he also needs to deceive customers to be able to sell dysfunctional land. These salesmen are "capitalist victims of capitalism.... [However,] there is a deeper level of contamination in this system. It is not just that bosses and workers are dehumanized, but both plays [also Caryl Churchill's *Top Girls* mentioned here] present a system which is so centrally flawed that its destruction reaches everywhere in the society" (Sauer, 1996: 131).

Fear of failure is dominant in these salesmen's discourse, including Levene's, too. "In Mamet's Darwinian nightmare, fear is omnipresent: it is a permanent pollutant

that can never really be eradicated" (Dean, 1996: 47). Unless they show the necessary performance in the sales contest held in the office, they might lose their job. "Here, the term cutthroat takes on new significance; it is no coincidence that the second prize in the salesroom competition is a set of knives" (Dean, 1996: 47). As Anne Dean says, it is a metaphorical knife: "Betrayal is always a possibility, and a metaphorical knife in the back a likely outcome of a botched deal or error" (Dean, 1996: 47). At the root of the anxiety discourse lays power relations whether it results with betrayal, a performance of camaraderie, or verbosity. It is necessary to examine "the relations of struggle and power, the manner in which things and men hate one another, fight one another, and try to dominate one another, to exercise power relations over one another" (Foucault, 1994: 12) in order to understand the connection of characters in the play, their actions and position. By this way it is possible to understand the political relations in the play.

Mamet's skills in creating a language that reflects power relationships is paramount in this play. In Mamet's plays language is not a tool to convey plot or subjects, yet it is the subject itself in his plays. Language and how people's actions and thoughts are shaped by language is the main theme in his plays. Here as well, Mamet shows his mastership of language through his linguistic versatility. In Levene and Williamson's conversation, Levene, out of fear, is trying to convince his manager by his non-stop talk; Williamson, on the other hand, is the more silent one though the more powerful:

> Levene: John . . . John . . . John. Okay. John. John. Look: (Pause.) The Glengarry Highland's leads, you're sending Roma out. Fine. He's a good man. We know that he is. He's fine. All I'm saying, you look at the *board*, he's throwing . . . wait, wait, wait, he's throwing them *away*, he's throwing the leads away. All that I'm saying, that you're wasting leads. I don't want to tell you your *job*. All that I'm saying, things get *set*, I know they do, you get a certain *mindset* . . . A guy gets a reputation. We know how this . . . all I'm saying, put a *closer* on the job. There is more than one man for the . . . Put a . . . wait a second, put a *proven* man out . . . and you watch, now *wait* a second—and you watch your *dollar* volumes. . . . You start closing them for *fifty 'stead of twenty-five* . . . you put a *closer* on the . . . (Mamet, 1984: 15)

Throughout the speech Williamson tries to interrupt Levene's frantic struggle to convince him for the leads. Levene's relentless talk actually indicates his powerlessness in front of Williamson as he has the fear that in case, he stops Williamson might turn him down. Indeed, he is using the salesman's strategy on Williamson where they give no chance to the customer to say no:

> Mamet builds into this speech Williamson's frequent attempts at interruption. Levene's verbosity and insistence do not permit him to get more than a few words out at a time, and are indicative of the salesman's burgeoning fear and fretfulness. Should Williamson manage to disagree with, object to, or dismiss any of Levene's assertions, the frantic salesman may flounder, succumb to confusion, panic, and thereby lose in what almost amounts to a one-way battle of words. The fact that the more powerful adversary is almost silent is an ironic paradox in a play filled with the sounds of linguistic warfare (Dean, 1996: 49).

When Levene pretentiously say "I don't want to tell you your job" or asserts himself as the 'proven man' he actually claims the power of knowledge due to his experience as an old salesman. However, his virtues as a salesman is no longer evident lately or valid in their current context. He is a version of Oedipus the King whose "knowledge is the kind of knowledge that comes from experience" (Foucault, 1994: 29). Just like Oedipus is interested in preserving his own kingship (Foucault, 1994: 25), Levene is actually interested in preserving his own kingship in the real estate world. When the prophet warns Oedipus, he thinks it is a plot set against him to deprive him of his power. Levene's quick jump into angry words when he feels threatened is in order to re-establish his power:

> Levene: [. . .] Nineteen *eighty*, eighty-*one* . . . eighty-*two* . . . six months of eighty-two . . . who's there? Who's up there?
> Williamson: Roma.
> Levene: Under him?
> Williamson: Moss.
> Levene: Bullshit. John. Bull*shit.* April, September 1981. It's *me*. It isn't *fucking* Moss. Due respect, he's an *order* taker, John. He *talks*, he talks a good game, look at the *board*, and it's *me*, John, it's me . . .
> Williamson: Not lately it isn't.

> Levene: Lately kiss my ass lately. That isn't how you build an org . . . talk, talk to Murray.
> [. . .] My stats for those years? Bull*shit*. . . . over that period of time . . . ? Bull*shit*. It wasn't luck. It was skill. You want to throw that away, John . . . ? You want to throw that away?
> Williamson: It isn't me . . .
> Levene: . . . it isn't you . . . ? Who is it? Who is this I'm talking to? I need the *leads* . . . (Mamet, 1984: 17-18)

It is a vicious circle Levene is in; he has no chance of making a sale with the leads he has. As Ann Dean calls it, the contest and its conditions is a paradigm of capitalism. "That the successful salesman is given the best leads while the runners-up are forced to accept inferior leads from the "B" list or are even dismissed, underlines the unfairness of a system that penalizes those who are weak and needy but rewards those who least need such support" (Dean, 1990: 192). With the thought of losing his power, Levene tries every way with Williamson including bribery:

> Levene: I can't close these leads, John. No one can. It's a joke. John, look, just give me a hot lead. Just give me two of the premium leads. As a "test," alright? As a "test" and I promise you . . .
> Williamson: I can't do it, Shel. (*Pause*.)
> Levene: I'll give you ten percent. (*n*.)
> Williamson: Of what?
> Levene: Of my end what I close.
> Williamson: And what if you don't close.
> Levene: I *will* close.
> Williamson: What if you don't close . . . ?
> Levene: I *will* close.
> Williamson: What if you don't? Then I'm *fucked*. You see . . . ? Then it's my job. That's what I'm *telling* you.
> Levene: I *will* close. John, John, ten percent. I can get hot. You *know* that . . .
> Williamson: Not lately you can't . . .
> Levene: Fuck that. That's defeatist. Fuck that. Fuck it . . . Get on my side. *Go* with me. Let's do something. You want to run this office, *run* it.
> Williamson: Twenty percent. (*Pause*.)
> Levene: Alright.
> Williamson: And fifty bucks a lead (Mamet, 1984: 23-24).

Levene's bribery does not work because it is a harsh materialistic world and when Levene cannot bring out the money immediately, Williamson backs out. No one wants to do a favor for anyone especially if it puts himself into a dangerous position.

Everyone has to be selfish to protect his own interests. Therefore, as a last resort Levene mentions his daughter:

> Levene: I'll give you thirty on them now, I'll bring the rest tomorrow. I've got it at the hotel. (*Pause*.) John? (*Pause*.) We do that, for chrissake?
> Williamson: No.
> Levene: I'm asking you. As a favor to me? (*Pause*.) John. (*Long pause*.)
> John: my daughter . . .
> Williamson: I can't do it, Shelly (Mamet, 1984: 26).

This is one of the moments in the play which causes different readings of it. Mamet's skill in leaving the silences at the right moment within the course of the conversation is extraordinary. Foucault claims that silences "are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses" (Foucault, 1981: 27). What is left unsaid is crucial in every part, absences and gaps are commonly used devices in Mamet's style. Just like the Deleuzian description of rhizomes, Mamet's writing is not unified or unifying, but implies juxtaposed signifiers not gathering around a center. They are rather 'nomadic assemblages' that open up gaps and displacements in the readings of his play. By this way Mamet is also subverting realism and pushes the audience to make its own various connections. For example, Anne Dean observes:

> Mamet builds into Levene's speech the frantic delaying tactics of a man who is afraid to stop talking: "Wait, wait, wait . . . wait a second . . . now wait a second." There is no indication in the script that Williamson is trying to interrupt, which makes Levene's exhortations to "wait" simultaneously pitiful and funny. At the same time, Mamet can also suggest that the silent actor may be trying to say something but is constantly beaten down by the garrulousness of the speaker. Therefore, Mamet's interruptive device can be utilized in production in two, equally amusing and telling ways (Dean, 1990: 199).

Similarly, when Levene mentions his daughter, the audience does not know the 'truth' about her. There is only the mention; there is the implication that the daughter is sick or in a kind of situation that needs Levene's support. It is also possible that Levene is making it up to convince Williamson, or even possible that he does not have any connection with his daughter as he stays in a hotel. All these readings are possible, and

the ‘truth’ value is of no importance here. For example, Christopher C. Hudgins sees Levene’s daughter as a trigger for his “aggressive salesmanship and for his burglary of the real estate office in *Glengarry Glen Ross*” (Hudgins, 1996: 20). However, it is also possible to ask if his love for his daughter is really a trigger for his behavior, let alone the uncertainty of the existence of a daughter. On the other hand, Steven Price says all-male casts of Mamet’s plays are ‘surragate families’ and that’s why “actual families cannot be mentioned because they threaten the stability of the company: whenever Levene speaks of his daughter he is silenced by Williamson” (Price, 1996: 10). And Anne Dean argues that all talk in the play is about business and nothing else is permitted: “There are a very few moments in the play when the characters use any language that is not expressly concerned with business and even when they do it quickly becomes apparent that it is a ploy designed to coerce a colleague or cheat a client” (Dean, 1990: 192). Foucault claims that “Oedipus feels threatened by Creon at the level of power and not at the level of his innocence and his culpability” (Foucault, 1994: 25). Similarly, as an Oedipal figure Levene is concerned about attaining power and he is threatened by Williamson at the level of power; therefore, he is not an innocent person who is solely concerned about his daughter’s supposed sickness. In fact, the audience has no evidence for the existence of a daughter or at least her prominence in his life. Levene is only seen in the business environment and in the context of real estate business. The fact that Mamet leaves a purposeful gap here makes it possible to either identify with Levene just like a tragic hero or preserve a critical distance towards his Oedipal search for power. It also becomes an apt reading since Mamet portrays these characters as both victims and oppressors within the capitalist system.

Levene thinks he was a prominent figure for the company; therefore, acts like he was powerful, or he owned the business:

> Levene: Well, I want to tell you something, fella, wasn’t long I could pick up the phone, call *Murray* and I’d have your job. You know that? Not too *long* ago. For what? For *nothing*. “Mur, this new kid burns my *ass*.” “Shelly, he’s out.” You’re gone before I’m back from lunch. I bought him a trip to Bermuda once . . .
> Williamson: I have to go . . . (*Gets up*.) (Mamet, 1984: 26)

The conversational shifts throughout the speech—asking for help with a kind attitude, giving orders, insulting, swearing, then almost begging, bribing—indeed reveal the instability of Levene's power position. Like Oedipus his power came from his knowledge based on experience. "Oedipal knowledge, the excess of power and the excess of knowledge were such that he became unnecessary: the circle closed on him or, rather, the two fragments of the tessera were fit together—and Oedipus, in his solitary power, became unnecessary" (Foucault, 1994: 30). Levene once had that knowledge and power for a prominent position in the company, but now he just claims it without any ground. According to Foucault, Sophocles represents decomposition of the tyranny of power and knowledge: "And when classical Greece appeared—Sophocles represents its starting date, its sunrise—what had to disappear for this society to exist was the union of power and knowledge. From this time onward, the man of power would be the man of ignorance" (Foucault, 1994: 32). Williamson might not have Levene's knowledge and experience about real estate sales, but solely through his managerial position in the company he has the power to control Levene. Williamson's power over Levene is coherent with what Foucault calls 'an epistemological power: "that is, a power to extract a knowledge from individuals and to extract a knowledge about those individuals who are subjected to observation and already controlled by those different powers" (Foucault, 1994: 83). Williamson is the supervisor constantly observing the salesmen's performance, but he is being observed by the owners of the company as well. "In an institution like the factory, for example, the worker's labor and the worker's knowledge about his own labor, the technical improvements—the little inventions and discoveries, the microadaptations he's able to implement in the course of his labor—are immediately recorded, thus extracted from his practice, accumulated by the power exercised over him through supervision" (Foucault, 1994: 83-84). As the supervisor who observes him, Williamson decides that Levene's knowledge and experience is of no value lately, and he also does not serve Williamson's interests (as he cannot provide the bribery money); therefore, could be discarded.

It is Mamet's distinctive style to capture the rhythms of urban life while writing his dialogues; however, it is not right to name it a mere reflection of street language just as Christopher Edwards observes:

> [Mamet] possesses a wonderfully acute ear for the vernacular of Chicago and recreates it in all its raw poetic vigour, repetitive obscenity and desperate velocity. But the powerful naturalism of the speech is not mere literal transcription of what is heard. Like all naturalism, it only seems so because of the conscious artistry of the author. Mamet's effect is accomplished by way of a stylized formality (Tekinay, 2001: 45).

Mamet's scatological dialogue and the sexist language his characters most often use, his all-male plays such as *Lakeboat*, *Duck Variations*, *American Buffalo*, *A Life in the Theatre*, and *Glengarry Glen Ross* have given Mamet a reputation of being a misogynist by some critics. However, as Leslie Kane and Christopher C. Hudgins say, "assuming that a character speaks for an author, or that the conclusion of a dramatic plot reflects the author's personal beliefs, is one of the most elementary of interpretive mistakes" (Hudgins, et. al., 2001: 5). Even though Mamet finds a communal aspect in male bonding (Mamet, 1989: 85-91), it is not right to accuse him of misogyny since his character's sexist language use is actually an indicator of their Oedipal search for power, and his unresolved conflicts point "towards the need to conceive of change . . . not as a *reversal* . . . of hierarchical power, but as *transformation*, an actual alternative to the politics of dominance" (C. MacLeod quoted in Hudgins, et. al. 2001: 5). When asked if he is tired of his work being called misogynistic, Mamet's reply is also interesting:

> It's inaccurate and it's a lie, and not only is it that, but it's cowardly. What happened, I believe, was, years ago, I wrote a play called Sexual Perversity in Chicago (*sic*) which was about misogyny, how a nice, healthy relationship between two nice young people was ruined by the incursion of a misogynist. And since then, people have said, "It's been said that you are a misogynist." Well, nothing could be further from the truth, either in my personal life, if it's anyone's business, or in my work. I think if someone wants to make such an unpleasant and demonstrably false assertion, let him or her make it, and I'll respond with whatever small courtesy it deserves (Mamet quoted in Hudgins, et. al., 2001: 4).

Similarly, in *Glengarry Glen Ross* Mamet focuses on power relationships based on ethnicity, gender and sexuality, and his use of a sexist language indicates the characters' Oedipal desire for power and personal interest. But Mamet subverts the power structures through his Schizoanalytic language and writing style, and the unresolved conflicts. He constantly deterritorializes power structures without establishing new centers.

In *Glengarry Glen Ross* the salesmen's world is not only capitalist, but also a patriarchal one. It is a world of men, and their identity is defined through the job they do: "A man's his job and you're *fucked* at yours" (Mamet, 1984: 75). Failure in business equals to failure in being a man; therefore, in life. And the worst kind of offence a man can get is the one that insults his manhood. Yet, this definition is constrictive:

> The definition of masculinity within *Glengarry Glen Ross* is too limited for the majority of the characters to maintain, leaving them perpetually unsure of their identities. As in *Edmond*, it is the limited structure of their definitions which fails these men; the system of patriarchal capitalism that promises to define them, to position them in a place of power, is precisely what disempowers them by setting up a competition which always positions the majority of players as losers and, therefore, as not-men. Any comfort they might take from each other, any support or friendship, is constantly undercut by competition (C. J. McDonough quoted in Geis, 1996: 125).

These characters have no identity outside their Oedipal lack and their desire for the power of domination. They should "always be closing" (the practical sales maxim in *Glengarry*) and that desire also defines their relationship with each other and shapes their social dialogue. The topics they can talk about is limited to business, or they talk only to deceive each other or the customers. "Mamet restricts the social dialogue in order to illustrate the linguistic constraints that influence how a men's closed conversational relationship is constructed, and how that relationship easily becomes the power struggle between speaker and listener as each attempts to secure the position of authority" (Vorlicky, 1996: 83-84).

In the second scene Moss and Aaronow are sitting at a booth at the restaurant talking after the meal. To sum up, in this scene Aaronow is seen worried about his success rate on the all-important 'board.' Moss is planning to get hold of the leads by finding someone to a break-in for him and is trying to convince Aaronow to break in the office and steal the leads by manipulating his sensibilities. Aaronow is the silent one, but he seems lacking in power as he has no command of the masculine ethos. This is a male defined capitalist world of business, and Aaronow's passivity does not suit him for this role. He is nervous with the fear of losing his job; as he listens, he just agrees with Moss and supports him with short comments, which reveals his insecurity:

> Moss: The whole fuckin' thing . . . The pressure's just too great. You're ab . . . you're absolu . . . they're too important. All of them. You go in the door. I . . . "I got to *close* this fucker, or I don't eat lunch," "or I don't win the *Cadillac*. . . ." We fuckin' work too hard. You work too hard. We all, I remember when we were at Platt . . . huh? Glen Ross Farms . . . *didn't* we sell a bunch of that . . .?
> Aaronow: They came in and they, you know . . .
> Moss: Well, they fucked it up.
> Aaronow: They did.
> Moss: They killed the goose.
> Aaronow: They did.
> Moss: And now . . .
> Aaronow: We're stuck with this . . .
> Moss: We're stuck with *this* fucking shit . . .
> Aaronow: . . . *this* shit . . .
> Moss: It's too . . .
> Aaronow: It is.
> Moss: Eh?
> Aaronow: It's too . . .
> Moss: You get a bad mouth, all of a . . .
> Aaronow: You're on this . . .
> Moss: All of, they got you on this "board . . . "
> Aaronow: I, I . . . I . . .
> Moss: Some *contest* board . . .
> Aaronow: I . . .
> Moss: It's not right.
> Aaronow: It's not.
> Moss: No. (Pause) (Mamet, 1984: 30-31).

The job these salesmen do is selling land and property and "what they are selling hinges on a vision of the American dream as fulfilled through the acquisition of property (and specifically, through marketing property in magical-sounding Florida to middle-class inhabitants of Chicago), it is not surprising that many potential clients would come from first, second, or third-generation immigrant families" (Geis, 1996:

125). American dream is a form of terriorialization of desire. Deleuze and Guattari claim that every investment of desire is social, and instead of focusing on production, the traditional logic of desire focuses on acquisition and lack:

> To a certain degree the traditional logic of desire is all wrong from the outset: from the very first step that the Platonic logic of desire forces us to take, making us choose between production and acquisition. From the moment we place desire on the side of the acquisition, we make desire an idealistic (dialectical, nihilistic) conception, which causes us to look upon it primarily as a lack: a lack of an object, a lack of the real object (AO, 26/32) (Buchanan, 2008: 48).

The creation of American dream is, therefore, a social investment. Socially formed desire finds its expression in the 'need' of land. However, desires are not produced by need, but vice versa. "Deleuze and Guattari argue that desire isn't 'bolstered by needs, but rather the contrary; needs are derived from desire: they are counter products within the real that desire produces.' (AO, 28/34)" (Buchanan, 2008: 48). American dream finds its expression in the need for the acquisition of land and the scarcity and inaccessibility of it stands for the feeling of 'lack' when needs are not met in psychoanalytic terms. Land stands as a desired product to acquire for many immigrants as the acquisition of it would mean reaching the American dream. The salesmen in *Glengarry Glen Ross* know the significance of this since they see these immigrants as gullible potential buyers whom they can sell worthless land by providing them with the illusion to reach their dream. On the other hand, the degradation of women and the racist, sexist language indicate the power relationship formed between the salesmen and the customers:

> Moss: Polacks and deadbeats.
> Aaronow: . . . Polacks . . .
> Moss: Deadbeats *all*.
> Aaronow: . . . they hold on to their money . . .
> Moss: All of 'em. They, *hey*: it happens to us all.
> Aaronow: Where am I going to work?
> Moss: You have to cheer up, George, you aren't out yet.
> Aaronow: I'm not?
> Moss: You missed a fucking sale. Big deal. A deadbeat Polack. Big deal. How you going to sell 'em in the *first* place . . . ? Your mistake, you shoun'a took the lead.
> Aaronow: I had to.
> Moss: You had to, yeah. Why?
> Aaronow: To get on the . . .

> Moss: To get on the board. Yeah. How you goan'a get on the board sell'n a Polack? And I'll tell you, I'll tell you what *else*. You listening? I'll tell you what else: don't ever try to sell an Indian.
> Aaronow: I'd never try to sell an Indian.
> Moss: You get those names come up, you ever get 'em, "Patel"?
> Aaronow: Mmm . . .
> Moss: You ever get 'em?
> Aaronow: Well, I think I had one once.
> Moss: You did?
> Aaronow: I . . . I don't know.
> Moss: You had one you'd know it. *Patel*. They keep coming up. I don't know. They like to talk to salesmen. (*Pause*.) They're *lonely*, something. (*Pause*.) They like to feel *superior*, I don't know. Never bought a fucking thing. You're sitting down "The Rio Rancho this, the blah blah bah," "The Mountain View—" "Oh yes. My brother told me that. . . ." They got a grapevine. Fuckin' Indians, George. Not my cup of tea. Speaking of which I want to tell you something: (*Pause*) I never got a cup of tea with them. You see them in the restaurants. A supercilious race. A supercilious race. What is this *look* on their face all the time? I don't know. (*Pause*.) Their broads all look like they just got fucked with a dead *cat*, I don't know. (*Pause*.) I don't know. I don't like it. Christ . . . (Mamet, 1984: 28-30)

There are different approaches to Mamet's handling of race and gender in this specific passage. Christopher Hudgins, for instance, analyzes it as humor in Mamet which makes the audience laugh at Moss's narrative "partly out of our liberal superiority, laughing at the character," and the audience also laughs because it actually recognizes that it is Moss's own feelings of frustration and inferiority (Hudgins quoted in Geis, 1996: 126). However, in Deborah Geis' view the audience has the "liberal superiority" to laugh at Moss because they implicitly know that they are not "Patels" themselves (Geis, 1996: 126). Then Geis goes on with giving the example of the impressions of an Indian audience who saw the play:

> "[I]n my red silk sari I'm conspicuous," she says, even wondering for a moment whether the actors spotted her in the audience before the play began and said, "Let's get her today." Sitting in the front row has thus also broken the theatrical illusion; Panna says that "we see things we shouldn't be seeing", and the implication is that the performance of racism has become visible (Geis, 1996: 127).

Mamet's schizoanalytic writing style makes all these readings possible. It is for sure that Mamet's writing is not 'politically correct,' and political correctness is what Mamet despises. But it is also his writing style that makes someone to recognize this "liberal superiority" and put a critical distance towards it. Panna's reaction seeing racism and sexism visible on stage puts her in the situation of the Other. Maybe as

being the victim of this degrading language in real life, she feels twice as humiliated seeing its representation. However, the question is constant: how come a writer brings about change, a revolutionary act within society without making it visible? The representation of racism and sexism within the capitalist America does not make Mamet himself a racist or sexist. Hence, Panna herself can observe these salesmen both as victims of this "tyranny of the American dream" and also participants in the cycles of capitalist victimization (Geis, 1996: 127). As Foucault argues every power relationship involves the means of escape:

> [...] if it is true that at the heart of power relations and as a permanent condition of their existence there is an insubordination and a certain essential obstinacy on the part of the principles of freedom, then there is no relationship of power without the means of escape or possible flight. Every power relationship implies, at least in potential, a strategy of struggle, in which the two forces are not superimposed, do not lose their specific nature, or do not finally become confused. Each constitutes for the other a kind of permanent limit, a point of possible reversal (Foucault, 1994: 346).

And for Mamet 'making it visible' is a strategy of struggle with power relationships.

The language Mamet deploys for his characters is self-referential. "The language of the salesmen is emphatically self-referential, saturated with characteristics typical of "sales talk," pervasively sexual, and indicative of real and imagined power relationships" (Worster, 1996: 64). Mamet makes use of verbs of utterance many times in his play, as David Worster observes words like say, said, tell, told, talk, talking, and speaking appear over two hundred times throughout the play. Self-referential aspect of language is critical in Mamet's dialogue because Mamet is concerned with how language is used as a tool for power relationships. "In this play, talking is so critical to the composition of identity and power that just to speak is not enough, the speaker must call attention to his speech" (Worster, 1996: 64). Therefore, in salesmen's talk Mamet uses verbs of utterance also to establish power over the Other as the listener/receiver: "The proclamation of utterance is particularly aggressive because it firmly positions the hearer as the listening object, the nonspeaker" (Worster, 1996: 64). Utterance is a tool of achieving dominance and creating a reality for the salesmen. A good example of this is when Moss goes on his speech by trying to plant the idea of

stealing the leads, he tells Aaronow that he can sell the leads to a rival company held by Jerry Graff. Hearing this Aaronow starts to question whether Moss has a real plan or only "speaking" about it:

> Moss: No. What do you mean? Have I talked to him about *this*? (*Pause*.)
> Aaronow: Yes. I mean are you actually *talking* about this, or are we just . . .
> Moss: No, we're just . . .
> Aaronow: We're just "*talking*" about it.
> Moss: We're just *speaking* about it. (*Pause*.) As an *idea*.
> Aaronow: As an idea.
> Moss: Yes.
> Aaronow: We're not actually *talking* about it.
> Moss: No.
> Aaronow: Talking about it as a . . .
> Moss: No.
> Aaronow: As a *robbery*.
> Moss: As a "robbery"?! No.
> Aaronow: Well. Well . . .
> Moss: Hey. (*Pause*.)
> Aaronow: So all this, um, you didn't, actually, you didn't actually go talk to Graff.
> Moss: Not actually, no. (*Pause*.)
> Aaronow: You didn't?
> Moss: No. Not actually.
> Aaronow: Did you?
> Moss: What did I say?
> Aaronow: What did you say?
> Moss: Yes. (*Pause*.) I said, "Not actually." The fuck *you* care, George? We're just *talking* . . .
> Aaronow: We are?
> Moss: Yes. (Pause.)
> Aaronow: Because, because, you know, it's a *crime*.
> Moss: That's right. It's a crime. It is a crime. It's also very safe.
> Aaronow: You're actually talking about this?
> Moss: That's right. (*Pause*) (Mamet, 1984: 39-40).

Mamet's self-referential dialogue makes the reader think about the relationship between language, thought, idea, and action. He makes the audience question the connection between language and reality. This dialogue between Moss and Aaronow focuses attention on how representational view of language does not make any sense. Representational thought assumes that there is an actual and virtual world, and actual is represented in the virtual. However, to Deleuze both the actual and the virtual are real, and the virtual is not subordinate to the real: "The very concept of thought as representation assumes that there is some objective, present, real and external world

that is then re-presented by thought, as though thought were a passive picture or copy of the world. There would be an actual world (the real), and then its virtual and secondary copy" (Colebrook, 2002: 1). As Aaronow and Moss go on with their dialogue it further exemplifies the connection between reality and language, and how language becomes a tool for dominance. Moss uses Aaronow's gullible naiveté: "A conversation that had appeared to Aaronow as an opportunity to bolster his confidence, gain an ally, and consolidate a valuable friendship with a "real" salesman has disastrously backfired" (Dean, 1996: 55). Now there is no difference between 'listening' and taking part in the crime. Moss claims that simply by "listening" Aaronow already took part in the crime, and he turns it into a threat to make Aaronow what he wants:

> Aaronow: . . . I thought that we were only talking . . .
> Moss: . . . they *take* me, then. They're going to ask me who were my accomplices.
> Aaronow: *Me*?
> Moss: Absolutely.
> Aaronow: That's ridiculous.
> Moss: Well, to the law, you're an accessory. Before the fact.
> Aaronow: I didn't ask to be.
> Moss: Then tough luck, George, because you are.
> Aaronow: Why? *Why*, because you only *told* me about it?
> Moss: That's right.
> Aaronow: Why are you doing this to me, Dave. Why are you talking this way to me? I don't understand. Why are you doing this at *all* . . . ?
> Moss: That's none of your fucking business . . .
> Aaronow: Well, well, well, *talk* to me, we sat down to eat *dinner*, and here I'm a *criminal* . . .
> [...]
> Moss: I lied. (*Pause*.) Alright? My end is my business. Your end's twenty-five. In or out. You tell me, you're out you take the consequences.
> Moss: Yes. (*Pause*.)
> Aaronow: And why is that?
> Moss: Because you listened (Mamet, 1984: 45-46).

In *Glengarry Glen Ross* characters claim their identity by the power relationships they establish with the others through their self-reflexive, aggressive, sexist, and manipulative language. It is also the discourse of capitalism which "gives rise to fierce competition and voice to failure and frustration, it also "reveals … and ritualizes language," rendering definitions of what it means to be a success" (Kane,

1996: xxiv). Characters in *Glengarry Glen Ross* only make linguistic exchanges to attain power. A language that reflects and constantly recreates their corrupt business world is violent and sexist, and language does not serve communication. Theirs is an Oedipal existence where their language is based on need and lack: “The problem is that they have so thoroughly plundered the language of private need and self-fulfilment and deployed it for the purpose of deceit and betrayal that they no longer have access to words that will articulate their feelings” (Bigsby, 1985: 123). Oedipal based desire for power is also apparent in Roma and Lingk’s conversation in Scene 3. The scene starts in the middle of their conversation, and Roma is seen in his aggressive sexist sales talk trying to generate a need in Lingk to buy land by manipulating his desire for safety which is also tailored by the capitalist discourse. Lingk is observed in very short comments during the dialogue in total surrender of power, not capable of saying ‘no’ to this powerful salesmen, but also keen on acquiring the same power Roma has, hence falling for Roma’s act of camaraderie built on a scatological language even though they have not even get acquainted properly (audience learns that they have not even met properly at the end of the conversation when they see the two exchanging names):

> Roma: [...] The great fucks that you may have had. What do you remember about them?
> Lingk: What do I . . . ?
> Roma: Yes.
> Lingk: Mmmm . . .
> Roma: I don’t know. For *me*, I’m saying, what it is, it’s probably not the orgasm. Some broads, forearms on your neck, something her *eyes* did. There was a *sound* she made . . . or, me, lying, in the, I'll tell you: me lying in bed; the next day she brought me café au lait. She gives me a cigarette, my balls feel like concrete. Eh? What I'm saying what is our life? (*Pause*.) It's looking forward or it's looking back. And that's our life that's it. Where is the *moment*? (*Pause*.) And what is it that we're afraid of? Loss. What else? (*Pause.*) The *bank* closes. We get *sick*, my wife died on a plane, the stock market collapsed . . . the house burnt down . . . what of these happen . . . ? None on 'em. We worry anyway. What does this mean? I'm not *secure*. How can I be secure? (*Pause.*) Through amassing wealth beyond all measure? No. And what's beyond all measure? That's a sickness. That's a trap. There is no measure. Only greed. How can we act? The right way, we would say, to deal with this: "There is a one-in-a-million chance that so and so will happen . . . Fuck it, it won't happen to me. . . . " No. We know that's not the right way I think. (*Pause.*) We say the *correct* way to deal with this is "There is a one-in-so-and-so chance this will happen...God *protect* me. I am powerless, let it not happen to me..." But no to *that.* I say. There's something else. What is it? "If it happens, AS IT MAY for that is not within our powers, I will *deal* with it, just as I do *today* with what draws my concern today." I say this is how we must act. I do those

> things which seem correct to me *today*. I trust myself. And if security concerns me, I do that which *today* I think will make me secure. And every day I do that, when that day *arrives* that I need a reserve, [a] odds are that I have it, and [b] the *true* reserve that I have is the strength that I have of *acting each day* without fear. (*Pause*) (Mamet, 1984: 48-49).

What Roma is actually doing in this dialogue is telling Lingk what he is supposed to believe. The use of manipulative sales talk to attain power over the customer is indeed exemplary of Deleuze's ideas when he says there is no communication except a controlled system of information to secure a society of control. To him language actually never serves the purpose of communication:

> Communication is the transmission and propagation of information. [...] Information is a set of imperatives, slogans, directions: order-words. When you are informed, you are told what you are supposed to believe. In other words, informing means circulating an order-word. Police declarations are appropriately called "communiqués.' Information is communicated to us, they tell us what we are supposed to be ready to, or have to, believe, or to believe that we are bound to believe. And not even believe, but to act as if we believed. We are not asked to believe but to behave as if we did. That is information, communication. And independently of these order-words and their transmission there is no communication, there is no information. This is the same thing as saying that information is exactly the system of control. It is true, I am speaking platitudes – this is obvious! It is obvious, except that it particularly concerns us today. It affects us today because, we are entering a society that can be called a society of control (Deleuze, 1987).

Therefore, in Deleuzian terms rather than suffering from a lack of communication in its usual sense, these salesmen are actually achieving all the aspects of 'communication.' Since there are no ready-made meanings to be conveyed and grasped; communication in the way people generally understand is not possible. In a 'society of control' like ours, which is a concept that Deleuze further develops from Foucault, communication is rather a system of information to exercise power over the Other. Indeed, when Deleuze explains the society of control, what he claims about how corporations work is also an apt description for the real estate office in *Glengarry Glen Ross*:

> This is obvious in the matter of salaries: the factory was a body that contained its internal forces at the level of equilibrium, the highest possible in terms of production, the lowest possible in terms of wages; but in a society of control, the corporation has replaced the factory, and the corporation is a spirit, a gas. Of course the factory was already familiar with the system of bonuses, but the corporation works more deeply to impose a modulation of each salary, in states of perpetual metastability that operate through challenges, contests, and highly comic group sessions. If the most idiotic television game shows are so successful, it's because they express the corporate situation with great precision. The factory constituted individuals as a single body to the double advantage of the boss who surveyed each element within the mass and the unions who mobilized a mass resistance; but the corporation constantly presents the brashest rivalry as a healthy form of emulation, an excellent motivational force that opposes individuals against one another and runs through each, dividing each within. The modulating principle of "salary according to merit" has not failed to tempt national education itself (Deleuze, 1990).

In *Glengarry Glen Ross* the sales contest is indeed serving the purpose of control to maintain perpetual metastability within the business. Salesmen take the challenge, and in an attempt to survive within the competitive corporate environment where loyalty and trust have no place; they even deceive their colleagues and exploit the customers without any regret. Rivalry is the motivational force, that's why they can trick their friends, threaten them, and seduce the customers. Their success is measured according to business through these abilities; and if they have this merit they will be rewarded with a Cadillac, if they do not have it, they have no place within the corporation; therefore, will be fired. This pressure makes any means acceptable to them; hence, Act II, which is a full act without any scenic episodes, starts with the real estate office ransacked, the robbery has already taken place. The contracts are stolen and there is an investigation being held in the office by Baylen, a detective. As the investigation goes on within an inner office where the salesmen go in one by one for an interrogation, outside the audience sees different interactions of salesmen. The Act starts with Roma, who is the most successful salesman on the board, panicking when he sees the ransacked office since he gets worried that the sales which he closed with Lingk a night before got stolen, too. When he learns from Williamson only some of the contracts are stolen and his sale to Lingk already got filed, he gets relieved and immediately starts asking for his award: "Then I'm over the fucking top and you owe me a Cadillac" (Mamet, 1984: 54). Roma keeps on with his aggressive style and does

not care about the state of the office or whether any of his colleagues suffer from this robbery; the object of desire, the Cadillac, is his and he is not concerned with any fuss that would keep him away from this object:

> Roma: And I don't want any fucking shit and I don't give a shit, Lingk puts me over the top, you filed it, that's fine, any other shit kicks out *you* go back. You . . . *you* reclose it, 'cause I *closed* it and you . . . you owe me the car (Mamet, 1984: 55).

As Roma gets nervous with the idea that he has to reclose all the other sales he did that week and gets angry with Williamson because he gives him from the old leads for that day, he also starts making racist remarks:

> Roma: *Patel*? Ravidam *Patel*? How am I going to make a living on these deadbeat *wogs*? Where did you get this, from the *morgue*? (Mamet, 1984: 62).

When Roma learns that he cannot reclose his previous sales since the boss, Murray, will go out for them, Roma starts insulting Williamson's ability to do his job since he does not want to deal with useless leads. In the male defined jargon of the business world, success in business is being a 'man' and the one who cannot do it is the opposite; if they 'lack' the ability, they are equal to being a 'woman,' that's why a degrading language can be used towards them: "Your business is being an asshole, and I find out whose fucking cousin you are, I'm going to go to him and figure out a way to have your ass . . . fuck you—I'll wait for the new leads" (Mamet, 1984: 63). At that moment Levene enters all ecstatic having achieved to make a sale of eighty-two thousand dollars of worthless land to Bruce and Harriet Nyborg. While he is cordially trying to tell his story, Moss comes out of the interrogation angry with being accused, and Aaronow is called in. Roma gets excited with Levene's success, which the audience later learns that not out of camaraderie but for personal interest to work with him and earn more when he says to Williamson: "My stuff is *mine*, whatever *he* gets for himself, I'm taking half. You put me in with him" (Mamet, 1984: 107). Moss

is angry with the police interrogation since it is a way of exercising power that makes him feel powerless. Just like Foucault argues the institutions have not only economic power, but also political power (the right to give orders, establish rules) and a judicial power (punish and reward) (Foucault, 1994: 83). The real estate agency has all three forms of power now with the entry of the police force. Lacking in power, and also with the fear that he will get caught (since later when the pieces are fit together audience learns that he really has planned the robbery) Moss does not want to listen to Levene, and Roma's fake courtesy and support. Roma and Moss also fall out with each other because of the competitive environment; Moss is jealous of Roma's success: "I get this *shit* thrown in my face by you, you genuine shit, because you're top name on the board . . ." (Mamet, 1984: 70); and Roma insults Moss and supports Levene for his personal Oedipal desire for power: "Your *pal* closes, all that comes out of your mouth is *bile*, how fucked *up* you are . . ." (Mamet, 1984: 71). These salesmen have no identity outside the power relations, and the culturally coded Oedipal search for power frustrates them when they cannot attain it.

Within all this mess, when Moss leaves the office, Levene starts reciting his story. "Levene's pride in his achievement is almost tangible, his enthusiasm irresistibly infectious" (Dean, 1990: 208). Here Mamet's use of language once again turns into a metalinguistic element. His Oedipal self-centered characters' only concern is the fulfilment of their own desires; whereas their desire is a real contact, their need for success causes more loneliness and frustration. Therefore, in order to compensate for their loss fiction becomes their retreat in which they build themselves a world of deception. In Deleuzian terms the forces of desire produce representations (Colebrook, 2002: xxxii), but when desire is turned into need, there will always be 'lack' because there are only differences in life instead of meaning. The coherent world these characters try to construct for themselves will have no counterpart. For this reason, it is not a coincidence that many of Mamet's characters are hucksters, con men, charlatans, or salesmen. Through storytelling, which is a constant case in their life, his characters expose their desires and fears, and it sometimes becomes the way they keep contact with the others to cope with their loneliness. Deborah Geis also argues that storytelling is another performative aspect of language and it becomes a metadramatic

tradition in Mamet (Geis, 1992: 49-68). Storytellers and listeners are always significant in Mamet's plays; the language they use for these stories are to conceal their deep desires, deceive others, and invent new meanings; however, what they do not say usually suppresses the truth about them. Making storytelling a strategy both for himself and his characters, David Mamet argues dramatists have a similar task of storytelling:

> It occured to me while I was doing *House of Games* that the difficulty of making the movie was exactly the same difficulty the confidence man has. For the confidence man it is depriving the victim of her money; for me it is misleading the audience sufficiently so they feel pleased when they find out they've been misled, tricking them so that every step is logical, and at the end they've defeated themselves. So, the process of magic and the process of confidence games, and to a certain extent the process of drama, are all processes of autosuggestion. They cause the audience to autosuggest themselves in a way that seems perfectly logical but it is actually false (Lahr, 2001: 113).

This is why when Levene starts reciting his success story the audience also falls for it. Not knowing that Levene is the actual person who broke in the real estate office, the audience also thinks he really made a sale. Mamet's con game becomes self-referential drawing attention to the flimsiness of the concept of reality and truth. And it becomes even more ironic when later it turns out that Levene himself has fallen for a scam by the Nyborgs who like to pretend they bought land and give fake cheques. When telling his story, Levene is fully indulged also deceiving himself in the desire-need-lack triangle. His search for power within this economic system cannot be reciprocated. As an Oedipal figure he has lost his old power, and like Oedipus Rex he is blind with his aspiration; as a result, he cannot see the deceptive purpose behind Nyborg's trickster act. His degrading corrupt language while telling his story also marks his lust for power. Hence, Anne Dean defines Levene's story having "an almost sexual excitement" when he made the customers sign the contract. The "pen" that is used to sign the contract becomes a phallic symbol in Levene's story which has an 'orgasmic evocation':

> Levene: [...] Now I handed them the pen. I held it in my hand. I turned the contract, eight units eighty-two grand. "Now I want you to sign." (Pause.) I sat there. Five minutes. Then, I sat there, Ricky, twenty-two minutes by the kitchen clock. (Pause.) Twenty-two minutes by the kitchen clock. Not a word, not a motion. What am I thinking? "My arm's getting tired?" No. I did it. I did it. Like in the old days, Ricky. Like I was taught . . . Like, like, like I used to do . . . I did it.
> Roma: Like you taught me . . .
> Levene: Bullshit, you're . . . No. That's raw . . . well, if I did, then I'm glad I did. I, well. I locked on them. All on them, nothing on me. All my thoughts are on them. I'm holding the last thought that I spoke: "Now is the time." (Pause.) They signed, Ricky. It was great. It was fucking great. It was like they wilted all at once. No gesture . . . nothing. Like together. They, I swear to God, they both kind of imperceptibly slumped. And he reaches and takes the pen and signs, he passes it to her, she signs. It was so fucking solemn. I just let it sit. I nod like this. I nod again. I grasp his hands. I shake his hands. I grasp her hands. I nod at her like this. "Bruce . . . Harriet . . . " I'm beaming at them. I'm nodding like this. I point back in the living room, back to the sideboard. (Pause.) I didn't fucking know there was a sideboard there!! He goes back, he brings us a drink. Little shot glasses. A pattern in 'em. And we toast. In silence. (Pause.)
> Roma: That was a great sale, Shelly. (Pause.)
> Levene: Ah, fuck. Leads! Leads! Williamson! (Williamson sticks his head out of the office.) Send me out! Send me out! (Mamet, 1984: 73-74)

Lines between sexual desire and desire for power are blurred within storytelling. "As he moves toward the climax of his tale, a climax that seems almost orgasmic particularly when one notes his final "Ah fuck," it is as if he has lost himself in a sexual dream" (Dean, 1990: 209). Mamet in effect shows that a good story actually blurs the line between reality and fiction and reminds Deleuze when he claims images and virtual is productive of reality: "We need to see our languages and systems of representation not just as masks or signs of the actual, but as fully real powers in their own right" (Colebrook, 2002: xxxviii). That is why when Mamet makes Levene change the tense, he uses from Simple Past to Present while telling his story, it is drawing attention to the shift between the real and the imaginary: "By dint of words alone, both men enjoy reliving the event, participating in the triumphant sale as its recollection stimulates their imagination" (Dean, 1990: 210).

Apart from storytelling, acting is another attribute of these salesmen that when deployed by Mamet it becomes a metatheatrical element and points to the relationship between language, representation and reality. Acting within acting draws attention to the thin line between reality and fiction and makes the audience question

representation. Although the salesmen try to define and stabilize their identity through their success in business and how much money they make, the connection between language and identity is emphasized in Mamet's plays; thus, no matter how much the salesmen try, the idea of fixed identity positions is constantly subverted. This is compatible with the Deleuzian idea of formation of identities which argues that in the world of representation and common-sense people imagine a world of presence and identities. Psychoanalytic approach also explains the formation of identities based on desire and lack. Slavoj Zizek has a similar point of view claiming the 'cultural symptom' is necessary: "If we did not imagine ourselves as having lost some original enjoyment, desire or presence we would have no self or identity at all" (Colebrook, 2002: 17). Judith Butler also argues that "[w]ithout the trauma of subjection to some imagined law or other we would have no identity" (Colebrook, 2002: 18). However, Deleuze and Guattari insist that desire is positive in itself, "To pursue this project of positive difference, we have to accept first that difference is not just imposed by language on the world; difference is not a single system or structure to which we, as speaking subjects, must 'submit'" (Colebrook, 2002: 18). Traditional common-sense view of subjectivity regards the subject identical to itself, and there is also a tension between psychoanalysis and schizoanalysis as psychoanalysis still claims an origin for identity even though the subject 'lacks' it. Schizoanalysis, on the other hand, focuses on difference and emphasizes multiplicity, and desire is productive:

> [...] the unconscious is treated by Deleuze and Guattari not as personal or individual 'property', but as a collective assemblage. This means that the unconscious is neither imaginary nor symbolic, but is real in the sense that it creates or produces reality. … 'If desire produces, its product is real. If desire is productive, it can be productive only in the real world and can produce only reality' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a, p. 28).They assert that social reality and desiring-production are not two separate realms but are in fact one and the same process of production. In this sense Deleuze and Guattari establish a certain correspondence between libidinal economy and political economy, claiming that: "social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions. We maintain that the social field is immediately invested by desire, that it is the historically determined product of desire, and that libido has no need of any mediation or sublimation, any psychic operation, any transformation, in order to invade and invest the productive forces and the relations of production. There is only desire and the social, and nothing else (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a, p. 31, emphasis in original) (Žukauskaitė, et. al., 2015: 8-9).

Therefore, for Deleuze and Guattari desire is productive and positive, it does not lack anything. There is no single identity or fixed subjects: "As Deleuze and Guattari suggest, 'Desire does not lack anything; it does not lack its object. It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire, or desire that lacks a fixed subject'" (Deleuze and Guattari quoted in Žukauskaitė, et. al., 2015: 9). Correspondingly, in Mamet's plays there are no fixed identities, also in *Glengarry Glen Ross*, subjects are fragmented, ambiguous, and elusive. Therefore, the metatheatrical element in *Glengarry Glen Ross* foregrounds difference in identity formation and subverts fixed subjectivities. The leading scene in this regard is when Lingk suddenly enters the real estate office while Levene and Roma are talking about the Nyborg sale. As soon as Roma sees Lingk, he understands that there most probably is a problem and Lingk has come to cancel their sales deal. Therefore, he immediately reacts and quickly asks Levene in private to act out as one of his customers that bought real estate from him:

> Roma sees something outside the window.
> Roma (*Sotto*): Oh, Christ.
> Levene: The hell with him. We'll go to lunch, the leads won't be up for . . .
> Roma: You're a client. I just sold you five water-front Glengarry Farms. I rub my head, throw me the cue "Kenilworth."
> Levene: What is it?
> Roma: Kenilw . . .
> Lingk enters the office (Mamet, 1984: 78).

It seems these salesmen are professionals in acting in order to get themselves out of unwanted confrontations. They are also good at analyzing a possible problem within a business deal; Roma's prediction that Lingk has come to cancel the contract is, indeed, correct. Both Roma and Levene are very quick and effective in improvising; it is incredible to see them shift identities, adapt to a lie within seconds and comply with it. Mamet makes this even more evident when Roma suddenly mentions the name 'Black Creek;' Levene, for a second, tries to figure out how to go on, and immediately after starts to improvise and pretends so well that he had just forgotten the name 'Black

Creek' only for a second. And later Roma makes up another story about a magazine after which for a moment Levene wavers, but then again seizes the track right after:

> Lingk: I've got to talk to you.
> Roma: (*Looking up*) Jim! What are you doing here? Jim Lingk, D. Ray Morton . . .
> Levene: Glad to meet you.
> Roma: I just put Jim into Black Creek . . . are you acquainted with . . .
> Levene: No . . . Black *Creek*. Yes. In Florida?
> Roma: Yes.
> Levene: I wanted to *speak* with you about . . .
> Roma: Well, we'll do that this weekend.
> Levene: My *wife* told me to look into . . .
> Roma: *Beautiful*. Beautiful rolling land. I was telling Jim and Jinny, Ray, I want to tell you something. (*To* Levene:)You, Ray, you eat in a lot of restaurants. I know you do. . . . (*To* Lingk:) Mr. Morton's with American Express . . . he's . . . (*To* Levene:) I can tell Jim what you do . . .?
> Levene: Sure.
> Roma: Ray is director of all European sales and services for American Ex . . . (*To* Levene:) But I'm saying you haven't had a *meal* until you've tasted . . . I was at the Lingks' last . . . as a matter of fact, what was that service feature you were talking about . . . ?
> Levene: Which . . .
> Roma: "Home Cooking" . . . what did you call it, you said it . . . it was a tag phrase that you had . . .
> Levene: Uh . . .
> Roma: Home . . .
> Levene: Home cooking . . .
> Roma: The monthly interview . . . ?
> Levene: Oh! For the *magazine* . . .
> Roma: Yes. Is this something that I can talk ab . . .
> Levene: Well, it isn't coming out until the February iss . . . *sure*. Sure, go ahead, Ricky.
> Roma: You're sure?
> Levene (*nods*): Go ahead (Mamet, 1984: 79-80).

With this small act Roma's main purpose is apparently to prevent a disaster for himself, and with that purpose in mind he bombards Lingk with loads of information in order to manipulate him easily. This is again an example of what Deleuze calls "communication." First, by changing the subject frequently, Roma tries to distract and stupefy Lingk; and his fast pace does not give Lingk any chance to interfere. On the other hand, he tries to impress and overpower Lingk with his friendly terms with an imaginary 'important executive' while at the same time giving Lingk the 'honor' to be

in a closed circle by sharing a secret with him. Like that Lingk would feel himself flattered and part of a male bonding.

In fact, the idea of male bonding does not come up irrelevantly to Roma. For business purposes salesmen are good at analyzing customer behavior; Roma realizes his lack of self-confidence and reads Lingk as a 'henpecked husband.' He wants to boost Lingk's self-confidence so that he can make the decision to keep the land by himself without his wife's consent. There is no place for women in this masculine business environment:

> [T]he exclusion of women from these plays implies that the values the male characters traditionally associate with the "feminine"—compassion, tenderness, empathy, spirituality—are seen as threatening to their business ethos; in the business world such values are characterized as weakness, "and weakness is despised as effeminate and dangerous." By banishing women and the values they purportedly represent from these plays, Mamet thus shifts the focus to an examination of "the cocoon of the traditional American masculinity myths" inside which he himself was raised. It is these values of machismo—toughness, strength, cunning—which have become appropriated and apotheosized by American business, alchemized into the fool's gold of power, greed, and competition (Zeifman, 1992: 124-125).

However, "Lingk can assert his presence before the domineering Roma only by adopting his wife's voice, the authority of the absent woman" (Vorlicky, 1996: 96). After listening to them for long, Lingk can interrupt by putting his wife forth:

> Lingk: My wife . . . (*Roma rubs his head*.)
> Levene: (*Standing in the door*): Rick . . . ?
> Roma: I'm sorry, Jim. I can't talk now. I'll call you tonight . . . I'm sorry. I'm coming, Ray. (*Starts for the door*.)
> Lingk: My wife said I have to cancel the deal (Mamet, 1984: 82).

Introducing Jinny Lingk indirectly into a male dominant scene like this Mamet is subverting the dynamics of male dominant power relationships. It is true that even though Jinny Lingk is absent in the scene as a woman, she becomes the voice of a man.

It is significant that it is “her money” Lingk claims back: “It’s not me, it’s my wife” (Mamet, 1984: 89) he says, “She wants her money back” (Mamet, 1984: 90). Throughout his dialogue Lingk has no voice of himself and always utters Jinny’s words; it is what she “told” him to do, what she “wants,” and what he “has to” do.

> The absent woman’s words, however, penetrate the social dialogue and, in effect, demand to be heard, redirecting the conversation away from Roma and Levene’s fantastic performance. Yet, while Jinny’s opinions are spoken by her husband, another new, dynamic topic is added to the men’s discourse coherence: the absent woman, herself. She inserts her presence into the men’s dialogue, therefore, not only through a character’s reiteration of her words but also through the characters’ discussion of her role (Vorlicky, 1996: 97).

Right after Jinny’s indirect entrance into the scene Roma tries to thwart her subversions by imposing the masculine ethos on Jim Lingk and wants to empower him to silence Jinny: “he positions himself as someone from the “outside” who, through “talk”(91), can put Lingk in touch with the powers of the masculine ethos—those collective, mythic powers that can finally subordinate the power of the internalized absent woman” (Vorlicky, 1996: 97).

> Roma: Where are you going . . . ? This is *me*. . . . This is Ricky, Jim. Jim, anything you *want*, you *want* it, you *have* it. You understand? This is *me*. Something *upset* you. Sit down, now sit down. You tell me what it is. (*Pause*.) Am I going to help you fix it? You’re goddamned right I am. Sit down. Tell you something . . . ? *Sometimes* we need someone from *outside*. It’s . . . no, sit down. . . . Now talk to me.
> Lingk: I can’t negotiate (Mamet, 1984: 91).

Roma claims his power back from Jinny by both choosing a familiar friendly tone full of ‘comradely’ imperatives while at the same time asserting to be the objective voice from “outside.” He furthers the act of camaraderie so much so that the ‘sincerity’ of his tone and language is also ambiguous for the audience. This is because Mamet’s schizoanalytic style enables different readings towards either to believe Roma’s sincerity in his effort to help out of male bonding or to interpret it as his

professionalism in manipulative sales talk, or even the possibility that Roma goes back and forth in between two attitudes.

> Lingk: She told me not to talk to you.
> Roma: Let's . . . no one's going to know, let's go around the *corner* and we'll get a drink.
> Lingk: She told me I had to get back the check or call the State's att . . .
> Roma: *Forget* the deal, Jimmy. (*Pause*.) *Forget* the deal . . . you know me. The deal's *dead*. Am I talking about the *deal*? That's over. Please. Let's talk about *you*. Come on. (*Pause. Roma rises and starts walking toward the front door.*) Come on. (*Pause*.) Come on, Jim. (*Pause*.) I want to tell you something. Your life is your own. You have a contract with you wife. You have certain things you do *jointly*, you have a *bond* there . . . and there are *other* things. Those things are yours. You needn't feel *ashamed*, you needn't feel that you're being *untrue* . . . or that she would abandon you is she knew. This is your life. (*Pause*.) Yes. Now I want to *talk* to you because you're obviously upset and that *concerns* me. Now let's go. Right now (Mamet, 1984: 93).

Ann Hall says, "Mamet's texts mimic the patriarchy and the role of women in them" (A. C. Hall quoted in Jacobs, 1996: 120). However, this mimicry has a disorienting role for the patriarchal order. "His female characters create disturbances, admittedly behind the scenes, in effect behind the 'yellow wallpaper,' but they succeed in creating subtle disruptions in these texts that tempt us to return, rethink, and reconsider" (Jacobs, 1996: 120). Her unseen presence in the text is reminiscent of 'desiring-production' in Deleuze and Guattari's definition of schizophrenic process: "Their hypothesis is that what we see through the cracks in the wall between reason and unreason caused by the irruption of the schizophrenic process are the operations of the unconscious at their most primitive, functional level, namely that of something they call 'desiring-production'"(Buchanan, 2008: 36-37). Jinny's appearance in the text is a part of Mamet's schizoanalytic approach as she is subversive because she asserts her presence where she is socially unwanted, ignored and diminished. The disruption Jinny causes in the male dominant order is insurgent. In other words, the intrusion of Mamet's absent woman character is a deterritorialization of the male order like the 'woman behind the yellow wallpaper.'

During their dialogue Roma tells Lingk a lie that their check has not been cashed yet, and tries to confuse him about the number of working days he has before applying for the state attorney in case he needs. However, Williamson enters, and unknowing the situation between the two, in order to assure Lingk who saw the police in the office he tells Lingk that his check has already been cashed and they are insured. Lingk gets panicked and leaves, but it is ironic that while leaving he looks like he has believed in a bond with Roma and feels guilty for breaking it, which the audience sees in his apologetic tone and language:

> Lingk: Oh, Christ . . . (*Starts out the door*.) Don't follow me. . . . Oh, Christ. (*Pause*. *To* Roma:) I know I've let you down. I'm sorry. For . . . Forgive . . . for . . . I don't know anymore. (*Pause*.) Forgive me. (*Lingk exits. Pause*) (Mamet, 1984: 95).

Not being able to comply with the con game of the salesmen as being someone outside their discourse Williamson spoils the game; and therefore, in the salesmen's degrading language is equaled to being the female Other or a child who do not belong to the business world of 'men':

> Roma: (*To* Williamson) You stupid fucking cunt. [...] Whoever told you you could work with *men*? [...] I don't care *whose* nephew you are, who you know, whose dick you're sucking on.
> [...] What you're hired for is to *help* us – does that seem clear to you? To *help* us. *Not* to fuck us up . . . to help *men* who are going *out* there to try to earn a *living*. You *fairy*. [...] You want to learn the first rule you'd know if you ever spent a day in your life . . . you never open your mouth till you know what the shot is. (*Pause*.) You fucking *child* . . . (*Roma goes to the inner room*) (Mamet, 1984: 95-97).

Where Roma stops, Levene takes over and goes on degrading Williamson. However; the balance of the power relationship immediately shifts when it is Williamson and Levene instead of Roma. Having become a bit rusty in his salesman skills Levene gives himself away in language. It is ironic that language as what empowers a salesman has now become a debilitating factor for Levene:

Williamson: (*Brushing past hin*): Excuse me . . .
Levene: . . . excuse you, *nothing*, you be as cold as you want, but you just fucked a good man out of six thousand dollars and his goddamn bonus 'cause you didn't know the *shot*, if you can do that and you aren't man enough that it gets you, then I don't know what, if you can't take *some thing* from that . . . (*Blocking his way*.) you're *scum*, you're fucking white-bread. You be as cold as you want. A *child* would know it, he's right. (*Pause*.) You're going to make something up, be sure it will *help* or keep your mouth closed. (*Pause*.)
Williamson: Mmm. (Levene lifts up his arm.)
Levene: Now I'm done with you. (*Pause*.)
Williamson: How do you know I made it up?
Levene (*Pause*): What?
Williamson: How do you know I made it up?
Levene: What are you talking about?
Williamson: You said, "You don't make something up unless it's sure to help." (*Pause*.) How did you know that I made it up?
Levene: What are you talking about?
Williamson: I told the customer that his contracts had gone to the bank.
Levene: Well, hadn't it?
Williamson: No. (*Pause*.) It hadn't.
Levene: Don't *fuck* with me, John, don't *fuck* with me . . . what are you saying?
Williamson: Well, I'm saying this, Shel: usually I take the contracts to the bank. Last night I didn't. How did you know that? One night in a year I left a contract on my desk. Nobody knew that but you. Now how did you know that? (*Pause*.) You want to talk to me, you want to talk to someone *else* . . . because this is my job. This is my job on the line, and you are going to *talk* to me. Now how did you know that contract was on my desk?
Levene: You're so full of shit.
Williamson: You robbed the office (Mamet, 1984: 98-99).

When Williamson takes full power, Levene surrenders and confesses his crime with the hope that Williamson will not give him to the cop. However, Williamson learns everything, including the fact that Moss was his partner, and then hands him over the police taking pleasure in winning the power game. Levene has no ammunition in his hands hearing that his success story was also a con game played against him. As a last resort, he tries to approach Williamson's conscience bringing his 'daughter' forward, but to no avail. It's a harsh world of business and Levene does not belong here anymore.

Williamson: I called them when we had the lead . . . four months ago. (Pause.) The people are insane. They just like talking to salesmen. (Williamson starts for door.)
Levene: Don't.

> Williamson: I'm sorry.
> Levene: Why?
> Williamson: Because I don't like you.
> Levene: John: John: . . . my daughter . . .
> Williamson: Fuck you. (Roma comes out of the Detective's door. Williamson goes in) (Mamet, 1984: 104).

Nomad, in Deleuze and Guattari's terms, does not fit into fixed identities and shatters determinants of desire based on power relationships; they create schizophrenic becomings. Schizophrenic is the one who indulges in desiring-production with a different flow of consciousness. Just like Jinny Lingk, Aaronow also deterriotorializes the male code of this social order by not betraying his colleague Moss. Betrayal is one of the determiners of survival in this relentless business world; however, he neither betrays nor submits to his 'powerful' colleague Moss. That's why one of the final lines in the play belongs to Aaronow who abides by his own moral code that does not belong to this world: "Oh, God, I hate this job" (Mamet, 1984: 108). Levene's act of theft, on the other hand, is not a schizophrenic act towards constituting his own desiring-production. His idea of taking the leads is not revolutionary, as he is after perpetuating the same social order. He is a typical Oedipal character who wants to kill the father (Mitch and Murray) and take their place within the order of power relationships. He wants to be the owner of power. Yet, Mamet's text *Glengarry Glen Ross* is schizophrenic in Deleuze and Guattari's terms as it escapes the limited confines of Oedipal desire and maintains its own desiring-production. Through his rhizomatic writing Mamet questions the overwhelming conditions of the capitalist world and deterritorializes the repressive social codes. Schizophrenic exposes the flows incongruent with the flows of the social body, schizophrenic writing does the same. Through his schizophrenic writing Mamet uncovers how capitalism is incongruent with the social body, exposes power relationships and subverts them.

CHAPTER II

2. Politics of Gender in Drama

2.1. “Trifles” by Susan Glaspell

2.1.1. Plot:

Susan Glaspell’s *Trifles* takes place in the kitchen of a farmhouse throughout the play. The play starts with three men and two women entering the house. With their entrance the audience learns that one of the household Minnie Wright is already under custody for murder of her husband. The men are in the house to find evidence for the allegation. The findings show that Mr. Wright has been strangled with a rope around his neck. Lewis Hale is the neighbor to the Wright farm, and he is the one who discovered the dead body of Mr. Wright. And he is accompanied by the sheriff Henry Peters and the county attorney George Henderson. The two women, sheriff’s wife Mrs. Peters and the neighbor Mrs. Hale, have arrived in order to collect some objects that belong to Minnie Wright and take them to her. As soon as they enter the house, they find themselves in the kitchen, but men do not find the kitchen worthy to look for clues since they think it is filled up with ‘trifles’ that would not matter for solving a crime; therefore, they go upstairs. While men are engaged with looking for evidence to a murder motive upstairs, women stay downstairs in the kitchen and start examining it only with the purpose to collect Minnie’s belongings at first. Whilst women are analyzing the kitchen, they delve into details of the setting which involves Minnie’s unfinished chores, a quilting job that went wrong after a point, a damaged bird cage, and a dead canary whose neck is broken. Piece by piece women gather what the details might mean together and unveil the motive behind Minnie’s possible crime. After uncovering the eventual reason behind the murder, the two women decide to hide the evidence from men, which they obviously think would be fair for Minnie Wright.

2.1.2. Analysis of "Trifles"

As a prominent figure during the early modern period at the end of the 19th and early 20th century Susan Glaspell began her playwrighting career in the course of her active years within Provincetown Players, the first modern American theatre company, which she co-established with her husband George Cram Cook and through which they introduced Eugene O'Neill along with many other writers. Her fiction writing which was not limited to plays also comprised novels and short stories, she was a well-received famous writer within the modern movement, and she received a Pulitzer Prize for the play *Alison's House* in 1931. Many other Provincetown writers back then focused on the "problem of woman in the modern world," and "[a] significant number of the plays [...] center around peasants, working -class, or lower-middle-class women who seem in many ways untouched by the contemporary world" (Barlow, 1995: 273). These writers and also Glaspell brought a modern perspective on these issues. At her time Glaspell was also in a community of activist socialists and feminists and she was also among the co-founders of their New York women's group 'Heterodoxy.' Being a feminist writer of her time, she challenged the century's definitions of womanhood, fixed female roles, women's isolation and confinement, and their powerlessness both individually and in the face of law. However, her feminist stance during the end of the 19th century and early 20th century became 'outdated' during the post-war years of 1950s and her work disappeared as traditional male female roles began to be promoted in social life and literature. Her disappearance would continue until the 1970s when feminist activists and theorists began to dig deep to find lost women writers' work in order to revive a women writers' canon.

Susan Glaspell wrote her play *Trifles* in 1916 based on a real crime case that she herself had followed in 1901 as a newspaper reporter. According to the data, 'real' murder case was as follows:

> The case at first glance seemed simple. Sometime after midnight on December 2, 1900, John Hossack, a well-to-do farmer, was struck twice on the head with an ax while he slept in bed. Margaret Hossack, his wife of thirty-three years, who was

> sleeping beside him, reported that a strange sound, "like two pieces of wood striking," wakened her; she jumped out of bed, went into the adjoining sitting room, saw a light shining on a wall, and heard the door to the front porch slowly closing. Only then did she hear her husband's groans. Assembling the five of her nine children who were still residing at home, she lit a lamp, reentered the bedroom, and discovered Hossack bleeding profusely, the walls and bedsheets spattered, brain matter oozing from a five-inch gash, his head crushed (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 22-23).

The first assumption was prowlers killing Hossack, but there was nothing missing in the farmhouse. After inconclusive findings of a coroner's inquest, there was failure of evidence until the murder weapon was found under the family corn crib. Later neighbor testimonials for marital conflict arrived and Mrs. Hossack got arrested. Although the police could not find any further evidence to prove Mrs. Hossack as the murderer, she received a sentence for murder at the end of the case based solely on circumstantial evidence of neighbor testimony. After some time of conviction lawyers appealed to a high court that overturned the decision and Mrs. Hossack got released for lack of evidence.

According to Linda Ben-Zvi, "juridical attitudes toward, and prosecution of, women are shaped by societal concepts of female behavior, the same concepts that may have motivated the act of murder" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 22), and Glaspell, as the journalist reporting the case, "was actually a primary contributor to the shaping of public opinion about the woman being tried" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 22). However, "[t]he possibility of exploring the implications of the Hossack trial in terms of gender roles or of pursuing the question of justifiable homicide would have been unthinkable in Iowa in 1901, even if Glaspell had consciously been moved to do so" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 41). Yet, when Glaspell wrote the play in 1916, the times had changed. "Nineteenth amendment, women's rights, and the dismantlement of absolutist thought in all areas" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 41) was the context she was in while writing the play. Glaspell was living among a community of socialists and feminists; there was a body of people working for suffrage, anti-militarists, social reformists standing up to class distinctions. "Unlike many suffragists, their arguments were usually posited on materialist rather than an essentialist reading of gender, concerned either with class

struggles of which gender limitations were part or enlightenment ideals of individualism applicable to both women and men" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 41). The individualism of the era focused mostly on legal and social freedom, and feminists wanted women to have the same rights to be individuals as men. Written in such a period, *Trifles* challenges stereotypical female roles, women's confinement and isolation, in an endeavor to find for women ways of expressing their lives and rights and empowers women instead of victimizing them. On account of such contemporary issues, contemporary feminist critics still refer to Glaspell's early modern play: "how to free women from the stereotypic roles into which they have been cast, how to articulate their lives and their rights without reinscribing them in the very roles against which they inveigh, how to represent female power not victimization" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 42). Nonetheless, Glaspell does not support a fixed role for women and does not argue in favor of a sexual difference of higher moral ground. That's why "in reading the works through a contemporary grid, critics should be careful of turning them into contemporary tracts, assuming that, just because Glaspell offers a picture of two women who bond, she is arguing sexual difference, or the categorization of women under a fixed moral genus" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 42). In fact, Glaspell's insurgent political role in problematizing the social order and gender roles in *Trifles* consolidates in an expressionistic setting through a subversion of classic detective fiction by presenting inefficient and powerless male detection, and her denial of fixed categorizations amplifies with the negation of narrative closure pointing to the question of different readings. On the other hand, she still makes the audience active readers in solving the crime while achieving to generate the power of indignation even though she subverts the conventional form of detective fiction.

It is important to consider the form of detective fiction which Susan Glaspell chose for the play and how she subverts the form through an expressionistic setting. In his short essay "The Philosophy of Crime Novels," Gilles Deleuze analyses the old concept of detective novel and compares it with *La Serie Noire*, the collection of crime fiction founded by Marcel Duhamel in 1945. Although Deleuze focuses on the novel as a form while examining the crime fiction, what he offers is also significant for other

forms of crime fiction such as drama. It is important that according to Deleuze's study the classic detective novel was based on a genius detective devoting himself to the 'power of the mind' since the start of the 19th century. The idea of truth and the need to reach it, which we know from Deleuze's earlier works that is based on an Oedipal search for power of knowledge, is at the center of this concept.

> In the old conception of the detective novel, we would be shown a genius detective devoting the whole power of his mind to the search and discovery of the truth. The idea of truth in the classic detective novel was totally philosophical, that is, it was the product of the effort and the operations of the mind. So it is that police investigation modeled itself on philosophical inquiry, and conversely, gave to philosophy an unusual object to elucidate: crime (Deleuze, 2004: 81).

Deleuze detects two schools of truth within the tradition of detective novel; one the French school which was based on deduction, and the English school based on induction methods: "There were two schools of truth: 1) the French school (Descartes), where truth is a question of some fundamental intellectual intuition, from which the rest is rigorously deduced; and 2) the English school (Hobbes), according to which truth is always induced from something else, interpreted from sensory indices" (Deleuze, 2004: 81). The detective fiction followed this tradition of duality and has produced examples of each such as Sherlock Holmes stories by Conan Doyle, and Gaboriau's Tabaret and Lecoq; and Gaston Leroux's, Rouletabille. Deleuze's point here is that the focus seems to be the search for truth that in reality serves as a tool to preserve the status quo, the power dynamics, which he calls 'power of falsehood':

> This is because the truth is in no way the ambient element of the investigation: not for a moment does one believe that this compensation of errors aims for the discovery of the truth as its final objective. On the contrary, this compensation has its own dimension, its own sufficiency, a kind of equilibrium or the reestablishment of it, a process of restitution that allows a society, at the limits of cynicism, to hide what it wants to hide, reveal what it wants to reveal, deny all evidence, and champion the improbable. The killer still at large may be killed for his own errors, and the police may have to sacrifice one of their own for still other errors, and so it is that these compensations have no other object than to perpetuate an equilibrium that represents a society in its entirety at the heights of its power of falsehood (Deleuze, 2004: 83).

The power of falsehood has three elements in it: informant, corruption, and torture. However, the old detective fiction works as a mirror reflecting the society in its police and criminals indicating a deep complicity between them:

> We are always led back to the great trinity of falsehood: informant-corruption-torture. But it goes without saying that the cops do not of their own accord initiate this disquieting complicity. The metaphysical reflection of the old detective novel has given way to a mirroring of the other. A society indeed reflects itself to itself in its police and its criminals, even while it protects itself from them by means of a fundamental deep complicity between them (Deleuze, 2004: 83).

Le Serie Noire, due to Deleuze, made 'the power of falsehood' the primary detective element. It introduced us with the politics of crime, "whether it's people sitting around trying to figure out the secret of this unity of the grotesque and the terrifying, the terrible and the clownish, which binds together political power, economic power, crime and police activity [...]" (Deleuze, 2004: 84). The old detective novel used to participate the reader as "active readers" trying to solve the mystery while reading, and according to Deleuze this causes the reader to lose its grip on reality and its power of indignation:

> Was it good for us to participate as "active readers" in the old detective novel, and thereby lose our grip on reality and thus our power of indignation? Indignation wells up in us because of reality, or because of masterful works of art (Deleuze, 2004: 84).

Deleuze goes on with asserting that the old school realism was insufficient to make good literature as it provided readers with stereotypes, puerile notions, and cheap fantasies, "In bad literature, the real as such is the object of worse than any imaginative imbecile could dream up" (Deleuze, 2004: 84). And he puts forward parody to subvert the power of falsehood:

> Instead what was needed to bring the real back to us was parody, it was through parody that the real returned with a vengeance, and with it the complicity of humans to revel not in truth but in the power of falsehood. We know that parody is a form of imitation, but an imitation characterized by ironic inversion, a repetition with a critical distance, which marks difference rather than similarity. Parody is at once a vehicle of satire and a way to portray society through a critical and malicious and often denigrating actant; in the case of crime novels, as seen through the eyes of the criminal. What Deleuze saw in this form was the power to break through the falsehoods that overlay our social blindness and to confront the truths of our own deep and abiding complicities. Without an ability to expose those complicities for what they are we would be forever doomed to repeat the criminal acts that are in themselves the darkest aspect of parody: the truth of our own illusionary lives (Hickman, 2012).

Since it subverts and is critical of female stereotypes and women's conventional roles by presenting inefficient and powerless male detection, Glaspell's *Trifles* is a parody of male reasoning that relies on intellectual intuition claiming to deduce 'truth' or that induces it from sensory indices, and turns this male reasoning upside down with 'unreliable' female intuition based on 'trifles,' female experience, and solidarity. Also, the connection between the real crime story Glaspell reported in 1901 and the fictional crime story of *Trifles* makes the audience question the fictive aspect of reality and formation of truth. Glaspell's first subversion comes with placing a woman as the killer of her husband since "[w]omen who kill evoke fear because they challenge societal constructs of femininity—passivity, restraint, and nurture—thus to isolate and label the female offender, to cauterize the act" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 19). Ben-Zvi places *Trifles* among one of the three plays in the century based on murder cases and says, "All do more than rework a tale of murder; they reveal in the telling the lineaments of the society that spawned the crime" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 20). By focusing on the circumstances that drive Mrs. Wright to murder and thus providing a different reading of 'truth,' Glaspell also makes the reader question the reading of the 'truth' in Hossack case. On the other hand, non-existence of Minnie Wright on the stage, the fact that Glaspell does not physically represent Minnie is another subversion of crime fiction emphasizing the lack of female representation in legal issues and more generally in social life. Also, the representation of private space, women's domain, through the kitchen setting without the central criminal character is another subversive element in Glaspell's crime fiction. Likewise, Ben-Zvi says, "And by situating her play in the

kitchen not the court, in the private space in which Minnie lived rather than the public space in which she will be tried, Glaspell is able to offer the audience a composite picture of the life of Minnie Wright, Margaret Hossack, and countless women whose experiences were not represented in court because their lives were not deemed relevant to the adjudication of their cases" (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 35). Through her subversions Glaspell lays bare what Deleuze calls 'the trinity of falsehood'—informant, corruption, torture—prevalent in fictive realities of social life.

Expressionistic techniques in the formation of the setting of *Trifles* imply the difficult circumstances under which Minnie lived. Back then in the 19th and early 20th century the farms were distant from each other and it meant loneliness and isolation for women who mostly work in the farmhouse laboriously. Elaine Hedges who did a research on the living conditions of these farmer housewives in the past says, "The absence both of human contact and of any ameliorating features in the landscape exacerbated the loneliness felt by women, who had often only reluctantly uprooted themselves from eastern homes and families in order to follow their husbands westward" (S. K. Humphrey quoted in Hedges, 1995: 54). What is unsaid in the text becomes significant once again in this play, too, "references to the outdoor setting are few" (Hedges, 1995: 52), as the scarcity of the portrayal of outside setting indicates women's confinement and isolation. On top of this isolated farm living Minnie is also lonely in the house, she has no children, and we learn from Mr. Hale that her husband did not talk much and did not even let her get a telephone line for the house; therefore, Minnie had no contact with anyone outside either:

> HALE: Harry and I had started to town with a load of potatoes. We came along the road from my place and as I got here I said, I'm going to see if I can't get John Wright to go in with me on a party telephone.' I spoke to Wright about it once before and he put me off, saying folks talked too much anyway, and all he asked was peace and quiet—I guess you know about how much he talked himself; but I thought maybe if I went to the house and talked about it before his wife, though I said to Harry that I didn't know as what his wife wanted made much difference to John— (Glaspell, 1916)

Glaspell chose an apt setting to express Minnie's isolation in the 'lonesome' cold farmhouse where is "down in a hollow and you don't see the road" (Glaspell, 1916), and constraints she endures; her kitchen is gloomy "*and left without having been put in order—unwashed pans under the sink, a loaf of bread outside the bread-box, a dish-towel on the table—other signs of incompleted work*" (Glaspell, 1916). As Ben-Zvi states the expressionistic stage setting shows Minnie's desperation and her living conditions:

> The interior of the kitchen replicates this barrenness and the commensurate disjunctions in the family, as the woman experienced them. Things are broken, cold, imprisoning; they are also violent. "Preserves" explode from lack of heat, a punning reminder of the casual relationship between isolation and violence. The mutilated cage and bird signify the brutal nature of Wright and the physical abuse the wife has borne. Employing expressionistic techniques, Glaspell externalizes Minnie's desperation and the conditions that caused it (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 19).

What Gerhard Bach says for the setting of Glaspell's other play *The Verge* is also true for *Trifles*:

> As is typical of expressionist drama, meaning is conveyed through channels supplementing the spoken word. The setting "speaks" to the audience; the atmosphere enveloping the action expresses the unseen inner life of the protagonists. Much of what is intended is not expressed verbally but visually (Bach, 1995: 251-252).

Glaspell subverts the conventions of realism with another form of realistic technique: expressionism. Through this expressionistic setting the audience makes sense of Minnie's internal state that might have led her to murder. It is also through these small signs, the so called trifles that Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters can put the pieces of the mystery together because they take part in female experience themselves and they can understand what that isolation means to Minnie since all these small objects are familiar in their domestic life as well. The role the setting has within the play is almost like a character that takes part in the dramatic action:

> Glaspell made use of the considerably small and claustrophobic stage area at the Wharf to create a setting that perfectly fitted her depiction of women's confinement in the domestic sphere, and powerfully conveyed the sense of isolation and entrapment experienced by American rural wives in the early twentieth century. Perhaps more importantly, Glaspell went beyond simply exploiting the mimetic power of the realist stage, and built the kitchen-set and all its trifles into the play to the effect that the stage became a silent yet active participant in the dramatic action (Sözalan, 2006: 21-22).

The setting also draws attention to the stereotypical binary oppositions and women deconstruct these binaries as they solve the crime through the helpful clues in the setting. The binary between men and women is reinforced through the opposites of outside-inside (domestic), significant-trivial. The setting being nourished from these binary oppositions "provides for the expression of an idea that apparently cannot or should not be approached primarily or initially through language" (Bach, 1995: 252). Women are conventionally situated in the domestic sphere and seen responsible for domestic chores while men's place is outside dealing with the farm work. Within this division of labor women's work is socially defined as 'trivial' as men deal with the 'real significant' issues. Emphasizing these socially constructed oppositions, as soon as the characters enter the scene the kitchen is considered 'insignificant' by men because it is women's sphere and they think it can only contain 'trifles,' not any important clues for the case. In fact, women's 'small concerns' become an element of humor for the men:

> COUNTY ATTORNEY: Here's a nice mess.
> [The women draw nearer.]
> MRS PETERS: (to the other woman) Oh, her fruit; it did freeze, (to the LAWYER) She worried about that when it turned so cold. She said the fire'd go out and her jars would break.
> SHERIFF: Well, can you beat the women! Held for murder and worryin' about her preserves.
> COUNTY ATTORNEY: I guess before we're through she may have something more serious than preserves to worry about.
> HALE: Well, women are used to worrying over trifles.
> [The two women move a little closer together.] (Glaspell, 1916)

What is laughing material for men grows into a force that draws the two women together since as housewives in the farm they know from experience how much labor is put into the makings of these 'trifles.' Binary oppositions are built further in the setting as men choose a male defined area for investigation, the bedroom upstairs, while women stay downstairs in the kitchen (downstairs-upstairs, kitchen-bedroom). Turning a blind eye to women's experience, men look for clues pertaining to the mind. They think that they have the necessary intellect to deduce or induce to investigate the 'truth.' However, as Deleuze says the intellectual mind is not aiming for the discovery of the truth, it is not its objective but a compensation of errors. Minnie is already in jail and the aim of the detective mind is to find clues to keep her there. In the early 20th century, by law women had no right to representation, not 'a jury of her peers' (hence the name for Glaspell's story version), and any clues the male mind finds will be nothing other than compensations to maintain the conventional social order, 'a society in its entirety at the heights of its power of falsehood.'

> [...]detective characters must rely on their interpretive faculties brought to bear on the external evidence alone and not on inspiration or guidance that skips the analytic process. The preclusion of "feminine intuition" stands out, however, as a notably gendered warning to creators of female sleuths. Assuming reasoning to be a masculine process, this edict points toward the fluidity of interpretive strategies that may describe the female detective's ways of knowing. Glaspell highlights this assumption precisely in order to critique such detached male ratiocination. She juxtaposes the ineffective technique of the male investigators to the perceptiveness of Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters precisely by placing the women's examination of all the evidence they have in a liminal space between the use of purely externalized logic and empathic (intuitive) understanding (Gainor, 2004: 48-49).

By giving a domestic sphere, the kitchen, a central role within the play, positioning women in the center of the play and giving them power to conduct the investigation that would lead to a solution, and in opposition putting men incapable of and inefficient in detection, Glaspell subverts the conventions of detective fiction. "Once the play reveals itself to be thematically concerned with the conditions which had led Mrs. Wright to murder her husband, the choice of setting – the kitchen rather

than the bedroom which is the scene of the particular crime in the play – is justified not only because of its centrality in her life but also because it is the symbol of women's imprisonment within the boundaries of the domestic sphere" (Sözalan, 2006: 25). Also women having the central role in a detective fiction is uncommon because they are seen unreasonable, intuitive, unreliably emotional and erratic by the society; therefore, they are generally either the victim or the hysteric murderer within the peripheries of power structures. On the other hand, men are conventionally in the center as they represent reason, reliability, intellect, and decisiveness. However, in *Trifles* as men go upstairs in their male defined 'proper' inspection area, they are disconnected from the female reality and they become powerless and inefficient in solving the crime. "The genius detective devoting himself to the 'power of the mind'" is absent here. Men's Oedipal search for power of knowledge is frustrated by an alternative 'reality' of women, and the stability/reliability of knowledge systems is shaken. Their search for 'truth' is of no use

> because the men are unable to decode the domestic trifles which are the clues to solving the puzzle. Downstairs in the farmhouse they see nothing of importance, merely 'kitchen things'. The two wives, however, are able to piece together the domestic trifles and arrive at an understanding of the intolerable conditions under which Mrs. Wright had been living: the loneliness, the lack of female company, and the hardness of her husband who had choked the life out of her. These conditions led Mrs. Wright to murder her husband (E. Aston quoted in Sözalan, 2006: 25-26).

'The power of falsehood' is denied to male characters in Glaspell's detective fiction and *Trifles* becomes a parody of male detection and reasoning. Ben-Zvi also sees this as a deconstructive element showing the subjective nature of all essentialist readings:

> Not waiting to be given the vote or the right to serve on juries, Glaspell's women have taken the right for themselves. Her audience in 1916 would get the point. It would also understand that Glaspell is deconstructing the very assumptions about the incontrovertibility of the law and about its absolutist position. Mrs. Peters and Mrs. Hale, by suturing into their deliberations their own experiences and fears—just as the men in the Hossack case did—illustrate the subjective nature of the reading of evidence and, by implication, of all essentialist readings (Ben-Zvi, 1995: 39).

The non-linear plot development is another subversion of detective fiction in *Trifles*. In a conventional detective story, the reader first gets to know the characters, then the murder takes place during the course of events, the reader takes active part in finding the murderer within the plot development, and finally the murderer is found and punished. In *Trifles*, however, the murder has already taken place when it starts and the supposed murderer, Minnie Wright, is absent among the characters, already in jail. And by the end of the play there is no proper closure assuring the reader a hundred percent if Minnie really did kill her husband or not. Developing non-linear plots was part of the "tendency to invent new forms more expressive of a woman's experience in early twentieth century women writers" (Makowsky, 1995: 317), Glaspell followed this pattern not only in her novels but also in her plays like *Trifles*.

The non-linear plot development is also what makes Glaspell's writing rhizomatic in Deleuzian terms, "A rhizomatic method [...] does not begin from a distinction or hierarchy between ground and consequent, cause and effect, subject and expression; any point can form a beginning or point of connection for any other" (Colebrook, 2002: xxviii). Rhizomatic writing is considered subversive as it does not satisfy by meeting the conventional expectations and it pushes the audience to its limits of thinking. This also happens while the plot develops over a missing main character, Minnie. From the beginning reading of the missing character becomes a main concern for the audience (Czerepinski, 1995: 146). The absent female character, which is a device Glaspell used in many examples of her dramatic writing is identified as an "absent center," in her writing: "One of the acknowledged hallmarks of Susan Glaspell's dramatic writing is the device of the "absent center," the structuring of the play around a female character who never appears but whose impact on the present characters and action is powerfully felt" (Laughlin, 1995: 219). An "absent center" through the missing main character is another aspect of Glaspell's rhizomatic writing. "[...] the search onstage for clues that might fill the void left by death and/or abandonment brings to life the offstage character—in a sequence of self-revealing

reenactments of memories, doubts, and fears, in a struggle to make sense" (Bach, 1995: 247). By this way the absent center brings into life the perspective of the character, creates an awareness in other female characters and; thus, in the audience, which in other ways would not be possible. Like that through rhizomatic writing the absoluteness of single truth, in this case 'a male truth' judging women and preserving male power of falsehood is subverted and thwarted.

"[...] the absent women [in Glaspell's plays] transcend the social roles that define the majority, what they realize beyond ordinary limits cannot be understood by those contained within the social world" (Czerepinski, 1995: 148). With the absence of the main character in *Trifles*, two women take the stage center and discovering clues one by one, patching them together, they go beyond the limits. It is almost like a different language that women are speaking, and men are not capable of understanding or reading these signs. This system of signifiers comprehensible to women can be defined through Helen Cixous' L'écriture féminine.[1] Cixous proposes women writers a female language that would express the female experience as the Western culture marginalizes female practice through binary oppositions. Cixous defines a non-linear, fluid language that is totally unique and subversive. Considering these terms Glaspell's *Trifles* also creates a new language with its subversive feminist theme, non-linear plot, disrupting binary oppositions. Within the play also women disrupt the conventional symbolic system by reading signs through a language that they can only understand thanks to their shared experience. This language is incomprehensible to men. To go back to Deleuzian terms, through their differentiated experience women, indeed, deterritorialize male experience. What Glaspell does here with her writing is not putting female experience to a higher ground and essentializing it, but just putting forward another 'difference' within the flow of immanence. That's also why, for example, when Minnie says for the husband "died of a rope round his neck" (Glapell, 1916), it sounds like a different language, almost like an epidemic, not something

[1] Marcia Noe anaylzes Glaspell's play *The Verge* through using Helene Cixous' method. See: Marcia Noe, "The Verge: L'Ecriture Féminine at the Provincetown," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 129-142.

Minnie had done but a natural result of his violent behavior to his wife (Alkalay-Gut, 1995: 74). That's why men are inefficient and powerless in reading the signs the two women read one by one.

The first trifle, the first sign Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters come across and read is the roller towel in the kitchen.

> COUNTY ATTORNEY: (with the gallantry of a young politician) And yet, for all their worries, what would we do without the ladies? (the women do not unbend. He goes to the sink, takes a dipperful of water from the pail and pouring it into a basin, washes his hands. Starts to wipe them on the roller-towel, turns it for a cleaner place) Dirty towels! (kicks his foot against the pans under the sink) Not much of a housekeeper, would you say, ladies?
> MRS HALE: (stiffly) There's a great deal of work to be done on a farm.
> COUNTY ATTORNEY: To be sure. And yet (with a little bow to her) I know there are some Dickson county farmhouses which do not have such roller towels. (He gives it a pull to expose its length again.)
> MRS HALE: Those towels get dirty awful quick. Men's hands aren't always as clean as they might be (Glaspell, 1916).

The dirty towel indicates different meanings for men and women in the scene. Where men see a lack in housekeeping skills in Minnie since women's place is regarded as kitchen and keeping it clean is their job, Mrs. Hale sees excessiveness of workload in keeping a farmhouse because she shares the same experience with Minnie. Elaine Hedges refers to the historical documents pioneer and farmwomen did back then and says, "The work is, as one historian has said, "almost endless" and, over the course of a lifetime, usually consisted of tasks "more arduous and demanding than those performed by men" (Hedges, 1995: 55). Examples of the work regularly done by women in the farm included "water carrying, cooking, churning, sausage making, berry picking, vegetable drying, sugar and soap boiling, hominy hulling, medicine brewing, washing, nursing, weaving, sewing, straw platting, wool picking, spinning, quilting, knitting, gardening, and various other tasks" (Hedges, 1995: 55). This is also why Minnie asks for her preserves to be checked because there lies a load of work and effort in it and this is comprehensible only in the case of women who have the same

experience in the farmland. “The two women’s inquiry into Mrs. Wright’s living conditions is stimulated by their familiarity with the objects they see in the kitchen, and their first-hand knowledge of women’s domestic lives enables them to draw conclusions about her inner life” (Sözalan, 2006: 26). Men’s discourse, on the other hand, is undermining while ridiculing the women, and it also tends to overpower women by diminishing their work. Yet, their incomprehension draws women together:

> Mr. Hale’s remark about the preserves, that “women are used to worrying over trifles,” is a mild example of this ridicule, as is the attorney’s comment, intended to deflect that ridicule but itself patronizing: “Yet what would we do without the ladies.” It is this ridicule to which Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters especially react. When Mr. Hale belittles women’s work we are told that “the two women moved a little closer together,” and when the attorney makes his seemingly conciliatory remark the women, we are further told, “did not speak, did not unbend.” Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters, who at the beginning of the story are comparative strangers, here begin to establish their common bonds with each other and with Minnie (Hedges, 1995: 57).

Starting to see the similarities of their lives as housewives in a farm women draw closer and the audience sees the first sign of empathy from Mrs. Hale.

> COUNTY ATTORNEY: Ah, loyal to your sex, I see. But you and Mrs Wright were neighbors. I suppose you were friends, too.
> MRS HALE: (shaking her head) I've not seen much of her of late years. I've not been in this house—it's more than a year.
> COUNTY ATTORNEY: And why was that? You didn't like her?
> MRS HALE: I liked her all well enough. Farmers' wives have their hands full, Mr Henderson. And then—
> COUNTY ATTORNEY: Yes—?
> MRS HALE: (looking about) It never seemed a very cheerful place.
> COUNTY ATTORNEY: No—it's not cheerful. I shouldn't say she had the homemaking instinct.
> MRS HALE: Well, I don't know as Wright had, either.
> COUNTY ATTORNEY: You mean that they didn't get on very well?
> MRS HALE: No, I don't mean anything. But I don't think a place'd be any cheerfuller for John Wright's being in it (Glaspell, 1916).

Mrs. Hale feels guilty for not visiting Mrs. Wright for more than a year. The cheerlessness of the place on one side, it seems also not possible for Mrs. Hale’s similar busy schedule in her farmhouse. Elaine Hedges’ research also draws light upon

the isolation women feel in these farms: “A walking visit to neighbors was not a casual affair but could take an entire morning or afternoon,” says Faragher in describing the settlement on separate farmsteads, often far distant from each other, and, like Juster, he concludes that “the single most important distinction between the social and cultural worlds of men and women was the isolation and immobility of wives compared to husbands” (Hedges, 1995: 58). Mrs. Wright’s husband was apparently uncaring and unkind towards her and within all this isolation not even letting her get a phone or proper clothes to go to town.

> MRS HALE: (examining the skirt) Wright was close. I think maybe that's why she kept so much to herself. She didn't even belong to the Ladies Aid. I suppose she felt she couldn't do her part, and then you don't enjoy things when you feel shabby. She used to wear pretty clothes and be lively, when she was Minnie Foster, one of the town girls singing in the choir. But that—oh, that was thirty years ago. This all you was to take in? (Glaspell, 1916)

As women gather Minnie’s clothes and wander around the house their sympathy towards Minnie gradually rises. After recognizing the isolation, they also realize that the house is awful cold [“MRS PETERS: My, it's cold in there” (Glaspell, 1916)]. The image of a dark, isolated, cheerless, and cold house gets stronger with women’s observation. Yet, the two women still do not have the same attitude since at first Mrs. Peters seems more supportive of the male power of falsehood being “married to the law.”

> MRS HALE: I'd hate to have men coming into my kitchen, snooping around and criticising.
> [She arranges the pans under sink which the LAWYER had shoved out of place.]
> MRS PETERS: Of course it's no more than their duty.
>
> [...]
>
> MRS HALE: (who is standing by the table) Well, I don't see any signs of anger around here, (she puts her hand on the dish towel which lies on the table, stands looking down at table, one half of which is clean, the other half messy) It's wiped to here, (makes a move as if to finish work, then turns and looks at loaf of bread outside the breadbox. Drops towel. In that voice of coming back to familiar things.) Wonder how they are finding things upstairs. I hope she had it a little more red-up up there. You know, it

> seems kind of sneaking. Locking her up in town and then coming out here and trying to get her own house to turn against her!
> MRS PETERS: But Mrs. Hale, the law is the law (Glaspell, 1916).

While they are tidying up the clothes women discover that Minnie was quilting before, and they start a discussion about the method she was using. Men coming down from upstairs and with their scorning ironic discourse once again they make fun of women's trivial issues. Mrs. Hale gets more and more annoyed with the attitude of men:

> SHERIFF: They wonder if she was going to quilt it or just knot it!
> [The men laugh, the women look abashed.] (Glaspell, 1916).

However, when men keep looking for evidence outside in the barn, apparently the two women have found a leading clue that might serve as an evidence for murder motive, "a sign of anger":

> MRS HALE: (examining another block) Mrs Peters, look at this one. Here, this is the one she was working on, and look at the sewing! All the rest of it has been so nice and even. And look at this! It's all over the place! Why, it looks as if she didn't know what she was about!
> [After she has said this they look at each other, then start to glance back at the door. After an instant MRS HALE has pulled at a knot and ripped the sewing.] (Glaspell, 1916).

As soon as they discover the wrong going in the quilting process, Mrs. Hale starts to fix it. Here the audience do not know if she does that out of sisterly instinct to protect Mrs. Wright, whose predicament she already feels sympathy for, or just a female support who knows the value of such a hard work as quilting and does not want it to go to waste. Then suddenly while she is looking for paper and a string to wrap the clothes, Mrs. Peters finds an empty birdcage. "The discovery of a broken birdcage ultimately allows them to construct a narrative about the canary whose neck John may have wrung; the bird is taken by the women as a symbol of Minnie's virtual

incarceration in a life of privation and hardship" (Gainor, 2004: 44). When they find the cage and start piecing together the parts of what might have happened, Mrs. Peters is seen drawing closer to a different 'truth' rather than being the collaborator of male power of falsehood.

> That identification becomes quite evident by the time the women find the most compelling piece of circumstantial evidence against Mrs. Wright—the broken bird cage and the dead herd, its neck wrung and its body placed in a pretty box in Mrs. Wright's sewing basket. When the men notice the cage and Mrs. Hale misleadingly speculates that a cat may have been at it, it is Mrs. Peters who confirms the matter. Asked by the county attorney whether a cat was on the premises, Mrs. Peters—fully aware that there is no cat and never has been—quickly and evasively replies, "Well, not *now* They're superstitious, you know; they leave" (365). Not only is Mrs. Peters deliberately lying here, but, more important, she is assuming quite another role from the one she played earlier. Uttering a banality, she plays at being the shallow woman who believes in superstitions, thus consciously playing one of the roles the men expect her to assume and concealing her keen intellect from them, her ability to extrapolate facts from small details (Mustazza, 1989: 495).

The canary bird which they later discover dead with a broken neck in Minnie's sewing box is a sign indicating Minnie's isolation which "induced madness in many" (Hedges, 1995: 59) rural woman at that time. Minnie could not join any social activities and she does not have any children, the only source of solace for her loneliness and confinement in the house seems to be the singing of the canary. Mrs. Peters identifies with her remembering her own experience as a child:

> MRS PETERS: (in a whisper) When I was a girl—my kitten—there was a boy took a hatchet, and before my eyes—and before I could get there—(covers her face an instant) If they hadn't held me back I would have—(catches herself, looks upstairs where steps are heard, falters weakly)—hurt him (Glaspell, 1916).

Also not having a child, the silence it brings causes sympathies with the women, and especially Mrs. Peters can relate to the feeling as she had lost a child:

> MRS PETERS: (something within her speaking) I know what stillness is. When we homesteaded in Dakota, and my first baby died—after he was two years old, and me with no other then— (Glaspell, 1916).

The boundaries of difference between women's experience getting blurrier, Mrs. Peters gets free of male power of falsehood and starts to evaluate Minnie from a different perspective:

> As Mrs. Peters listens to Mrs. Hale's recollections of Minnie's past and comes into physical contact with Minnie's present, "It was as if something within her, not herself had spoken, and it found in Mrs. Peters something she did not know as herself' (Ferguson, p. 383). Minnie's lonely life evokes memories of the stillness when Mrs. Peter's first baby died while she was homesteading in the Dakotas. Minnie's violent response to the killing of her pet canary recalls murderous feelings in Mrs. Peters when her pet kitten had been brutally slain. Sharing her memories with Mrs. Hale, Mrs. Peters recognizes her connection with other women and, consequently, is capable of moving from a typically male to a more typically female mode of judgment (Mael, 1989: 284).

Quilting for these rural women is a channel through which they reflect their lively, creative inner selves. It is 'a difference in dreary space' and it has the same function with the bird, that is desiring production in Deleuzian terms. "In the monotonous expanses of the prairie and the plains the presence of one small spot of color, or a bit of music, might spell the difference between sanity and madness" (Hedges, 1995: 60). Desiring machines, according to Deleuze, connect people to reality (Buchanan, 2008: 28). And thanks to creative acts these women stayed connected to reality. By looking at the quilt, the two women can understand that something must have gone wrong, with precision to details they see that she was doing well up to some point, and then things changed, and quilting became faulty. They can read the sign easily because quilting "became in the course of the nineteenth century probably the major creative outlet for women—one patriarchically tolerated, and even "approved," for their use, but which women were able to transform to their own ends" (Hedges, 1995: 61). Quilting back then became a way of expression for the rural women where they pierced their desires, thoughts, and feelings: "Through quilting, through their stitches as well

as through pattern and color, and through the institutions, such as the "bee," that grew up around it, women who were otherwise without expressive outlet were able to communicate their thoughts and feelings" (Hedges, 1995: 61). Being contained and forced into undesirable situations like confinement and isolation, women nurture their desiring production and express themselves in creative ways:

> Desiring-production is that aspect of the operation of the unconscious that cannot be assimilated by what they refer to as social production and reproduction, or more simply as the socius (AO, 189/204). As we'll see in what follows, desiring-production is that aspect of desire that the body without organs as the agent of antiproduction is unable to contain, unable to force onto its smooth surface and thereby repress it (the Body without Organs is in fact defined by Deleuze and Guattari as the site of primary repression [AO, 10/15]) (Buchanan, 2008: 44).

The strangulation of the bird, therefore, symbolizes the killing of Minnie Wright's creative spirit, her desiring production as the bird metaphor in literature usually stands for the 'voice of the soul,': "Through the traditional literary metaphor of the bird's song as the voice of the soul, the women acknowledge that John Wright not only killed Minnie's canary, but her very spirit" (Makowsky quoted in Sözalan, 2006: 31-32). The bird can also be associated with the mythical figure Philomela/nightingale who is a story-teller in a different kind of language (Sözalan, 2006: 32); and the audience knows that Minnie used to sing herself in her youth, which was also restrained by her husband; therefore, "Mr. Wright's killing the bird is, [...] indicative of his depriving his wife of the joy of life, the final step he had taken in the course of his gradual killing of his wife's spirit" (Sözalan, 2006: 32). This is also why killing of Mr. Wright,—as the name suggests Mr. Right, the 'right' defined by the male social order—destroying the obstruction in the formation of revolutionary desiring production, is a desiring production itself in the form of sudden madness in Minnie's case. If violence through killing is accepted as a 'pathological case' here, it is a form of desiring production in its pure state, since all the course of events suggests that the killing happened when Minnie broke down finally and set her soul free:

> Desiring-production is that aspect of desire which if it were to pass into social production and reproduction would sow the seeds of disorder and revolution as it does every time a little piece of it manages to elude the coding society imposes on it so as to contain it. That is why we only see desiring-production in its pure state in pathological cases, it only shows up where the apparatuses of the social machinery have ceased to function (Buchanan, 2008: 45).

Nevertheless, Minnie's 'desiring production in its pure form' helps the two women see the male 'power of falsehood' and how it works, make connections with Minnie's and their own lives, and reach an understanding; "the understanding that they do reach goes beyond the mere solving of the crime to a redefinition of what the crime was" (Dymkowski, 1988: 92) when Mrs. Hale blames herself for not bonding with her female friend:

> MRS HALE: (not as if answering that) I wish you'd seen Minnie Foster when she wore a white dress with blue ribbons and stood up there in the choir and sang. (a look around the room) Oh, I wish I'd come over here once in a while! That was a crime! That was a crime! Who's going to punish that? (Glaspell, 1916)

And with their final decision the two women achieve to subvert the system of law whose object is only to 'perpetuate a society at the heights of its falsehood.' Finding the truth was never the object of men's investigation, rather it was a 'compensation of errors.' Therefore, women "break through the falsehoods that overlay our social blindness and [...] confront the truths of our own deep and abiding complicities" (Hickman, 2012) and revolt against male authority through a 'knot' in the male concept of justice.

> Quilting equalizes the thickness of the blanket; knotting emphasizes the distinctions. When the women inform the men at the conclusion that Minnie was planning to knot the quilt, although they had not discussed this matter between them, they determine to differentiate between the legal definition of the crime, in which all considerations external to the act itself are meaningless and equal, and their moral definition of the crime, in which nothing is even and flat. Distinctions must be made, with the delicacy of a needle, and they have made them (Alkalay-Gut, 1995: 79).

The knot they tied in male 'power of falsehood' is a differentiation, a subversion, and the two women embrace the power of difference, which is all there is in the immanent plane of life according to Deleuze.

> "Knot it" conveys the sense of knotting the rope around the husband's neck: the women disclose the murderess. But they will "knot" tell (Alkalay-Gut, 1995: 80).

Although the audience sees that women hid the dead bird as the main evidence, Susan Glaspell does not give a total definite ending at the end of the play. Lack of narrative closure in the play, in fact, points to the question of different readings:

> The ending of the play and story suggests that Minnie could well be released from jail for lack of motive or conclusive evidence, although what her life in the community—or what the community itself—will thereafter be like remains unknown. Additionally, we must ponder what the impact of their realizations and choices will be for Mrs. Peters and Mrs. Hale. Now that their lives are linked (and linked to Minnie Wright's), what will this mean for them, especially given their difference in class position—a sheriff's wife and farmer's wife would not often travel in the same social circles, after all—that the events of the story temporarily elide? Robin Woods provocatively argues that the process of ratiocination separates the detective from society, simultaneously condemning this figure to a life of crime (16). In Glaspell's narrative the women become accessories after the fact, and, to the extent that we identify with them, so do we. Surely, Glaspell is asking her audience to ponder the implications of her work for such broad ideological formations as gender, class, and the legal structure of American society (Gainor, 2004: 50-51).

This path to different readings is, indeed, in line with the thematic concern of the play. Glaspell takes stereotypical binary oppositions that construct gender roles for women and turns them upside down by presenting a parody of the idea of fixed truth deduced or induced from male reasoning. Instead, highlighting female intuition and experience that is skilled in reading the 'trifles' Glaspell subverts the conventional forms of detective fiction while at the same time achieving to generate the power of indignation in the audience and prompt them to take sides with rejecting the power of falsehood.

2.2. “Angels in America” by Tony Kushner

2.2.1. Plot:

2.2.1.1. Part One: “Millennium Approaches”

Angels in America begins in New York City in October 1985 and treats the stories of one straight, one gay couple, Louis Ironson and his four years long lover Prior Walter, and Mormon lawyer Joe Pitt and his wife Harper. In the first part, “Millennium Approaches” the scene opens with the funeral of Louis's grandmother where Rabbi Isidor Chemelwitz delivers a eulogy at Sarah Ironson’s memorial service. After the funeral, Prior shows Louis his Kaposi's sarcoma lesions and tells him that he is HIV infected (AIDS). Louis panics and leaves to bury his grandma promising to come back home. Later Louis tries to care for Prior, but he cannot stand the stress and fear of losing him. In the meantime, Joe talks to Roy Cohn in his office who offers Joe a position in the Justice Department. Joe regards Roy as a mentor and friend but does not accept his offer before asking his wife Harper. However, Joe’s valium addicted, hallucinating wife Harper gives some excuses and does not want to move to Washington.

Later the two couple’s stories overlap: While Louis, in an emotional distress of Prior’s condition, is crying in the bathroom of the courthouse that he works as a word processor, comes across with the courthouse clerk Joe. In an effort of consolation, Joe offers Louis a napkin; during their talk Louis verbalizes his thought that Joe is gay, Joe denies. A week later Harper and Prior meet in a mutual dream scene, and on the “threshold of revelation” Harper could see that Prior is sick, and Prior exposes Harper that her husband is a closeted homosexual. At home, Harper openly asks Joe if he is a homosexual, but Joe denies it while at the same time mentioning that he has struggled with the urge. Roy, on the other hand, learns from his doctor Henry that he has AIDS, however, Roy rages in anger and threatens Henry to diagnose him with liver cancer since he does not want to lose his clout as a lawyer. Henry, then advises him to use his power for the procurement of an experimental drug, AZT, to cure his AIDS.

As Prior's illness grows worse, Louis leaves Prior and sneaks out at night to have an anonymous sex affair in Central Park. On the other hand, in another scene, Prior tells his ex-drag queen friend Belize who is a nurse at a hospital that he has been hearing a mysterious and attractive voice; after Belize leaves, the voice is heard as a messenger who declares her coming soon. As time goes by, Louis and Joe grow sexually closer, and in the end, Joe calls his mother, Hannah, in Utah and confesses for the first time that he is gay. Hannah finds him ridiculous and hangs up the phone, yet she decides to sell her house and go to New York to lay her hands on the issue. When Joe admits his homosexuality in front of Harper, she wants him to go, while at the same time, in a split scene Louis tells Prior he is moving out.

Then, one-night Prior wakes to see the ghosts of his ancestors, Prior I and Prior II, who have come to prepare the way for the messenger. Further, Joe declines Roy's offer; in the face of which Roy rages and tells Joe about his legal intervention in the trial of Ethel Rosenberg and guaranteeing her execution as his greatest success. Joe, who sees Roy as a personal mentor is appalled by his unethical position as a lawyer. After Joe leaves Roy's house, Ethel Rosenberg's ghost appears and witnesses Roy's abdominal pain and calls an ambulance to take him to the hospital. Meanwhile, Joe follows Louis to the park and then talks to him that results in their going home to have sex. On the other hand, while Prior is lying in his bed an Angel crashes through the roof of his apartment as a messenger.

2.2.1.2. Part Two: "Perestroika"

While Harper wanders in her hallucination in Antarctica with the travel agent Mr. Lies, she picks up a tree to light a fire which turns out in reality that she picked it up from Brooklyn's Prospect Park; as a result, the police come and take her. Joe's mother, Hannah, who is at their apartment at the moment, receives the call and goes to rescue Harper. Later Harper starts to attend to the Mormon Visitor's Center where Hannah works voluntarily. On the other hand, Roy is seen in the hospital insulting Belize with his racist statements, nevertheless Belize warns him, as a help from one "faggot to another", not to be subject to drug experiments in his treatment of AIDS

and to find AZT with the help of his forceful connections. In another scene Belize, who also has taken care of his friend Prior, is seen with Prior after a friend's funeral who died because of AIDS. Prior reveals his story of the Angel that comes to him as a messenger. In a flashback scene, the audience learns that Prior is chosen as a prophet whose mission is to stop people "moving" in order to bring God back who had been tempted by people's migratory tendency and left Heaven in 1906 after the San Francisco earthquake. It seems, according to Angels, in order to bring God back people must stop their movements and changing.

Meanwhile, since Roy has borrowed money from one of his clients, his law career is under threat because his political opponents are trying to disbar him. As Joe visits him in his hospital room, he gives Joe his blessings, but when he learns that Joe has been living with another man for a month, he gets angry and tells him to end it and go back to his wife. As he gets up in anger, his blood spreads everywhere and Joe learns that he has got AIDS. At the same time Ethel Rosenberg's ghost appears in Roy's room and enjoys Roy's misery. As the scenes skip, Harper is seen in Mormon Visitor's Center watching a diorama of the Mormon migration, then Prior comes to the Center for research on angels, and the two fantasize seeing Louis and Joe in the diorama arguing. When the diorama dummy mother animates, Harper leaves with her and gets advice on loss and change.

Louis, on the other hand, learns that Joe is a Mormon, appalled by what he has learnt, he declares Joe that he wants to see Prior; when Prior and Louis meet at the park, Prior talks harsh on Louis and demands that Louis shows him visible scars which prove he is hurt inside. Later, when Louis learns from Belize that Joe has bonds with Roy, Louis gets shocked and very angry. He finds past legal documents of trials where Joe worked as a clerk and confronts Joe to have a fight. Joe beats him at his home and after he leaves, they never see each other again. Further, when Roy learns from Ethel that he has been disbarred, Ethel informs him that he has been defeated; however, Roy tricks Ethel into singing for him like his mother, and pretends dead, as Ethel finished her Yiddish song, Roy wakes up declares Ethel defeated and then dies. After Roy's death, Belize asks for Louis to come and prey Kaddish, the Jewish prayer for the dead,

to give his thanks for the AZT pills that he secretly takes from Roy's stash and to forgive him. Louis has no knowledge of Yiddish prayers, but miraculously Ethel's ghost helps him prey.

Prior who follows Joe into the Mormon Visitor's Center, gets very sick when he enters the building, Hannah helps him and accompanies him to the hospital. There, Prior asks Hannah what happens to prophets that refuse the job and Hannah advices him to wrestle with the Angel. In the hospital, the Angel of America comes and Prior wrestles her and asks for her blessings. As a result, a ladder comes from Heaven and Prior gains access to Heaven where he goes to refuse his prophecy. In the San Francisco-like Heaven, Prior gives the book of prophecy back and asks Angels to halt the plague and give him more life. The Angels inform him that they could not discard the plague. Prior recommends the Angels that they sue God for abandoning Heaven and his children. In his voyage back, Prior sees Roy discussing the lawsuit with God and offering him to be his lawyer. Waking up in his hospital bed Prior sees that Belize has taken him AZT pills, but Prior refuses to use these drugs. When Louis asks him whether he could come back, Prior tells Louis he loves him, but he cannot ever come back. On the other hand, Harper leaves Joe to go to San Francisco in order to build herself a new life.

In the Epilogue, characters Louis, Prior, Belize and Hannah are seen near the Bethesda Fountain in New York, four years has passed. While Belize and Louis talk politics, Prior talks to the audience about AIDS epidemic, about the Middle East, about democracy, and about how change and progress are inevitable.

2.2.2. Analysis of "Angels in America"

Born in 1956, a contemporary American playwright Tony Kushner had been known only among the circles of off-Broadway with his plays *Yes, Yes, No, No* (1985), *Stella* (1987), *A Bright Room Called Day* (1987), *Hydriotaphia* (1987), and *The Illusion* (1988) until his play *Angels in America* took off in 1991-1992. With its full title *Angels in America: A Gay Fantasia on National Themes*, which is comprised of two parts, *Millennium Approaches* and *Perestroika*, the play brought Tony Kushner a Pulitzer Prize for Drama in 1993 (*Millennium Approaches*), and a Tony Award for Best Play in 1993 (*Millennium Approaches*) and in 1994 (*Perestroika*). Attending Columbia University for his B.A. degree and New York University for a M.F.A degree, Kushner also worked as a guest artist in several universities' Theatre programs such as New York, Yale and Princeton. He also undertook the part as the director of literary services for the Theatre Communication Group in New York City, and playwright-in-residence at the Juilliard School of Drama in New York City between the years 1990-1992. His play *Angels in America* entered the Broadway scene so fast that David Savran commented, "not within memory has a new American play been canonized by the press as rapidly as *Angels in America*" (Savran, 1995: 207), since this play "has almost single-handedly resuscitated a category of play that has become almost extinct: the serious Broadway drama that is neither a British import nor a revival" (Savran, 1995: 207)." After his burst into Broadway with *Angels*, the play was also adapted into a television show in 2002 and won an Emmy Award, which made Tony Kushner even more famous as a playwright. Kushner stands distinguished as a political writer with a lyrical tone focusing on subjects of gender, race, class, morality, and belief systems. Some of his other plays after *Angels in America* are *Slavs!* (1994), *Homebody/Kabul* (2001), *Caroline, or Change* (2004), and *The Intelligent Homosexual's Guide to Capitalism and Socialism with a Key to the Scriptures* (2011). *Angels in America: Millennium Approaches* was first performed as a workshop performance in 1990 at the Mark Taper Forum, and *Perestroika* was also performed in a workshop at the same Forum in 1992. The Broadway production of the play took place in 1993.

Although Kushner himself has some concerns about the political power of theatre and art in general especially when he says, “I have even in the best of times only the shakiest faith in art, in the political power of the written word’, and that ‘in times of political extremity writing seems to me a luxury . . . what, my despair asks me at such times, is the use of writing?” (Kushner quoted in Bigsby, 2000: 105), it would be right to say that Kushner “theatricalizes politics” (Al-Badri, 2014: 4) rather than only saying that he is a political writer. He believes “All art of every sort changes the world” (Kushner, 2001: 62). Kushner thinks collective political activism has a stronger effect to change the world: “What really changes the world is the consequence of thinking about the world, the consequence of thinking about art about the world, the consequence of human gesture received, absorbed, returned to the world — the gesture that changes the world most is that which is expressed not in the theater but in the arena of political engagement: activism, in other words, organizing, resisting, doing what one can to advance liberationist, progressive, multiculturalist, egalitarian agendas” (Kushner, 2001: 63). However, art still has that power because it is not all contemplation but also action according to him. This part aims to analyze the politics of gender as exemplified in Tony Kushner’s play *Angels in America, a Gay Fantasia on National Themes*. In his work Kushner goes back to recent history focusing on the AIDS epidemic and the crisis caused by it in 1990s, the indifference of Reagan administration against the epidemic and its victims who were mostly from minority groups, and its effects on the gay community. The work of Kushner, in that sense, gains a political aspect as it testifies to the history of the neglected, the subaltern, contrary to the mainstream history, and reclaims a history of homosexual America. To put it in Deleuzian terms, the play presents a re-reading of history with a focus on desire and its potentialities for change as history is impossible without desire. As the title also indicates, the foregrounding of “national themes” is a suggestion of a counter-narrative of the nation dedicated to construct an alternative history of the United States which comprises the Other and the marginalized including the homosexuals, Jews as well as the political failure of the Left against the new conservatism of the Reagan and Bush eras, and the relationship between sexuality and power.

Kushner's *Angels* may be considered as gay literature which is defined as "the fiction, poetry, drama, history, and essays written by, about, and for gay men" (Bram, 2009: 147). Moreover, Bram puts it in the category of "AIDS fiction" which according to him has a political role: "AIDS fiction is as personally connected to the world at hand as the writing of Lorraine Hansberry and James Baldwin was to the Civil Rights movement, or The Grapes of Wrath was to the Great Depression, or the poem "Easter 1916" was to the Dublin uprising that confused Yeats with horror for its violence and admiration of the participants" (Bram, 2009: 119). Early AIDS plays were mostly melodramatic, sentimental side of the death of many being at the focus. However, with a more experimental attitude in 1990s, in which Kushner also took part, things began to change. "[B]y the early to mid 1990s, playwrights and filmmakers began experimenting with different styles and narratives and moving away from a singular focus on death" (Friedman, 2007: 107). The main reason of trying to shift the focus from death was to represent the epidemic and its social effects in a broader perspective. Although AIDS is one of the main themes in Kushner's play along with ethnicity, race, religion, and the political and historical context of the US in 1990s, the play principally deals with the issues of difference and inclusion by putting forward gays who are the main victims of AIDS epidemic. Embracing the queerness as fabulousness the play is an attempt to defeat exclusion and celebrate multiplicity and community. On the other hand, "Kushner not only asserts a fundamental critique of American bourgeois individualism (particularly in its Reaganite configuration), but he also asserts his faith that the U.S. does, after all, have the "potential for radical democracy"" (Saal, 2007: 66). In other words, Kushner does not promote a liberal stance as some critics suggest, but rather presents an example of epic theatre calling for collective change which makes his theater political just like Brecht whose goal was social action rather than individual one.

> Kushner's plays examine many of the issues that also figure in his own gay activism: liberalism and socialism in a post-Marxist age; communitarianism in a culture that privileges individualism; spirituality (particularly informed by Jewish kabbalah mysticism) in a secular era; erotic experience as a portal of the transcendent; and sexuality, ethnicity, and race in a post identity age. Kushner, viewing his sexuality not as a stable identity but as a dialectical subject position, regards it as an artistic and

> political asset that provides him an outsider's vantage point from which to analyze social relationships (Summers, 2002: 394).

The time interval of *Millennium Approaches* is between October 1985 and January 1986; and the period in the second part, *Perestroika,* is between January 1986 and February 1990. Indeed, with its very structuring of the setting *Angels* makes it clear that it makes the concept of time an issue in the play. The actual events taking place in the play are between 1985 and 1986; however, the ending moves forward in future with an Epilogue to the year 1990, which is actually a past time, though a recent one, for the playwright at the time he wrote the plays (1992). The movement of this time structure, backwards and forwards, when included the now-time of the plays' reader can be considered as a framework of the concept of time in the play, which itself finds embodiment in the play as a character, the Angel of America. The time interval 1985-6 coincides with the Reagan era in the US and the new conservatism of the period is criticized. President Ronald Reagan and his Republican crew during the time is condemned to be particularly responsible for the spread of the AIDS epidemic in the 1980s due to the dismissal of the conservative politics. Reagan himself did not pronounce AIDS for a long time seeing it as a disease specific to homosexuals, and also morally judging same sex relationships as the reason to it. "By the time President Reagan had acknowledged AIDS in 1987, believing it to be a disease that only affects the marginalised – gay men – over 20 000 Americans had died" (Saddik, 2007: 160).

With postmodern era comes the questioning of the constructed nature of the discourse of history putting history writing in close proximity to fiction writing. If both have a constructed nature, it is also possible to see fictional text more favorable as it has the chance to give a voice to silenced minorities, the left out, by creating an alternative narrative contrary to the discourse of mainstream history. Kushner, in that sense, presents a counter narrative on "*National Themes*" and becomes the "alternative historian" through the dialogue he creates with America's recent past.

As a capitalist myth, "American dream" at the core of the "National Themes" seems to be reached only by some advantaged. Ideals of freedom and prosperity,

though enjoyed only by a few, are basic premises of this American dream. Kushner points out to the other side of the coin when he makes Belize, "the moral center of the play," say:

> Up in the air, just like that angel, too far off the earth to pick out the details. Louis and his Big Ideas. Big Ideas are all you love. "America" is what Louis loves.
> [...]
> I hate America, Louis. I hate this country. It's just big ideas, and stories, and people dying, and people like you.
> The white cracker who wrote the national anthem knew what he was doing. He set the word "free" to a note so high nobody can reach it. Nothing on earth sounds less like freedom to me.
> You come with me to room 1013 over at the hospital, and I'll show you America. Terminal, crazy and mean. (Kushner, 1993b: 94-95)

Kushner's first criticism goes to the Liberal discourse reflected through Louis's character. And the person who Belize talks about that is in the hospital room 1013 is Roy Cohn who stands for corrupted America that is "terminal, crazy and mean." Roy Cohn is the closeted gay conservative lawyer from the McCarthy era who became famous for contributing to McCarthy's anti-communist propaganda by overtaking some role in illegally influencing the judges for the death penalty of Ethel Rosenberg and Julius Rosenberg. "Ethel Rosenberg, her husband Julius Rosenberg, and her brother David Greenglass were Americans accused of being communist spies and selling secrets to the Soviets during the late 1940s. Ethel and Julius were convicted at their highly controversial trial in 1951, and executed in 1953" (Saddik, 2007: 161). It does not seem like a mere legal disclaimer, but also a deliberate pointing at the blurriness of the boundaries between history and fiction when Kushner uses Roy Cohn as a character even without changing his name and write:

> A Disclaimer: Roy M. Cohn, the character, is based on the late Roy M. Cohn (1927-1986), who was all too real; for the most part the acts attributed to the character Roy, such as his illegal conferences with Judge Kaufmann during the trial of Ethel Rosenberg, are to be found in the historical record. But this Roy is a work of dramatic fiction; his words are my invention, and liberties have been taken (Kushner, 1993a: 5).

Reality and fiction all got mixed up, Kushner makes the reader question the fictionality of official history. Using historical records Kushner's fictional character

Roy Cohn is based on real Roy Cohn who helped the real execution of real Ethel Rosenberg by creating his own fiction and affecting the judgement. And the reader today goes back in time through Kushner's text and reads another version of the past. With a historical materialist approach, Kushner revisits the past in order to give a reflection of the Reagan era. "Kushner uses history (and tragedy, as well as his own brand of magic realism) to illustrate the lessons of the past for those living in the present, in a nod to Benjamin's plea to learn from the past" (Brook, 2006: 78). Indeed, Kushner's reference to Walter Benjamin's ideas on history in his essay "On the Concept of History," is embodied as a character in the play *Angels in America* as the Angel of America. In his essay, Benjamin looks at Angelus Novus, a painting by Paul Klee, and interprets it as the image of the angel of history. In his description, Benjamin sees the angel stuck as a storm is blowing from Paradise driving him into the future while his gaze is fixed on the past, to the catastrophe piling and hurling before his feet. This posture of the Angel suggests that he wants to return to the past and repair it, but he is propelled into the future by a storm which is defined by Benjamin as "progress."

> There is a painting by Klee called Angelus Novus. An angel is depicted there who looks as though he were about to distance himself from something which he is staring at. His eyes are opened wide, his mouth stands open and his wings are outstretched. The Angel of History must look just so. His face is turned towards the past. Where we see the appearance of a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe, which unceasingly piles rubble on top of rubble and hurls it before his feet. He would like to pause for a moment so fair [verweilen: a reference to Goethe's Faust], to awaken the dead and to piece together what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise, it has caught itself up in his wings and is so strong that the Angel can no longer close them. The storm drives him irresistibly into the future, to which his back is turned, while the rubble-heap before him grows sky-high. That which we call progress, is this storm. (IX) (Benjamin, 1974)

In Benjamin's concept of history, bits and pieces of the past are piling on top of each other, and it is not possible for the angel to get these fragments back together. Benjamin defines the task of the historical materialist as "to brush history against the grain":

> There has never been a document of culture, which is not simultaneously one of barbarism. And just as it is itself not free from barbarism, neither is it free from the process of transmission, in which it falls from one set of hands into another. The

> historical materialist thus moves as far away from this as measurably possible. He regards it as his task to brush history against the grain. (VII) (Benjamin, 1974)

It is not possible to stop the progress. The angel of history cannot make the fragments of history whole again. Therefore, Benjamin resorts to "the Messiah," who alone can succeed where the angel must fail in the redemption of history.

> In every epoch, the attempt must be made to deliver tradition anew from the conformism which is on the point of overwhelming it. For the Messiah arrives not merely as the Redeemer; he also arrives as the vanquisher of the Anti-christ. The only writer of history with the gift of setting alight the sparks of hope in the past, is the one who is convinced of this: that not even the dead will be safe from the enemy, if he is victorious. And this enemy has not ceased to be victorious. (VI) (Benjamin, 1974)

In Benjamin's metaphorical expression "the Messiah" is the historical materialist who has a redemptive relation to past by making it his job to focus on the past to recover it instead of the future. "Historical materialism is a way of comporting oneself, not toward the totality of the historical process, but toward certain instants of the past: to make the fragments whole again" (Beiner, 1984: 424).

Similarly, it is possible to say that Kushner appeals to a historical materialist approach by choosing a specific time frame from the recent past of America, rather than an idea of the past as a totality, and he also makes Benjamin's essay his subject in the play. When Prior meets the Angel in the play, the Angel of America complains of the pile of debris humans have left behind and asks Prior to stop the progress. Just like the Angel of History is stuck in Benjamin's description, the Angel of America gives the impression of desperation in the face of all the pile of rubbish called history. Hence, with Angel's plea Prior is offered to become a prophet to stop movement so that God comes back to heaven. However, Prior refuses the role to stop progress as redemption of history by stopping progress is not possible, like it is explained in Benjamin's text. Historical reflection is redemptive, remembrance has a saving power; therefore, it is a revolutionary commitment of the historian to reflect on the past (Beiner, 1984: 425).

The time frame Kushner chose to reflect upon is Reagan years since as a Leftist, political, gay playwright Kushner comes to grips with New Conservatism of the era and he deals with all the related issues that come as the result of this politics such as negligence and denial of conservatives regarding AIDS epidemic and its effects especially on gay population, ethnicity, race, gender, religion, and family. To refer to the corruption of Reagan management and the decayed conservative politics, Roy Cohn stands as an apt metaphor. "He is like the polestar of human evil, he's like the worst human being who ever lived, he isn't human even, he's..." (*Perestroika*, Act 4, Scene 3, 93) Belize aptly describes Roy Cohn as "the polestar of human evil." At the time, Roy Cohn had been assistant to Senator Joseph McCarthy and took the same role in other Republican governments as well. When Roy Cohn sent Ethel Rosenberg to death using illegal methods, he was the prosecuting attorney. Using real historical records Kushner depicted Roy Cohn as a vital figure with strong dramatic effect to represent the corruption in neoconservatism.

> [S]tructurally and ideologically, the play challenges the conventions of American realism and the tenets of Reaganism. Indeed, it offers by far the most explicit and trenchant critique of neoconservativism to have been produced on Broadway. It also provides the most thoroughgoing-and unambivalent--deconstruction in memory of a binarism absolutely crucial to liberalism, the opposition between public and private. Angels demonstrates conclusively not only the constructedness of the difference between the political and the sexual, but also the murderous power of this distinction (Savran, 1995: 219).

In *Angels in America*, Roy Cohn also becomes one of the vital figures to deconstruct the binarism between public and private. "According to Kushner's point of view, Roy Cohn, who is "the heart of modern [American] conservatism" (Kushner, Angels 213), embodies political injustice, hypocrisy, and the irony of self-contradiction" (Al-Badri, 2014: 78). A closeted gay man in his real life Roy Cohn supported conservative moral judgement against the gay population, and ironically died of AIDS himself. Roy is chosen as a metaphor as his self-contradiction and hypocrisy is in parallel with the Reagan administration:

> Michael Schaller points out that President Reagan was criticized as a hypocrite by his children: Ronald and Nancy Reagan attempted to alter the sexual behavior of many

> Americans and their attitudes toward abortion and the rights of women. [. . .] President Reagan, who condemned abortion as murder, urged pre-marital chastity and championed the "traditional" family of husband as breadwinner, wife as mother and homemaker. Conservatives predicted that the decade would assure the "end of the sexual revolution." The president's words, critics charged, rang false. Reagan was the first divorced man elected president and had married two career women. He had a distant relationship with his children, two of whom, Patti and Michael, had written books that criticized their parents as hypocrites. (Schaller quoted in Al-Badri, 2014: 79).

In the play, Roy's contradiction between his public and private life is exposed most vividly in the scene where he sees his doctor to check his symptoms. Roy's speech with the doctor lays bare how identity is based on power. Even though he has lesions on his skin, which proves he has AIDS, Roy does not accept the doctor's diagnosis as he sees it as "gay plague" and he refuses to define himself as homosexual; what's more, he threatens the doctor with destroying his career in case he diagnoses Roy with the disease:

> Say: "Roy Cohn, you are a homosexual." (*Pause*)
> And I will proceed, systematically, to destroy your reputation and your practice and your career in New York State, Henry. Which you know I can do.
> [...]
> Your problem, Henry, is that you are hung up on words, on labels, that you believe they mean what they seem to mean. AIDS. Homosexual. Gay. Lesbian. You think these are names that tell you who someone sleeps with, but they don't tell you that.
> [...]
> Like all labels they tell you one thing and one thing only: where does an individual so identified fit in the food chain, in the pecking order? Not ideology, or sexual taste, but something much simpler: clout. Not who I fuck or who fucks me, but who will pick up the phone when I call, who own me favors. This is what a label refers to. Now to someone who does not understand this, homosexual is what I am because I have sex with men. But really this is wrong. Homosexuals are not men who sleep with other men. Homosexuals are men who in fifteen years of trying cannot get a pissant antidiscrimination bill through City Council. Homosexuals are men who know nobody and who nobody knows. Who have zero clout. Does this sound like me, Henry? (Kushner, 1993a: 44-45)

Indeed, in this scene Roy is vocalizing the conservative views of his era on gender and the definition of masculinity. Separating masculinity from the body, desires, and sexual preferences in his definition, what is left is power; masculinity equals to power. "[P]ower is perpetual generation of truth versus nontruth" (Grace, 2009: 63), in Foucault's concept of power. Moreover; power manifests itself in discourse, as Foucault puts it, "there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize

and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (Foucault, 1980: 93). Capitalism would not have been this strong if there was not the family unit, and the preservation and perpetuation of the family is possible through the production of heteronormative discourse. Conservative politics uses this discourse in order to preserve the institution of family and reproduction so that it nourishes the capitalist system. Roy Cohn's role within this picture is being the mediator for the capitalist machine to work; he has the power to create his own version of truth, just like he sent Ethel to death with his own version of truth, he can claim that he has liver cancer, not AIDS as it is only what homosexuals have (Kushner, 1993a: 46). AIDS being seen as the "homosexual plague" is also a part of power relationships that stigmatize same sex relationships, just as they stigmatized working class, as "sexually unclean, degenerate, and dangerous", which dates back to what Foucault calls epistemological classification in the nineteenth century:

> During this period, as Foucault puts it, "the analysis of heredity was placing sex . . . in a position of 'biological responsibility' with regard to the species." This discourse of sexuality was organized around concerns about "the body, vigor, longevity, progeniture, and descent of the classes that 'ruled.'" By way of the discourse of sexology, according to Foucault, the nineteenth century bourgeoise attempted scientifically and defensively to isolate itself from the immediately felt threat of a working class stigmatized as sexually unclean, degenerate, and dangerous (Floyd, 2009: 44).

Apparently, Roy Cohn would not want to be a part of this disadvantaged group of homosexuals who lack power. Roy defines himself through the power he has within the political environment he belongs, and homosexuals are on the other side of the binary opposition without power.

> Cohn also serves as the embodiment of the Reagan era's and by extension Cold War America's interpretation and reliance on a certain creed of straight masculinity. He is an illustration of the Reagan era's fascination with the strong, individual, loner, which is also why Cohn cannot let himself be defined as a gay man since, according to him, the gay community has no power and without power there would be no Roy Cohn (Nielsen, 2012: 35).

Roy denies his homosexuality and the disease, in order not to lose his power; he refuses to acknowledge and reconcile difference and instead marginalizes it. With all his hypocrisy, corruption and exclusion of sexual differences Roy is a reflection of new conservative America and Reagan administration with its silence of the AIDS epidemic for long years.

Restoring America to its former self, family values and the defense of the American way of life were, for the masses, the attraction points as the "new right" in Reagan's election campaign. Therefore, they were, even from the very beginning, negligent of the gay community and the disease that they thought to affect only gay men.

> [H]is transformation of American society, known as the Reagan Revolution, was not just an economic decision but part of Reagan's overall project of restoring America to its former self. In his farewell address to the American people, Reagan described his own presidency, not as a revolution (which had been the common description), but as a rediscovery of 'our values and our common sense' (Berman, 1990: 5). In this way, according to Reagan himself, the 1980s was a reconstruction of a nation that had gone astray during the 1960s and 1970s with the increased liberation of minorities and experimentation with other forms of living of those years. The gay community had experienced tremendous personal and sexual liberation since the riots at Stonewall Inn in New York City in June of 1969 and it was partly this increased sexual freedom, manifested through visibility, that Ronald Reagan campaigned against with his project of restoring America by emphasizing issues of morality, religion and family values in social and cultural policies. Reagan's focus on religion and restoring the traditional American nuclear family proved detrimental to his administration's reaction to AIDS (Nielsen, 2012: 17).

Reagan administration was reclining upon the idea of divine retribution to stigmatize gay community. One of the prominent figures among the supporters of conservative movement, Jerry Falwell, the founder of the Moral Majority, which is a Christian Right political organization that also helped the Republicans win the election, used to claim that AIDS was God's wrath falling on homosexuals; and the conservatives were suggesting that the disease is the result of illicit sex (Shilts, 2007: 154-178). In an interview, Kushner also comments on this stigmatizing of gay people:

> I really was astonished in the 80s at the extent to which people believed – and it wasn't only Reagan, though he's culpable because he was elected to be a leader – the way in which society as a whole believed for a long time – believed that we deserved to die because we had sex with each other (Kushner quoted in Nielsen, 2012: 18).

It is also important to mention the social, economic and political context of the world when *Angels in America* first came out. The Cold War was ending with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, dissolution of the Soviet Union took place, and Democrat Bill Clinton displaced the Reagan Administration in 1993. In such a context Tony Kushner targets the greediness, corruption, discrimination and sexism of the 1980s Reagan era; however, apart from the immediate context,

> [t]he play draws clear parallels, through the historical characters of Roy Cohn and Ethel Rosenberg, between Reagan's America and its AIDS crisis and America during the 1950s, McCarthyism, and the second Red Scare. The play is full of references to current and historical events: the medieval plague, the Mayflower, the founding of America and the philosophy of radical individualism, the visions of Joseph Smith, early Jewish immigration to the US, the Mormon migration West, and people such as McCarthy, Reagan and a wealth of others. As the late days of the Weimar Republic serve as a historical parallel in *A Bright Room Called Day*, the structure, politics and culture of the Cold War is used to parallel the 1985 state of the United States of America in *Angels in America*. Daryl Ogden comments on this when he writes 'Kushner portrays Reaganism polemically, as a version of Neo-McCarthyism' (Nielsen, 2012: 15-16).

AIDS, like many epidemics, can be described as a force that invades and it brings forth the implementation of measures, and in the case of governments unfortunately it includes hostility against the patients, especially the homosexual ones. Since governments constitute an example to the people, discrimination and abusive attitude against homosexuals increase. Conservative administration emphasizes the family and tradition while overlooking the spread of AIDS and death of many. Therefore, *Angels in America* puts forward the ones who are overlooked, discriminated, and abused, those who fight against AIDS or those who has lost the battle, and they all become the focus of the text. In reality America is "the melting pot where nothing melted," (Kushner, 1993a: 10). In Kushner's act of speaking for the Other, it is like the mosaic full of diversity and contradiction are together within the nation. For that reason, the play is not only a record of history untold, but it is also a counter-narrative re-writing the history of the nation. Kushner's play; hence, provides

the reader with the perspective of an alternative nation that includes the excluded. This is also why the subtitle of the play emphasizes "national themes":

> Speaking the night after the play's British première, Kushner emphasised the importance of the subtitle and its linking of 'gay fantasia' with 'national themes': 'I felt that a lot of what you could identify as gay theater in America . . . in the late sixties and seventies was focused very extensively on domestic issues and relational issues. That was appropriate to its historical moment and to what was of concern to the community at that time, because the notion of gay liberation was relatively new. I think there's a shift in attention happening now, and *Angels* is an example of that' (Bigsby, 2000a: 107).

Reading Kushner's comment, emphasis on "gay fantasia" and "national themes" in the title can be explained as both form and politics becoming more radical. Kushner sees his generation of gay artists and writers passing to the "fabulous" as a form from the "ridiculous." The theatre of the fabulous utilizes from history and politics in its creation, it is historically and politically aware and rejects being weak as the gay identity:

> This radicalization of politics can also be seen in a radicalization of the theatrical form. For this Kushner acknowledges his debt to Charles Ludlam and his fabulous theatre. Charles Ludlam founded the Ridiculous Theatrical Company in 1967 (2 years before the Stonewall Riots) and, until his untimely death from AIDS in 1987, the company produced a series of plays, most in a fantastic, over-the-top, campy and ridiculous style and often in a non-logical form. Kushner sees Ludlam's theatre as a sort of first generation gay theatre and his own as a second generation. This generational transformation can be called the change from the ridiculous to the fabulous. What Kushner calls the theatre of the fabulous utilizes a notion of history (standing on the shoulders of the ridiculous) and politics. The politics of the fabulous, as it is inspiring Kushner, comes from a Queer Nation chant: 'We're here. We're Queer. We're Fabulous. Get used to it'. Fabulous in one sense evolves beyond ridiculous in the way that fabulous becomes a rejection of the weakness inherent in being stigmatized as ridiculous. Fabulous rejects being perceived as weak or suffering in relation to oppression. Another related sense is that this use of fabulous is a historical awareness of gay history and gay theatre history that Ludlam, at least the pre-Stonewall Ludlam, could not have (Nielsen, 2012: 39).

Fabulous, therefore, embraces difference, being queer; it is a claim to have the right to be different. "The Fabulous is the assertively Camp camp, the rapturous embrace of difference, the discovering of self not in that which has rejected you but in that which makes you unlike, and disliked, and Other" (Kushner quoted in Smith, 2018: 32).

Fabulousness is self-confidence, accepting oneself as is, holding on to difference, and resisting assimilation. The subtitle "gay fantasia" is, therefore, related with the theatre of the fabulous. "In this the magic of the fabulous is precisely the magic of the theater" (Kushner, 1997: 31). There is magic in it, fantasy becomes a part of it as it embraces queerness and goes against the realistic representation of identity. Just as embracing being "queer" this theatre openly shows its magic and displays the wires. "The illusion is always incomplete, inadequate; the work behind the magic is meant to be appreciated" (Kushner, 1997: 31). This is once again resisting realistic conventions. Indeed, Kushner puts it as a note at the very beginning of his play *Angels in America*:

> The moments of magic—the appearance and disappearance of Mr. Lies and the ghosts, the Book hallucination, and the ending—are to be fully realized, as bits of wonderful theatrical illusion—which means it's OK if the wires Show, and maybe it's good that they do, but the magic should be at the same time be thoroughly amazing (Kushner, 1993a: 5; 1993b: 7).

In his creation of the Theater of the Fabulous interpreting the past, re-writing it and creating a history as a community is crucial:

> If we are moving from a Theater of the Ridiculous to a Theater of the Fabulous, I would guess that this development also has something to do with telling stories, of having arrived as a community with a history-of both oppression and liberation. We are now fabulous in part because we are fabulists, fabled, organized, and powerful enough to have the luxury to begin to examine the past and interpret it. And to pass it along to our descendants, openly. For homosexuals to work to create a history is for us to say that there will be those who come after-to say to the straight world, some of your children will be queer (Kushner, 1997: 32).

Being 'fabulists' is not only a homonymy for sounding like 'fabulous,' but Kushner defines their attempt to dig in history and re-write it as being 'fabulists' which can be analyzed through the Deleuzian notion of 'fabulation.' Deleuze's philosophy of history is based on two temporal models. Ronald Bouge explains Deleuze's approach to narrative through his philosophy of time. When a writer takes the problem of history as the concern in his/her work, especially the history of subaltern groups, the past is used to account for the sufferings of certain groups as an alternative history; but it is also true that in those texts dealing with this past opens up new possibilities (Bogue,

2010: 2). Kushner's work *Angels in America* takes the history of marginalized groups in the same way and at the end of the play shows the reader/audience new possibilities when this past is foregrounded and embraced. Indeed, he explicitly thematizes the problem of history, and that is exactly why he impersonates history as the Angel of America.

When studying Nietzsche in his book *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (1962) Deleuze claims that a philosopher should be like a "cultural physician" identifying and providing cures for social illnesses. Deleuze makes use of this concept of cultural physician later for his literary analysis of Marquis de Sade and Leopold Ritter in his book *Masochism: An Interpretation of Coldness and Cruelty* (1967) and identifies these two writers as disclosing the full dynamics of sadism and masochism. Therefore, Deleuze treats literature in the same way as philosophy to have an aim of diagnosing culture's illnesses and inventing possible cures. Deleuze maintains this view of literature throughout his career (Bogue, 2010: 5-6). According to Deleuze, act of writing liberates life. "Literature then appears as an enterprise of health', a health that would be 'sufficient to liberate life wherever it is imprisoned by and within man, by and within organisms and genera'" (Deleuze quoted in Bogue, 2010: 6). Kushner's work can be seen within this perspective, just as Deleuze regarded Kafka's work, as he is a political writer who "directly confronts and transforms the signs and forces of his World in an experimentation on the real" (Bogue, 2010: 6). Diagnosing the illnesses of his society can be seen as an aspect of "minor literature" practice in Deleuzian terms "which they define as literature that is immediately social and political, that engages a 'collective assemblage of enunciation', and that uses language with a 'high coefficient of deterritorialization'" (Bogue, 2010: 6-7). Kushner's *Angels in America* fit into this description of minor literature as well. First of all, it is immediately social and political for the historical issues it considers and for giving voice to the Other. Collective assemblage of enunciation is also another aspect of Kushner's work as it thematically strives to create a collectivity and emphasizes its importance in spite of all differences, especially at the end of the play when Louis, Belize, Hannah and Prior get together by the Bethesda Fountain in New York where they become a family not by blood and in traditional sense but as an earned family

with all its differences. Finally, Deleuze's concept of minor literature is characterized by a language 'high coefficient of deterritorialization." Deleuze and Guattari's concept of deterritorialization is another feature that makes literary style political. Minor writers play with language and go against the standard usage: "Through linguistic experimentation of various sorts, they destabilise the regularities of standard usage and thereby set in disequilibrium the sociopolitical forces that permeate 'proper' speech and enforce the status quo" (Bogue, 2010: 7). The language Kushner employs is different from standard usage as well, he uses a poetic and lyrical language. Some critics likens his language to Tennessee Williams as they "both depict dark and poetic images of the beautiful and the frightening aspects of existence, both create a stage language at once both naturalistic and lyrical, both ponder the space between illusion and reality" (Brook, 2006: 80). It is, indeed, possible to say that not only the language his characters use but also the whole language of theatre in Kushner's play fits into the description of minor literature as he goes over the boundaries and presents a blended style against the tenets of realistic representation.

> He is perhaps more successful than any of his predecessors or contemporaries in melding together an aesthetic drawn from aspects of post-naturalistic European theatre with elements of the traditions of America's lyrical dramatic realism. Influences from literature, art, and thought of the ancient world on through to the Renaissance blend together in Kushner's work, along with socialist politics inspired by Karl Marx and Leon Trotsky (Al-Badri, 2014: 34).

Since Kushner wants to subvert the distinction between private and public, lay bare the politics of gender in relationships and re-write the history of the Queer he has realistic intentions, but he blends this style with fantasy. Kushner's desire to offer theatre "that presents the world as it is, an interwoven web of the public and the private" blends fantasy, epic theatre, and realism to create a simultaneously artificial and real stage world where remarkable journeys become possible (Fisher, 2007: 129). Kushner's language sometimes becomes poetic and lyrical especially in dream scenes or where the Angel appears, and sometimes his language also becomes realistic representing the gendered political discourse of neoconservatism, or the language of the Queer (conversations mostly between Prior and Belize), or the political left (especially in Louise and Belize's conversations). Kushner's language is also meta-

theatrical in some cases and he makes the audience question the boundaries between reality and fictionality. The scene between Harper and Prior in *Millennium Approaches* where they share a hallucination and a dream makes the boundary between reality and fiction blurry, and no solid ground is given for this mutual dream scene, it is 'bewildering.' In a 'normal' hallucination or dream the subject generally is not aware of it being a hallucination or dream, but in this one both Prior and Harper are aware of the situation, and they also question the mutuality. Their mutual dream becomes a scene in which they question empiricism, truth and imagination, limits of imagination and the postmodern notion of the impossibility of creating anything original. In this scene, reality and imagination and the blurriness between the two meta-theatrically becomes the topic of their conversation, and it is surprising and ironic that dream plus hallucination, as the "threshhold of revelation," provides the 'truth' about Joe's homosexuality, which in reality he represses and denies:

> Harper: Are you . . . Who are you?
> Prior: Who are you?
> Harper: What are you doing in my hallucination?
> Prior: I'm not in your hallucination. You're in my dream.
> [...]
> Harper: [...] I don't understand this. If I didn't ever see you before and I don't think I did then I don't think you should be here, in this hallucination, because in my experience the mind, which is where hallucinations come from, shouldn't be able to make up anything that wasn't there to start with, that didn't enter it from experience, from the real world. Imagination can't create anything new, can it? It only recycles bits and pieces from the world and reassembles them into visions . . . Am I making sense right now?
> Prior: Given the circumstances, yes.
> Harper: So when we think we've escaped the unbearable ordinariness and, well, untruthfulness of our lives, it's really only the same old ordinariness and falseness rearranged into the appearance of novelty and truth. Nothing unknown is knowable. Don't you think it's depressing?
> Prior: The limitations of the imagination?
> Harper: Yes.
> Prior: It's something you learn after your second theme party: It's All Been Done Before.
> Harper: The world. Finite. Terribly, terribly. . . . Well . . . This is the most depressing hallucination I've ever had.
> Prior: Apologies. I do try to be amusing.
> Harper: Oh, well, don't apologize, you. . . . I can't expect someone who's really sick to entertain me.
> Prior: How on earth did you know . . .
> Harper: Oh that happens. This is the very threshhold of revelation sometimes. You can see things . . . how sick you are. Do you see anything about me?
> Prior: Yes.
> Harper: What?

Prior: You are amazingly unhappy.
Harper: Oh big deal. You meet a Valium addict and you figure out she's unhappy. That doesn't count. Of course I. . . . Something else. Something surprising.
Prior: Something surprising.
Harper: Yes.
Prior: Your husband's a homo.
(Pause.)
Harper: Oh, ridiculous.
(Pause, then very quietly)
Really?
Prior (*Shrugs*): Threshhold of revelation (Kushner, 1993a: 31-33).

Not only this mutual dream scene is part of Kushner's theatrical language but also the whole play is full of hallucinations, visions and ghosts, mostly Harper hallucinating Mr. Lies and her escape from her dreadful life, and Prior seeing the Angel of America and other angels along with the ghosts of his ancestors, and Roy seeing the ghost of Ethel Rosenberg. Deleuze adds visions and auditions as an element to the deterritorialization of language: "The visions and auditions produced through the writer's stammerings are hallucinatory visual and sonic images, such as psychotics experience (seeing phantoms and hearing alien voices, for example)" (Bogue, 2010: 8). Just as he finds schizophrenia revolutionary, as it turns common sense view upside down, such visions and auditions push language to its limits: "Like stutters and stammers, visions and auditions are deterritorialisations of language that push language to its limits and reveal its outside – the paradoxical 'beyond' of language that can only be produced through language" (Bogue, 2010: 9).

To return to the term "fabulation," Ronald Bogue uses it as a coinage, as a new term, covering the Deleuzian concepts of "cultural physician," and "minor literature". Reading Deleuze, Bogue claims that all minor writers are at the same time cultural physicians trying to cure the illnesses of the society. So according to Bogue "minor literature" has become a later term also including "cultural physician." Moreover, Bogue uses the Deleuzian term "fabulation" in a broader sense including the concepts of "cultural physician," and "minor literature" and their components of becoming-other, experimenting on the real, 'legending,' inventing a people to come and deterritorialization of language. He also adds to this concept the act of storytelling as

a way of rewriting history just as Tony Kushner sees fabulists as examining and interpreting the past:

> Deleuze often emphasises the 'powers of the false' when discussing narrative, arguing that in the creation of genuinely new stories the very categories of true and false become irrelevant, and I wish to make a similar point, but I feel that the phrase 'the powers of the false' too readily invites a reintroduction of the true/false distinction in its orthodox formulation. The term 'fabulation', by contrast, allows one to conceive of storytelling simultaneously as a way of engaging and articulating real and material problems – and hence as a way of getting at truths of a certain sort, of countering lies and insisting on historical facts that have been denied, buried or distorted – and as a means of inventing new possibilities for construing the world and its future development (Bogue, 2010: 12-13).

Identities are political and their existence depends on binary oppositions. The component of 'becoming-other' as part of fabulation is making the Other a part of the story. "Becoming- other, as I said earlier, entails a passage between categories, modes of existence and discrete entities such that stable elements are set in metamorphic disequilibrium" (Bogue, 2010: 9). At the same time "becoming-other in Deleuze-Guattari is consistently associated with the disruption of ordinary, commonsense time (referred to as Chronos) and the emergence of a floating, unfixed time (called Aion)" (Bogue, 2010: 11). 'Experimentation on the real' entails labor on history carried out for the text, "a labour that involves: a diagnostic critique of forces, events, memories and documents that shape the present; an articulation of untold, erased and forgotten events; and a reconfiguration of the past that discloses present junctures of potential transformation" (Bogue, 2010: 10). 'Legending,' on the other hand, stands for characters' being an allegory for the society: "Fabulative 'legending', I argue, involves both the treatment of characters and their actions as immediately sociopolitical in nature, and the development of a projective mythography of images that take on a life of their own" (Bogue, 2010: 10). As an aspect of legending when characters have heroic or 'larger-than-life' positions, Bogue calls this 'projective mythography' and: "Such mythographic projections, in fact, are essential to the invention of a people to come, the fourth element of fabulation" (Bogue, 2010: 10). These characters may also be indications of collectivity and represent how social interaction could be changed. Although Bogue uses "fabulation" as a method in his analysis of novels, Deleuzian

concept of fabulation through the reading of Bogue also conforms to Tony Kushner's play *Angels in America* with all its components.

The funeral scene at the very beginning of *Millenium Approaches* and the speech by the World's Oldest Living Bolshevik, Aleksii Antedilluvianovich Prelapsarianov, at the beginning of *Perestroika*, which both can be considered as prologues to the plays, along with the epilogue at the end of *Perestroika* draw the route of *Angels in America* around history and change, which will be discussed through Deleuzian concepts of history and becoming. "Rabbi Chemelwitz's opening monologue introduces an idea that becomes especially critical after the Angel's appearance in *Perestroika*: the opposition between continuity and change" (Al-Badri, 2014: 67). In the first prologue Rabbi Isidor Chemelwitz gives a eulogy for Louis' Jewish grandmother Sarah Ironson. The speech is significant because the death of Sarah Ironson signifies change in a bigger sense:

> Though this is the funeral of an individual, Sarah Ironson, grandmother of Louis, the Rabbi makes clear that it is also the end of an era. Likening her, in a joke, to one of the last Native Americans the Rabbi creates a parallel between the disappearance of the Jewish people who migrated to the USA from Eastern Europe, settled in the Bronx or in Brooklyn, and the erasure of the Native Americans as a people. In this parallel we find a notion of tribal belonging which governs the structures of experience of its members. This order has disappeared forever with Sarah Ironson. The Rabbi describes how Sarah Ironson and her fellow immigrants left Lithuania and Russia for America and how they fought for the Jewish home in New York, in America, so their children 'would not grow up here, in this strange place, in the melting pot where nothing melted' and he continues 'You do not live in America, no such place exists' (16), suggesting instead that their identity is fundamentally constructed by the country and culture that the predecessors left. In this sweeping denial of America as a category, as a unity and as an identity lies a fundamental premise that the play sets out to investigate. Does America exist and, if so, what constitutes it? (Nielsen, 2012: 42)

Rabbi goes on with claiming that such journey's like Sarah's do not exist anymore, but there is now a new kind of journey into 'becoming,' into creation of identities. The world is different now, and what is at stake is not one American identity of a 'melting pot,' but a whole scale of different identities each and all changing all the time. And the audience will see how each character within the play changes and follows a route of their own journey into 'becoming':

> You can never make that crossing that she made, for such Great Voyages in this world do not any more exist. But every day of your lives the miles that voyage between that place and this one you cross. Every day. You understand me? In you that journey is (Kushner, 1993a: 10-11).

On the other hand, in the second prologue the World's Oldest Living Bolshevik, Aleksii Antedilluvianovich Prelapsarianov, asks questions about history and change:

> "The Great Question before us is: Are we doomed? The Great Question before us is: Will the past release us? The Great Question before us is: Can we Change? In Time?" (Kushner, 1993b: 13)

The Old Bolshevik's speech, indeed, marks the end of another era as the Soviet Union is collapsing and Gorbachev is trying to restore communism calling for change through 'Perestroika'. A theory to reorder the chaos does not exist the Old Bolshevik claims, and therefore supports stasis. However; the whole play will answer this question; stasis is impossible, it is an endless journey into becoming for all beings, and change is inevitable.

"Can we live with difference and still share universal values, or is the nature of difference such that it will always be divisive?" (Kushner, 2016: 3) This question Tony Kushner asks in his recent anthropological study he conducted on race and ethnicity in Britain's minority groups is also a crucial question that embodies the whole play in *Angels in America*. It is possible to explain Kushner's approach with the Deleuzian concept of "becoming," (in the "fabulation" theory it is used as "becoming-other"). In *Angels in America* gender politics is dealt with as part of power relationships, and in a broader context it is taken as conservative absolutism versus inclusive multiplicity in the play:

> The battle is between this assertive, conservative absolutism and the inclusive vision of a Walt Whitman, the utopianism of an American project based on equality and variety, a promiscuous mixing of souls. No wonder, then, that sex should become a ruling metaphor as well as a central subject and that metaphors of flow, intermixing, transmutation should become the currency of a play which in itself refuses conventional limits, mixing different modes, allowing scenes to interpenetrate, as

> Kushner impregnates the body politic with antibodies that have the power to overwhelm a political virus which threatens to destroy what it claims to celebrate. Reagan represents law and order, a specious sense of moral fixity. Against this Kushner pitches not so much anarchy, which he distrusts politically, seeing Reagan's apparent faith in order as concealing a deeper anarchic and destructive impulse, as dualism, multiplicity (Bigsby, 2000a: 110).

While discussing the concept of "becoming" in *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari explain that human relationships are constructed through categories, classifications that we call "binary oppositions," these structures bring about power relationships; however, they claim, multiplicity is immanent, and it is already within us:

> A becoming-animal always involves a pack, a band, a population, a peopling, in short, a multiplicity. We sorcerers have always known that. It may very well be that other agencies, moreover very different from one another, have a different appraisal of the animal. One may retain or extract from the animal certain characteristics: species and genera, forms and functions, etc. Society and the State need animal characteristics to use for classifying people; natural history and science need characteristics in order to classify the animals themselves. Serialism and structuralism either graduate characteristics according to their resemblances, or order them according to their differences. Animal characteristics can be mythic or scientific. […] What we are saying is that every animal is fundamentally a band, a pack. That it has pack modes, rather than characteristics, even if further distinctions within these modes are called for. It is at this point that the human being encounters the animal. We do not become animal without a fascination for the pack, for multiplicity. A fascination for the outside? Or is the multiplicity that fascinates us already related to a multiplicity dwelling within us? (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 239-240)

Gendered identities are one of these classifications in human societies to maintain power relationships. However, nature is much more complex than a simple binary opposition between sexes. Sexual difference can be understood in relation to the concept of "becoming":

> The difference is that contagion, epidemic, involves terms that are entirely heterogeneous: for example, a human being, an animal, and a bacterium, a virus, a molecule, a microorganism. Or in the case of the truffle, a tree, a fly, and a pig. These combinations are neither genetic nor structural; they are interkingdoms, unnatural participations. That is the only way Nature operates—against itself. This is a far cry from filiative production or hereditary reproduction, in which the only differences retained are a simple duality between sexes within the same species, and small modifications across generations. For us, on the other hand, there are as many sexes as there are terms in symbiosis, as many differences as elements contributing to a process of contagion. We know that many beings pass between a man and a woman;

> they come from different worlds, are borne on the wind, form rhizomes around roots; they cannot be understood in terms of production, only in terms of becoming. The Universe does not function by filiation. All we are saying is that animals are packs, and that packs form, develop, and are transformed by contagion (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 242).

None of the binary oppositions are natural but constructed in order to maintain a relationship of domination. The one with the power dominates the Other. Fixed identities are created so that binary oppositions persist, and maintenance of power relationships could be provided. Therefore; subversion of identity positions, stereotypes and playing with fixed categories is revolutionary turning power relationships upside down. The concept of "becoming" in that sense is important:

> Becoming-other is a passage between categories that undermines both poles of an opposition. Becoming-woman is a passage between the categories of man and woman, just as becoming-child is a passage between those of adult and child. Because the poles are unevenly weighted, all becomings move away from the dominant and toward the dominated – hence, there is no becoming- male, becoming- white, becoming- adult, or becoming-human. A becoming- woman or a becoming- animal, however, is not a matter of imitating a woman or mimicking a dog or cat. A becoming-woman establishes a 'zone of proximity . . . an objective zone of indetermination or uncertainty', a 'proximity, an indiscernibility' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 273, 279), between 'man' and 'woman'. The object of such a mutative undoing of male and female identities is the creation of a 'line of flight' toward some hitherto unmapped gendering of the human, just as becoming-animal is a passage between the categories of the human and the animal toward something new (Bogue, 2010: 20).

In fabulation, becoming-other means involving the Other in the story. *Angels in America* involves the story of the Other employing binary oppositions not just for gender positions but also for many other categories: "Throughout *Angels in America*, the utopia/dystopia coupling (wherein disaster becomes simultaneously the marker for and incitement to think Paradise) plays itself out through a host of binary oppositions: heaven/hell, forgiveness/retribution, communitarianism/individualism, spirit/flesh, pleasure/pain, beauty/decay, future/past, homosexuality/heterosexuality, rationalism/indeterminacy, migration/ staying put, progress/stasis, life/death" (Savran, 1995: 212). Employing all these binaries and disrupting them by giving voice to the Other *Angels in America* is in a constant state of "becoming." One of the key figures, in that sense, is the Angel her/himself. The Angel is a figure of "becoming-other"

incorporating many contradictions through his/her body, thwarting the distinctions between the sexes. Angel becomes a deterritorialization of gendered bodies ironically through the celestial body s/he possesses, which at the same time makes the situation utopic.

> In Kushner's reading of Benjamin, the hermaphroditic Angel becomes the most crucial site for the elaboration of contradiction. Because her/his body is the one on which an impossible-and utopian-sexual conjunction is played out, s/he decisively undermines the distinction between the heterosexual and the homosexual. With her/his "eight vaginas" and "Bouquet of Phalli" (2:48), s/he represents an absolute otherness, the impossible Other that fulfills the longing for both the maternal and paternal (or in Lacanian terms, both demand and the Law). On the one hand, as the maternal "Other," s/he is constituted by "[d]emand . . . as already possessing the 'privilege' of satisfying needs, that is to say, the power of depriving them of that alone by which they are satisfied."15 On the other hand, "[a]s the law of symbolic functioning," s/he simultaneously represents the "Other embodied in the figure of the symbolic father," "not a person but a place, the locus of law, language and the symbolic.""6 The impossible conjunction of the maternal and the paternal, s/he provides Prior with sexual pleasure of celestial quality-and gives a new meaning to safe sex. At the same time, s/he also fills and completes subjectivity, being the embodiment of and receptacle for Prior's "Released Female Essence" (2:48) (Savran, 1995: 212).

Identities are constructed when intensities are reduced to a signifier: “Identity occurs with the reduction of intensities to a signifier, when we imagine the intensity as the image of something—when we think our love of apple pie signifies our Americanness” (Colebrook, 2002: 45). And desire is important in the formation of identities; however, “Desire is originally productive, connective and intensive, the investment in qualities that are neither masculine nor feminine but singular” (Colebrook, 2002: 45). Desire originally brings multiplicity instead of singularity. The Angel figure is the embodiment of “a thousand tiny sexes” turning the history of desire upside down. “According to Deleuze and Guattari, there is a history of desire that culminates in the reduction of ‘a thousand tiny sexes’ to the male/female binary” (Colebrook, 2002: 46). Yet, it is impossible to fix the Angel into that binary. “[T]he plays refuse to interpret sexuality, desire, or sexual behavior within a binary opposition, conceding that sex has many meanings, sometimes many conflicting meanings in the same sexual act” (Long, 2005: 157). This different interpretations of sex and sexual desire is pointed out in the

Angel's talk while at the same time giving Prior an orgasm. Angel's description of desire as flow reminds Deleuzian concept of desire described as immanent flow:

> You are Mere Flesh. I I I I am Utter Flesh,
> Density of Desire, the Gravity of Skin:
> What makes the Engine of Creation Run?
> Not Physics But Ecstatics Makes the Engine Run . . .
> […]
> The Pulse, the Pull, the Throb, the Ooze . . .
> […]
> Priapsis, Dilation, Engorgement, Flow:
> The Universe Aflame with Angelic Ejaculate . . . (Kushner, 1993b: 39-40)

Similarly, Kushner himself emphasizes the plurality of sexual experience and sexual desire:

> Sex has brought me joy. My people, my community defined by desire. The sweet Joy of Belonging. These are the honeyed leavings of my longings. Sex can be anaesthetic and awakening, abject and exalted, retaliatory and kind, dismal, angelic and pathetic, and all at the same time sometimes— sort of like the twenty hours of the Ring Cycle compressed into a few minutes thrashing on a bed (Kushner quoted in Long, 2005: 157).

According to Deleuze and Guattari reduction of desire serves capitalism; however, desire is universal, it includes variation and difference. Life begins, and from the moment of its process of beginning it constantly changes and is in a never-ending process of "becoming." Before capitalism, there is desire:

> In Deleuze and Guattari's sense, 'life' is a tendency towards difference, creativity, variation, becoming; any explanation of life that refers to a unit or measure – such as capital's quantities of labour or capital – has taken a production or effect as a cause. Life begins not as quantities of this or that identifiable substance, but as quantities of force which, in relation, produce identifiable or discernible qualities. Before we have capitalism's variables – so much labour power, so much capital, varying in relation to technology and efficiency – there are just desiring potentials. If there is a truth or universalism to capital it is the truth of desire (Colebrook, 2009: 20-21).

The prospect of gay sexuality is disturbing and threatening for the capitalist since its purpose is not reproduction; gay body is the "body without organs" because it is the plane where desire takes place without any need for a reference. "The BwO is *the field*

of immanence of desire, the *plane of consistency* specific to desire (with desire defined as a process of production without reference to any exterior agency, whether it be a lack that hollows it out or a pleasure that fills it)" (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 154). But desire of gay body is not only linked to pleasure or hedonism either. It is multiplicity and immanent flow just as in the Angel's description in *Angels in America*. In that sense capitalism is a reterritorialisation, and the prospect of gay relationships is a deterritorialisation. "[Capitalism] at once frees relations from external bodies – for anything can be an object of exchange, including religious ideas, historical images, academic prestige – while reducing all exchange or flow to the differential relation between a body's productive capacity and capital" (Colebrook, 2009: 20). The connection of heterosexual bodies with desire is also deterritorialisation, but when it results in reproduction and family, it creates new territories. Capitalism utilizes from this to recreate itself, but a gay body is the plane where it needs to find new ways of territorializing.

Nevertheless, desire is politically coded: "The very pleasures of a society—what we eat, how we move, what we wear, the commodities we desire, the very desire for commodities as such—are politically coded" (Colebrook, 2002: 46). Politically coded desire creates binarism and identity problems such as race and gender issues. Another binary, difference and sameness, assimilation and marginalization, in American society is also an issue dealt with in *Angels in America*:

> For Angels in America, Joe Pitt and Roy Cohn represent the worst excesses of assimilationism, while Hannah Pitt seems to maintain both her Mormon beliefs and a rapport with the morally marginalized. Louis, who is an almost cartoonishly assimilated secular Jew, seems soulless. Prior and Belize are certainly the most significantly marginalized characters. One is a drag enthusiast with AIDS; the other, an Afro-Puerto Rican, yet they both concede to some of the demands of the larger dominant culture (Long, 2005: 170).

Hence, the title of the play *Angels in America* comes from a discussion between Belize and Louise where issues of race, identities and politics connects with history of America. With his liberal attitude Louis claims that for being a relatively new settlement compared to Europe, America has less racial issues, and its only problem is

about political power: “there are no gods here, no ghosts and spirits in America, there are no angels in America, no spiritual past, no racial past, there's only the political, and the decoys and the ploys to maneuver around the inescapable battle of politics[…]” (Kushner, 1993a: 92) According to Louis “no angels in America” means not having a past in America to cause problems such as race. Louis’s assimilation is to such an extent that he even forgets about his Jewish background and the history of Jewish marginalization in American history. His claim depends on the fact that in Europe people have the roots and ethnicities; however, in America problem of race is about winning the political debate. Belize objects to this claim calling it “racist bullshit” (Kushner, 1993a: 93), and the whole play refutes the claim of an idealized America without a history of racism; she indeed has a history, a history piling the ruins of the past.

Kushner refers to Walter Benjamin’s Angelus Novus exactly for this purpose. There are definitely “angels” in America. It has a history of ruins; racial, sexual, and economic issues of its past piling on top of each other. The past pushing the present from backwards while the future is pulling it forwards, Angelus Novus stands as an allegory of America. According to Benjamin time does not exist as progress, and he also goes against the idea of a cause-effect relationship which assumes purpose in history; instead, there is discontinuity and gaps in the construction of history. Benjamin’s concept of history offers citations and montage as disruptive, subversive powers against mainstream history writing. “And if it is not in the power of the historian to cite integrally every one of its moments, he can nevertheless wrench some of them from the homogeneous and empty time in which various forms of historicism put them” (Benjamin, 2006: 148). While citation breaks the continuum, montage brings pieces from the past in a state of simultaneity:

> In this perspective, the dialectical reinscription within an actual context of reception clears away the disturbing strangeness of past vestiges in order to turn them to the patrimony of the present. Citations are no more those autonomous and rebel fragments, but, wrapped up in a mass of commentaries, the instruments of opportune retrospective filiations.
> […] To the traditionalizing effects of commentary, Benjamin thus opposes the citation as shock , which shatters the continuum and which does not resolve itself in any

> solution of continuity; and, on the other hand, the citation as montage – the literary equivalent of the collectible item – which puts the fragments of the past in a relation of simultaneity. Montage is this construction (different from any recomposition under the form of a whole or of a sequence) in which the fragments come into connection in order to form a constellation intelligible to the present, because no kind of continuity exists between them and it (Benjamin, 2006: 147).

Benjamin sets it as the task of the historical materialist to tell the untold story of the oppressed:

> Tradition as the discontinuity of the past in opposition to history as the continuity of events . . . The history of the oppressed is a discontinuity. The task of history is to get hold of the tradition of the oppressed (W. Benjamin quoted in Benjamin, 2006: 152).

The untold history of the oppressed becomes transmissible by making it visible through different techniques such as citation and montage. This constitutes a subversive relationship with the present as it gives voice to the negated and ignored:

> Therefore, it must be admitted that this tradition is not transmitted, in the proper sense of the term. It is conveyed by different linear traditions, inscribed within the reverse or the lining of a process of transmission that is foreign to it. Therefore, it becomes transmissible as soon as it is wrenched from the continuum. The citation, the collection, the montage are the privileged modes of this transmissibility: breaking up the historical continuity, they rescue from oblivion all that the powerful occludes or rejects, the scrap of the triumphant history which can constitute the material of a subversive relationship with the present and contest it in its basic egoism; exploiting this material, the ethic injunction that exists in it is deployed in every direction and addresses those who want to listen (Benjamin, 2006: 154).

On the other hand, the other part of "becoming-other" in Deleuze and Guattari is related with time as well. Just as Benjamin refers to discontinuity, and disruption in history through citations and montage, in Deleuze and Guattari "becoming-other" is also associated with the disruption of ordinary, commonsense time. In that sense Kushner's use of fragments from the past and his employment of a montage technique are disruption of ordinary time and history; therefore, are in line with both Benjamin and Deleuze & Guattari. In Deleuze and Guattari, in terms of the concept of time, "becoming" is just in between "that has already happened" and "that is yet to happen." That is exactly the point where Angelus Novus stands as well. Claire Colebrook

explains this through the example of Nietsche's famous statement and its connection with time:

> Consider Nietzsche's response to the epochal event of which he was convinced that few in Europe in the late nineteenth century were even conscious, let alone aware of what it meant: the death of God.8 In this sense, the death of God is something that has already happened, but also something that is yet to come. It raises the historical question par excellence – what has happened? – but also the prospective, diagnostic question: what is going to happen? (Colebrook, 2009: 43)

Deleuze's concept of time all together is a process and becoming. However, when process is considered what is at stake is not a single one, but processes that make multiple times. There are as many processes as there are perspectives. Therefore, his concept of time is based on difference and multiplicity. It is through desire that intensities form connections, and this is the situation even on a molecular level. "Matter, as intensity, has a tendency of desire: this means that it is oriented beyond itself, not to something it lacks (for that would be the desire of one thing for another), but towards other intensities or forces of desire" (Colebrook, 2009: 11). Organisms are results of connections. However, connections also form divergence, which is called disjunctions. "Any organism is, therefore, a composition of connections – the entering into relation of material capacities – along with a series of disjunctions, such that these connections create lines of divergence: the eye and light produce a seeing machine, while other lines of encounter – such as bats and their negotiation of space through soundwaves – produce different lines" (Colebrook, 2009: 12). Connections produce wholes, but human beings assume the reverse, that is, there was connection between wholes: "We mistakenly see history as the relation among bodies (often human bodies), rather than as a field of connections from which bodies are composed" (Colebrook, 2009: 12). Just as in Benjamin's concept of history he suggests the historical materialist to focus on fragments of history rather than totality, Deleuze offers micro-history as it becomes possible to understand connections which produce powers: "What a body is can be understood only through a micro-history, which analyses the production of powers from connections of forces" (Colebrook, 2009: 12). Series of becomings and multiplicities forming multiplicities of micro-histories Deleuze's concept of time is revolutionary and anti-conservative:

> So the transformations implied by Deleuze's multiple view of time are all irreversible and asymmetrical. There is no going back because the initial conditions have been changed by the process such that even if we were to reproduce, for instance, an initial set of objects, the place and function of those objects within the processes will have changed. In turn, this is a first clue as to the radical nature of Deleuze's philosophy of time: it is inherently anti-conservative and anti-reactionary due to its inbuilt and unavoidable asymmetries of time. There is no represented and original past to go back to. There is no eternal realm to escape to in the future, where time stands still. Every process is multiple, irreducible to others and free of claims to higher sources or pure origins. There is no way back and no way up and out. There is only the demand to be worthy of the complex processes making all things become together, but never as one (Williams, 2011: 4).

Deleuze's concept of history sees an important potentiality in history. There is a capacity for deterritorialisation when those micro-histories are foregrounded:

> Considered in terms of history, we might say that the French, English, Russian and American Revolutions could have occurred differently, had other bodies and other locales come into play, but we could also say that there is something like the Idea of revolution, which occurs as a potentiality for all social bodies. While this Idea is never exhausted in any actual instance it gives us some-thing like an essence: not essence as a stable form – where all revolutions would share some common core feature – but an essence of variation, where all revolutions express a power to differ: from cultural revolutions, to economic and industrial revolutions, to failed bourgeois revolutions. Deleuze and Guattari conclude *Anti-Oedipus* by referring to the 'abstract subjective essence' of life rendered evident in capitalism (Deleuze and Guattari 1977: 300); this is not man as a proper being, but a capacity for deterritorialisation – or the expansive creativity of desire made possible through the interconnection and redirection of flows of productivity, released from any privileged locus (Deleuze and Guattari 1977: 27). Historical analysis is at once an examination of variation, looking at the ways a potentiality is actualised in particular assemblages, at the same time as it intuits these singular powers, which Deleuze and Guattari name variously, but which include revolution, terror, despotism, the State, exchange, labour, race, sexuality. The point of history is to see these potentialities beyond their current Oedipal forms (Colebrook, 2009: 17-18).

Indeed, *Angels in America* becomes a deterritorialization presenting an alternative history of the gay community, and also focusing on different groups as Jews, Mormons, and black people. "In Anti-Oedipus, one of the most important of these potentialities is race, for it is race or the distribution of bodies across space, with a reduction of multiple intensive differences to disjunctions (this or that), that opens the process of human territorialisation from which, eventually, the universal white man of reason will be coded" (Colebrook, 2009: 18). In that sense, Belize is a

deterritorialization in *Angels* as he is a paragon of virtue, “the play’s trustworthy voice of Truth” (Kalb, 2011: 91), which is something not expected in a white dominant world of representation. Desire plays an important part in this potentiality of deterritorialization. It directs the flows of production and gives way for the new. Change is possible through desire. Kushner’s *Angels in America* appreciates the role of desire in change and creation. David Savran explains the connection of desire, time and change in *Angels* in an apt way:

> Most important, the time of "progress, migration, motion" and "modernity" is also, in Prior's formulation, the time of "desire," because it is this last all-too-human characteristic that produces modernity (2:132). Without desire (for change, utopia, the Other), there could be no history (Savran, 1995: 214).

Although David Savran criticizes Kushner for supporting a neo-Hegelian positivist progress by saying, “It is the time of "Change" (2:13) so fervently desired by Comrade Prelapsarianov and the "neo-Hegelian positivist sense of constant historical progress towards happiness or perfection" so precious to Louis (1:25)” (Savran, 1995: 214), and claiming that this promise was fulfilled at the end of the play through the announcement of the end of Cold War and arrival of change by Louis, Kushner, indeed, brings maybe the harshest criticism to Louis who is the spokesperson of a neo-Hegelian sense of progress in the play. Liberal pluralist Louis who believes in the big ideals of America and democracy, the idea of freedom that only a few can enjoy, is actually a man who is all words and theory but in practice something else leaving Prior when he needs Louis the most. Indicating the contradiction between his theory and practice the ‘truth teller’ Belize criticizes Louis’ “big ideas” : “Big Ideas are all you love” (Kushner, 1993b: 94), Louis has all those big ideas and all talk, but in reality he cannot even support the person he loves in time of need and walks out on him. The play provides a deterritorialization of all “big ideas.” Kushner’s this attitude is also true for his elaboration of other characters in the play, which turns out to be his questioning of ‘grand theories,’:

> “The characters in the play who might have otherwise cared for Prior and Harper are caught up in cognitive structures so heady, so denatured from concrete human need—

> Marxist Equality, Hegelian Progress, American Justice, Mormon Redemption—as to lead almost inevitably to abandonment. The play puts these grand "Theories" on display only to interrogate their success in describing "the world"" (Sierra, 2016: 23).

What is discussed in the play is rather whether all these "big ideas" can provide any ethical and humane action when the question is someone else's suffering: "Within Kushner's literary imagination, the final test for these "Theories" is whether or not they can render visible Prior's suffering and structure a mode of ethical response toward it" (Sierra, 2016: 23). In the play Kushner focuses on the potentiality to change and in that sense, he has a redemptive relation to past. What all the grand theories defend is thwarted and instead a mutual way towards insight is created through "threshhold of revelation" as an example in Harper and Prior's mutual dream scene:

> as epistemic expansion: they are taken to the "threshold of revelation" of the other. This inter-ontological space exceeds—indeed, explodes —the comprehensive (yet uncomprehending) grasp of "Theory." Harper and Prior acknowledge that their "churches" offer cognitions inadequate to the sublimity of the human Other, and this then propels them into a space of moral awareness that might otherwise have been subsumed into the effacing logic, the relentless "plastic forms," of theoretical abstraction (Sierra, 2016: 24-25).

In Deleuzian sense this" threshold" is a space where a process of becoming takes place, it is the creation of the new when grand theories fail. Two people reach an awareness through a different form of mutual understanding. This kind of "magic" Kushner uses on the stage, such as two people meeting in a dream/hallucination, is itself in the threshold as a creative theatrical element, since it is neither totally real, nor totally magic in its presentation; as a result, makes the audience question real life experience:

> I think there's value to the power of a really, sort of almost overwhelmingly convincing illusion that's sometimes both working and not working at the same time. . . . You believe it and don't believe it simultaneously, which engages a certain part of your brain that has to do with being skeptical about the nature of what you're experiencing in life (Kushner quoted in Hutchison, 2010: 15).

This threshhold scene between Prior and Harper and all the other split scenes, along with ghosts visiting from the past are instances of "becoming-other" as they disrupt ordinary concept of time and bring time as a concept of flow. The split scenes and

montage technique Kushner employs reminds cinematographic montage that Deleuze favors:

> Cinema takes us out of the homogeneous and regulated world of a single perspective. We no longer see time as the line formed on the movement. In our ordinary perception, we homogenize time; because we assume that there is only one flow of time and that this is our time flow, we organize the world from our own time. But cinema gives us a time in the order that is impersonal, uniform, abstract or imperceptible. Cinematographic assembly clearly places one perspective or the flow of time next to another, showing us the differentiation of time or the different rhythms that make up the whole of time (Serttek, 2013: 50).

Cinema has a deterritorializing effect as it has the potential to change life supporting difference and multiplicity. The cinematic view has become independent of any individual observer, there are multiple views. "Deleuze says that cinema can present images better than natural perception because in natural perception the vivid image is directed to the universe of images from one center, while the camera has the possibility to head from more than one center" (Serttek, 2013: 43-44). Thanks to these techniques time is no longer presented as linear. "Cinematic assembly clearly shows a differentiation of time or different rhythms that make up the whole time by clearly placing one perspective or the flow of time next to each other" (Türkgeldi: 117). This is why Kushner's disruption of time through cinematic montage in theater by split scenes, flashbacks (while Prior is accounting for his exchange with the Angel to Belize), his playing with the concept of time by mutual dream scenes, hallucinations, or bringing ghosts from the past shifts the center of the play and proves multiplicity and a space of becoming. These scenes open up new potentialities; therefore, deterritorializations:

> The use of split scenes allows Kushner to juxtapose the personal and the political, the real and the fantastic, and the relations between characters. The split scene technique is used to indicate simultaneity and the intertwined nature of the characters' lives and struggles. In the split scenes we see several worlds happening at once, and a reader or spectator is able to draw parallels between the two situations. The fantastical elements bring the play out of its domestic realism and allow a reader or spectator to access a grander vision of the society and world that the characters exist within (Nielsen, 2012: 20).

“[T]he breakdown of a single, enforceable chronology stands as one of the most powerful challenges to the sovereignty of the state,” for Homi Bhabha (Pratt, 2009: 9), which relates to the play’s title as “*A Gay Fantasia on National Themes”*. In *Angels in America* Kushner is subverting the single identity concept of a realistic approach through a breakdown of time; therefore, subverts the idea of a single national identity. He brings about the capacity for deterritorialization by presenting an alternative history of the Other. The play has a redemptive relation to past, which conveys a potentiality to change.

> In this vital sense, each of Kushner’s memorable characters will experience change, but more importantly, they also come to embrace dramatic transformations in their identities and values. Even the structure of *Angels* is organized around the theme of a universe and a human society receptive to the change that brings about redemption; nearly all the desperate flights from responsibility in *Millennium Approaches* are resolved in the various reconciliations in *Perestroika* (Omer-Sherman, 2007a: 87).

Representatives of liberalism and conservatism, Roy and Louis, both fail. “Neither liberalism nor conservatism (both ideologies are eloquently voiced throughout the drama) prove redemptive when conduct and conscience fail” (Omer-Sherman, 2007b: 11). Just like the pile of debris under the Angel’s feet, the past is pushing. When Harper asks the Mormon Mother mannequin in the Diorama Room of the Mormon Visitor’s Center about how people change, her answer explains that change is difficult and requires suffering:

> God splits the skin with a jagged thumbnail from throat to belly and then plunges a huge filthy hand in, he grabs hold of your bloody tubes and they slip to evade his grasp but he squeezes hard, he insists, he pulls and pulls till all your innards are yanked out and the pain! We can't even talk about that. And then he stuffs them back, dirty, tangled and torn. It's up to you to do the stitching.
> Harper: And then get up. And walk around.
> Mormon Mother: Just mangled guts pretending.
> Harper: That's how people change (Kushner, 1993b: 77-78).

Kushner actually focuses on the parallels between the Mormon experience and the Jewish one, both in exodus for their religious beliefs and both looking for a Promised Land. The tape played in the diorama show indicates these parallels: “Words such as

prophet, wilderness, desert storms, Kingdom of God, Zion, and exodus underline the parallel between the Mormon and the Biblical search for the Promised Land, while some of the expressions, like frontier wilderness, renegade Indians, and wagon trains, pertain specifically to the American settlers' experience" (Limpár, 2012: 386). Although they seem to be very different the Jewish and Mormon identities both imply fluidity wandering against a monolithic, stable identity. Therefore, their mobility is deterritorializing even though that constant change brings suffering. "In Angels' tense opposition (at times explicit and at others implied) between diasporic and Zionist identities, it is clear that Kushner privileges the expansive, open-ended identity of wandering over the narrowly proscribed politics and monolithic identity that accompanies territorialism" (Omer-Sherman, 2007b: 23). In the face of this much suffering, pain, and the pile of debris from the past, change might sound like a miracle but "just like the miracle of theater in the diorama room, may not work smoothly and demands much labor and faith on the part of the receiver, but the malfunction of the miracle, as the diorama room scene suggests, indicates a malfunctioning world and is, therefore, substantial in the process of facing problems and finding one's place in the present moment in relation to both the past and the future" (Limpár, 2012: 392). Harper's change occurs in such conditions, she faces the problem, in the end, accepts her husband's homosexuality; though difficult, she embraces change out of her suffering and on the plane she leaves for San Francisco her words eco the relationship between suffering, change and time:

> Nothing's lost forever. In this world, there is a kind of painful progress. Longing for what we've left behind, and dreaming ahead (Kushner, 1993b: 142).

Hence, in the context of *Angels* change comes with suffering and accounting for the past; as a result, 'experimenting on the real' in Deleuzian fabulation is crucial in order to find potentialities for change. This necessitates historical analysis done for the text, "a labour that involves: a diagnostic critique of forces, events, memories and documents that shape the present; an articulation of untold, erased and forgotten events; and a reconfiguration of the past that discloses present junctures of potential transformation" (Bogue, 2010: 10). Kushner's work involves not only research into

recent past of the Reagan Era, but also into McCarthyism, and diasporic Jewish culture, mythology and archaic Judaism (Pederson, 2009: 576-598), mysticism and apocalypse tradition in Jewish writing (Kilner-Johnson, 2019: 206-222) and Mormonism. Kushner digs into history just as a historical materialist should do in order to bring about change "unlike Benjamin's angel, propelled by the postlapsarian storm blowing from Paradise, Kushner uses his writing to stop, survey the wreckage, and propose ways to move forward" (Minwalla, 2002: 130). And the most important step towards change is inclusion of the Other. 'Can we accept difference?' is a crucial question in that sense. 'Can we live together with all our differences respecting the Other?' "[T]he possibility of, and the hope for, change, justice, and moral progress is always possible if we can break away from the rigid, calcified conservative-versus-liberal positions that separate us" (Fisher, 2007: 129). That is also why Louis, who has changed as well, recites Kaddish after Roy's death in the hospital room. All the characters go through a change, except the hopeless Roy Cohn but he dies at the end anyway, and the element of "legending" in Deleuzian fabulation is fulfilled as the characters and their actions represent the past, present and the future:

> The past, as previously indicated, is symbolized by the death of an elderly Jewish woman; the present by the greed of the Reagan era, by Cohn, and by a general loss of faith and loyalty, as demonstrated in the behavior of Joe and Louis. The future is represented by a choice between destruction and change best exemplified at the end of *Millennium Approaches* by the startling appearance of an angel, who may be bringing news of either salvation or apocalypse (Fisher, 1995-96: 30).

Can society include gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered individuals along with people of different skin colors or religious backgrounds? And can theatre help reinforce that target? The solution Kushner provides to these questions, both through his theme and the political role of his theatre, is collectivity, which is also part of "legending" since characters become signs of collectivity in the play and represent how their interaction could be changed (Bogue, 2010: 10).

Prior turns down the Angel's offer to become the Prophet and work on to stop progress:

> We can't just stop. We're not rocks—progress, migration, motion is . . . modernity. It's *animate*, it's what living things do. We desire. Even if all we desire is stillness, it's still desire *for*. Even if we go faster than we should. We can't *wait*. And wait for what? God . . . (Kushner, 1993b: 130)

There is no time or history without desire. And life is not possible without desire. Progress is "irreversible becoming" in the concept of time:

> Time is actualised in terms of a series of before and after; but time is also the potential (with each new addition to the series) to redefine the whole: so we need to see Bacon as after Cezanne, and Kant as after Hume, as well as seeing capitalism as a social machine following primitivism and despotism. Were we not to do so we would lose the sense of life as desire, as non-linear in its creation of itself with each new encounter, encounters that alter the very domain of the possible. There is no contradiction whatsoever in the commitment to non-linerarity along-side a strong sense of irreversible becoming (Colebrook, 2009: 26).

Without sense of linearity, people will lose the desire for creating the new, the better or change. There is desire for connection, and with each new connection that linearity at the same time becomes non-linear, which happens to be the potential to redefine the whole, a sense of irreversible becoming. That desire for connection also calls for collectivity as a way out of suffering, especially of oppressed groups:

> Gay rights may be obtainable, on however broad or limited a basis, but liberation depends on a politics that goes beyond, not an antipolitics. Our unhappiness as scared queer children doesn't only isolate us, it also politicizes us. It inculcates in us a desire for connection all the stronger because we have experienced its absence. Our suffering teaches us solidarity; or it should (Kushner, 1994).

The play ends with an emphasis on collectivity as Kushner believes in the power of social activism. Even Roy Cohn is taken into the community he rejects: "It is here that AIDS intervenes and finally forces Roy Cohn into a community that he had battled tooth and nail, and this is the great irony of the play: Roy Cohn is accepted into a gay community that he has rejected by a black nurse who is a former drag queen" (Nielsen, 2012: 35). On the other hand, wrestling with the Angel and getting his blessing for more life Prior "takes on a new, collective identity by holding out against the Angel" (A. Solomon quoted in Pederson, 2009: 589). Progress is inevitable and he prefers to

be part of the collective movement for change. At the end, a new type of family gathers in Bethesta Fountain, the fountain of healing, in New York City; it is a queer family and seems like potential change proven. “The great work begins” (Kushner, 1993b: 146), says Prior blessing the audience because the work is not only his but also to be shared by the audience outside the theatre:

> Prior predicts that “we”—the members of the queer family—“will be citizens,” but to achieve this status, “each and every one” must devise a new form of citizenship and work to construct a redeemed America that can gather gay and straight, black and white, Mormon, Christian, and Jew into a collective identity precisely through the act of quarreling over that identity (Freedman, 2008: 58).

Indeed, gay and straight, black and white, Mormon, Christian, and Jew identities are gathered in the epilogue of Angels in America, it is a collectivity not defined by sameness but difference, which seems utopic, but Kushner sees utopia, that potentiality for change, as the real function of theater:

> A method of change I think can be agreed upon. But utopia is incredibly important. I think that's the real function of theater. Utopia is the unreachable paradise and you don't have to create it within a generation or two, but it gives you a sense of where you're aiming at. And a few steps short of utopia there's the notion of a just, ordered society within a just, ordered world (Minwalla, 2002: 155-156).

CHAPTER III

3. Racial Conflicts on the Stage

3.1. “A Raisin in the Sun” by Lorraine Hansberry

3.1.1. Plot:

Lorraine Hansberry’s play A Raisin in the Sun depicts an African American family, Youngers, in Southside Chicago living in ghetto life conditions in segregation. The action takes place at an indefinite time between the World War II and the present. The Youngers are living in a dark, cramped two-bedroom apartment infested with roaches, and the neighborhood surrounded by rats. There are four adults and a youngster living in the small apartment; the mother Lena, Lena’s son Walter Lee and daughter Beneatha, her daughter-in-law Ruth, and Travis, the grandson. Although three people work in the family, they do not have the economy to move to a bigger place, and Travis has to sleep on the couch in the living room. The play begins with the family members waiting for the arrival of the cheque which comes from the insurance company after the death of Lena’s husband Big Walter. All the family members have different dreams regarding how to spend the insurance money. Lena wants a bigger house for her family with a garden she can also enjoy her time. Lena’s son Walter Lee wants to invest the money in a liquor store, and they have conflict with Mama as she does not consider it a proper business as a Christian and as a family. Beneatha, on the other hand, wants the money to go to medical school and become a doctor. Ruth is torn between supporting her husband’s dream and moving to a bigger and more comfortable house with a higher quality of life. Later Lena learns that Ruth is pregnant and secretly thinking of getting an abortion since they do not have proper conditions; therefore, when she receives the cheque Lena goes and invests some part of the money in a house in the suburb of Clybourne Park occupied by only white people. It is the only house that she can afford in order to take the family out of their current house. Seeing her son Walter angry and self-destructive with alcohol neglecting his family after her purchase, Lena decides to give the rest of the insurance money to Walter so that he can invest in his liquor store dream and asks Walter to spare some of the money for Beneatha’s college education. While the family is packing

for the move, a representative, Karl Lindner, from the Clybourne Park Improvement Association visits them and offers the family to renounce their decision in return for a cash payment collected by the neighbors of the area as they do not want any black family living in their suburb. Walter and Beneatha ridicule Lindner and reject the offer of Clybourne Park residents. But soon after Walter finds out that he has fallen for a scam of his friend; the remainder of the insurance money which he invested all including Beneatha's portion is stolen by one of the partners who ran away without any trace. When this comes to surface on the day of the moving, devastated Walter calls Mr. Lindner and invites him back again to accept his previous offer. The family members argue with each other over the incident and also Walter's decision, and they ask Walter not to accept the offer. In the meantime, the Clybourne Park representative appears, Walter does not want his son Travis to see what is going to happen, but Mama urges him to stay. Walter cannot accept the offer in front of his son, instead he renounces it and they proceed with the moving out of the ghetto.

3.1.2. Analysis of "A Raisin in the Sun"

First presented by Philip Rose and David J. Cogan at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre, New York in 1959, *A Raisin in the Sun* by Lorraine Hansberry won New York Drama Critics Circle Award. Lorraine Hansberry was the first female African American writer who won a Pulitzer Prize and her play was the first play by an African American female playwright that was produced in Broadway. "Time in the context of bringing to Broadway the first play by a black (young and unknown) woman, to be directed, moreover, by another unknown black "first," in a theater were black audiences virtually did not exist—and where, in the entire history of the American stage, there had never been a serious *commercially successful* black drama!" (Nemiroff, 1994: 6) African American experience was not totally new on Broadway; however, American stage was changing towards accepting dramas that criticize American values and ways of living:

> The black American was not a stranger to Broadway, though the Great White Way was not inappropriately named. Langston Hughes's racial melodrama of 1935, *Mulatto*, secured a successful run, while Theodore Ward's *Our Lan'* appeared in 1946 and Louis Peterson's *Take a Giant Step* in 1953–4. Broadway, however, was hardly a natural home for dramas that contested, as Hughes's and Ward's drama had done, the values and practices of American society. But the mood was changing. During the fifties and sixties the plight of black Americans was back on the agenda, put there by ordinary black Americans no longer willing to accept second-class citizenship. In a way *A Raisin in the Sun* was a classic statement of civil rights liberalism (Bigby, 2000b: 277) (Bigsby, 2000b: 277).

Hansberry was an educated black woman, which was out of ordinary for her time. She wanted to be intellectually challenged and politically active as a student: "Breaking with her family's tradition of attending southern black colleges, she chose the University of Wisconsin at Madison, a predominantly white institution, where she integrated her dormitory, becoming the first black student to live there, and became politically active" (Wilkerson, 1999: 138). Later moving to New York Hansberry started working as a writer for a periodical called Freedom, mostly reporting about Africa. Not wanting to limit herself she started writing plays and sketches. "Most of these works focused on racial oppression, but on occasion, a strong female character would break through" (Wilkerson, 1999: 139). She was deeply influenced by Simone

de Beauvoir's work *The Second Sex* and shaped her activism accordingly. "Stimulated by de Beauvoir's powerful work and her own experience, Hansberry wrote letters to lesbian and gay publications condemning homophobia, even as she attacked the oppression of blacks and the dangers of a nuclear age, and emphasized the need for activist intellectuals" (Wilkerson, 1999: 139). Civil Rights Movement during her time and emphasis on non-violent resistance provided the context for the wide acceptance of her play *A Raisin in the Sun*. Hansberry developed her theme for the play from a Langston Hughes poem: "Drawing from her knowledge of working-class black families who rented her father's apartments and with whose children she attended school, Hansberry crafted a realistic play that eloquently explored a theme from another Langston Hughes poem, ``Harlem" (from Montage of a Dream Deferred), which asks: ``What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun? . . . Or does it explode?"" (Wilkerson, 1999: 140).

Through her realistic play Hansberry focuses on the effects of racism, segregation and discrimination on black people while at the same time criticizing bourgeois values via the theme of American dream and its invalidity for black people and presenting a critique of patriarchal structure by way of an untraditional character, Beneatha. Disturbing facts of ghetto life for a working-class black family is depicted through realistic characters who try to survive under these conditions and try to draw their path for a better future. And the purpose of this realism is not only to reflect "real life" but also to change it towards a better version, which makes the play political. That's why Lorraine Hansberry says, "The realistic playwright states not only what is, but what can and should be" (Hansberry quoted in Bigby, 2000b: 276). Although the realistic depictions of the play is a limitation compared to the aesthetic radicalism and experimental spirit of the period in theatre, early modern period of black theatre arrives historically later to the white dominant theatrical environment; therefore, it is a fact that under those circumstances even the arrival of an example of a play about black people by a black writer on Broadway is revolutionary. In fact, the play will make way for more experimental examples of black theatre, like Adrienne Kennedy's *Funnyhouse of a Negro* in 1964, just a short time after *A Raisin*'s initiation in Broadway. However, Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun* is a political play on racism

which thematically replaces capitalist desire with a desire for freedom and dismantles white domination through a radical act towards desegregation.

It is crucial to understand the social-political context of segregation, Chicago ghettoes, racist discourse and the Civil Rights Movement in order to reflect on Hansberry's play *A Raisin in the Sun*. Hansberry wants the audience to learn about the 'truth' of African American living and draws the attention to the subject rather than the form; as Bigby says "It is an exercise in truth-telling in which subject takes precedence over form" (Bigby, 2000b: 276). The detailed description of Hansberry's realistic stage setting at the very beginning of the play depicts how ghetto life confines black people. Here everything is old, and gloomy, and the setting is described as having human feelings to represent the state of being the occupants are in. Even the furnishings are 'tired,' the carpet 'worn' out and 'weary' and 'depressing,' and just like black identity the furnishings and the light fight back:

> The YOUNGER living room would be a comfortable and well-ordered room if it were not for a number of indestructible contradictions to this state of being. Its furnishings are typical and undistinguished and their primary feature now is that they have clearly had to accommodate the living of too many people for too many years—and they are tired.
> [...]
> Now the once loved pattern of the couch upholstery has to fight to show itself from under acres of crocheted doilies and couch covers which have themselves finally come to be more important than the upholstery. And here a table or a chair has been moved to disguise the worn places in the carpet; but the carpet has fought back by showing its weariness, with depressing uniformity, elsewhere on its surface.
>
> Weariness has, in fact, won in this room. Everything has been polished, washed, sat on, used, scrubbed too often. All pretenses but living itself have long since vanished from the very atmosphere of this room.
>
> Moreover, a section of this room, for it is not really a room unto itself, though the landlord's lease would make it seem so, slopes backward to provide a small kitchen area, where the family prepares the meals that are eaten in the living room proper, which must also serve as dining room. The single window that has been provided for these "two" rooms is located in this kitchen area. The sole natural light the family may enjoy in the course of a day is only that which fights its way through this little window (Hansberry, 1994: 23-24).

Bigsby observes a parallel between the setting and the characters in Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun*. People in the house are getting old and are tired and

weary just like the furniture. Moreover, their life is dark just like the apartment with lack of proper sunshine, and they are trapped in this life like a rat is trapped:

> There is a parallel between the setting and those who inhabit it which makes the later decision to move house equally a decision to remake those who inhabit it. So we are told that its furnishings are 'tired', that, once the embodiment of 'love and even hope', they have had to 'accommodate' over time. The carpet shows its 'weariness', a 'depressing uniformity'. We are told that 'all pretenses but living itself have long since vanished from the very atmosphere of this room'. When Walter's wife, Ruth, appears we are told that, once pretty, she is now a 'settled woman', her hopes frustrated, while 'disappointment has already begun to hang in her face'. The single window which provides the sole natural light which the family enjoy, and which allows only a faint glow to 'fight its way through', is a parallel to the hope which has never quite been extinguished. Like the plant which Mama nurtures, 'they ain't never had enough sunshine'. They have been relegated to this overcrowded Southside apartment as they have been pressed to the edge of the social system. It is, as Ruth observes, a 'rat trap', perhaps, like the ringing alarm clock which opens the play, an implicit reference to Richard Wright's classic novel, Native Son, also set in Chicago's Southside (Bigby, 2000b: 277-8).

The conditions they live in the ghetto is neither comfortable nor sanitary. The apartment is invaded by cockroaches; Beneatha is seen “with a handkerchief tied around her face, [...] spraying insecticide into the cracks in the walls” (Hansberry, 1994: 54). And the children outside are playing in an unhealthy environment with rats; Travis comes home and accounts for the rat they caught: “Mama, you should of seen the rat . . . Big as a cat, honest!” (Hansberry, 1994: 59). Indeed, Hansberry portrays the neglect black communities have to suffer in ghetto life through the images of cockroaches and rats.

> So, too, Hansberry uses the bloody demise of a "rat.... Big as a cat, honest!" to establish a pervasive reality of ghetto life early in the play (Raisin 1.2). Where there is little or no municipal salutation service or landlord upkeep, rats and roaches thrive. Such implications run counter to dominant myths propping up pro-segregation institutions and individuals. When a black South Side infant died of a rat bite, for instance, the landlord denied culpability, saying, "well, they don't pick up their garbage. Anyway it was a nigger baby and they have a new one every year, so what does it matter?" (Carawan and Carawan 283). Like Gil Scott Heron's song "Whitey on the Moon" and Chicago Freedom Movement songwriter Jimmy Collier's "Rent Strike Blues," the rat in *A Raisin in the Sun* addresses this callous neglect and economic exploitation of ghettoized communities (Gordon, 2008: 127).

Hansberry herself was from a wealthy black family, which was a rare situation during her time, and this fact made some critics question the representational value of her depiction of the poor working class. One of her friends and a leading figure during the Civil Rights Movement, James Baldwin comments on the criticisms by showing the big amounts of black audience the play received as a proof of how it is a reflection of their life: "[...] so many black people in the theater [...] the reason was that never before, in the entire history of the American theatre, had so much of the truth of black people's lives been seen on stage" (Kodat, 1998: 155). During a speech she gave in American Society of African Culture conference in New York City in 1959 Hansberry called other writers to produce socially and politically conscious works that defend the emancipation of black people. In her speech Hansberry claimed that "all art is ultimately social: that which agitates and that which prepares the mind for slumber" (Hansberry, 1981: 5). And it is the artists' responsibility to tell the 'truth':

> I am saying that whatever the corruption within our people, tear it out and expose it and let us then take measure of what is left. I believe in the truth of art and the art of truth and the most painful exigency of cultural and social life will not be exempt from exploration by my mind or pen (Hansberry, 1981: 11).

Therefore, Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun* is a work that attempts the reflection of that 'truth' of black people in defense of independence and self-determination of black race. Hers is a social realism that intends not only to reflect but also has the intention to change that reality:

> Naturalism tends to take the world as it is and say: this is what it is, this is how it happens, it is 'true' because we see it every day in life that way—you know you simply photograph the garbage can. But in realism—I think the artist is creating what the realistic work imposes on it not only what is but what is possible . . . because that is part of reality too. So that you get a much larger potential of what man can do. And it requires much greater selectivity—you don't just put everything that seems—you put what you believe is . . . (Nemiroff, 1995: 228)

The play reflects the ghettoized lives of Younger family, and they are living this life just because of their skin color. Hansberry herself comments on what she intended to reflect:

> From the moment the first curtain goes up until the Youngers make their decision at the end, the fact of racial oppression, unspoken and unalluded to, other than the fact of how they live, is through the play. It's inescapable. The reason these people are in the ghetto in America is because they are Negroes. They are discriminated against brutally and horribly, so that in that sense it's always there and the basis of many things they feel, and which they feel because they are just perfectly ordinary human things between members of a family, are always predicated . . . on the fact that they live ghettoized lives (Carter, 1991: 45).

The 'reality' of African Americans that Hansberry reflects on was mainly defined by racial segregation, especially shaped by Jim Crow laws in the South USA. Although slavery was abolished after the Civil War, the enforcement of racial segregation proceeded in the south states through Jim Crow laws until 1965. The main purpose of Jim Crow laws was to restrain the political and economic progress attained by black people during the Reconstruction Period. However, it is a strange fact that C. Van Woodward points to the North for the genesis of segregation before it arrived the South: "the Northern Negro was made painfully and constantly aware the he lived in a society dedicated to the doctrine of white supremacy and Negro inferiority" (C. V. Woodward quoted in Lipari, 2013: 124). Chicago, the setting of *A Raisin in the Sun*, was one of these cities where segregation could be observed in its most exposed form. 'Black Belt' practice was an example to this discrimination in Chicago. In the city, African Americans were restricted to stay and live only in certain areas which was called the 'Black Belt.' Chicago was a city that received a lot of black migrants especially after Reconstruction Period in search of a decent life with better conditions, and Hansberry's parents were among these migrants:

> In the 19th century, Chicago, along with other northern cities such as Detroit, New York, and Cleveland, became a city of refuge for fugitive slaves. By 1900, after the failure of reconstruction, roughly 30,000 Blacks lived in Chicago. In the decades that followed, a great migration of southern Blacks moved northward seeking decent wages, better living conditions, and the possibilities of life more-or-less free from the legalized depredations of Jim Crow. Hansberry's parents both came to Chicago in that

> migration–her father from Mississippi and her mother from Tennessee–to make a new life in a new home (Lipari, 2013: 124).

The very real effects of Black Belt had grown bigger in time squeezing the growing black population more and more and with deteriorating conditions over the years. As a result, ghettoization occurred over the years:

> The Black Belt continued to grow in population but remained meager in size, inching outward slowly as whites that could afford to leave fled to the suburbs. The combination of a booming population with fierce racial segregation led the Black Belt inevitably toward terrible overcrowding and shocking disrepair. And, like the rest of the nation, the conditions only worsened with the stock market crash and the onset of the great Depression in 1929. What had been already tight housing conditions soon grew to slum like proportions. Apartments were cut up into what were called "kitchenettes" with rudimentary cooking facilities and often no bathing facilities. Schools were segregated and overcrowded, so much so that most Southside children could only go to school for half a day, receiving less than half the education of their white counterparts (Lipari, 2013: 126).

In *A Raisin in the Sun*, during a visit to the ghetto apartment Youngers' neighbor Mrs. Johnson, also jealous, reminds the Youngers about the bombings that happen against the mobility of black people: "I bet this time next month y' all's names will have been in the papers plenty—(Holding up her hands to mark off each word of the headline she can see in front of her) "NEGROES INVADE CLYBOURNE PARK—BOMBED!"" (Hansberry, 1994: 102). The violence and bombings mentioned in the play were also happening in real life most violently in Chicago. White people who wanted to resist black people moving out of that restricted ghetto life to areas mostly populated by white people used violence in order to stop black mobility. "Bombings were the penalty levied on black families who slipped through the restrictive covenant barriers erected to deter them from buying homes in white areas" (Bennett, 2006: 83). Black residents of Chicago suffered the most from this violence; bombs were used also as a psychological war inducing black people to stay put with fear of death, and they also showed how mid-century black movements in search of equality were limited:

> The most violently and residentially segregated metropolis in the nation, post-World War II Chicago rocked with more bombs in and around black homes and businesses

> than even Birmingham, Alabama. Hysterical anti-integration mobs of up to 10,000 whites faced down the National Guard in city streets, and some black families required police escorts of 1,000 or more on moving day into all-white blocks or housing projects (Meyer 115-21; Hirsch "Massive Resistance" 529). As Chicago housing historian Arnold Hirsch explains, more "than mere examples of anti-Black animus," these ritualized campaigns of violence and "sophisticated psychological war" around segregated housing reveal the practical, ideological, and political limits of mid-century African American movements for equality ("Massive Resistance" 523) (Gordon, 2008: 123).

The most common review *A Raisin in the Sun* received was reading Hansberry as supporting integration/assimilation in the play since the Younger family moves in a white populated neighborhood. For example, *Encylopedia of Literature and Criticism* places the play in the context of integrationist movement: "Written in the political and cultural context of the integrationist movement, *A Raisin in the Sun,* like *Rachel,* is a social protest play intended to persuade white people that black people are not only good at heart but sufficiently like whites in their values and cultural practices for whites to allow blacks to be their neighbours" (Coyle, 1991: 497). One of the famous criticisms that the play drew in its early years was by Amiri Baraka who deemed the play a melodrama that supports assimilation and bourgeois/middle class values, but he later changed his reading of the play:

> [In the 1960s,] we missed the essence of the work—that Hansberry had created a family on the cutting edge of the same class and ideological struggles as existed in the movement itself and among the people. What is most telling about our ignorance is that Hansberry's play still remains overwhelmingly popular and evocative of black and white reality, and the masses of black people dug it true.2 [. . .] The Younger family is part of the black majority, and the concerns I once dismissed as "middle class"—buying a house and moving into "white folks' neighborhoods"—are actually reflective of the essence of black people's striving and the will to defeat segregation, discrimination, and national oppression. There is no such thing as a "white folks' neighborhood" except to racists and *to those submitting to racism* (Baraka quoted in Wilkerson, 2001: 42-43).

On the other hand, white criticism disregards the play's criticism of racism by identifying the play as 'universal': "White critics from major New York newspapers described the play as "honest drama" that "has no axe to grind" and "will make you proud of human beings"" (Lipari, 2004: 85). Zachary Ingle also says, "The universal themes in *A Raisin in the Sun* helped it cross all racial, class, age, and ethnic

boundaries, while still fitting W E. B. DuBois's criteria for Negro theatre as being "by, for, about, and near [Negroes]"" (Ingle, 2009: 192). Ben Keppel states that universalist readings blur the play's criticism of racism and capitalism : "*A Raisin in the Sun* is an intriguing play, one that appropriates a traditional narrative form to press a point entirely alien to the main-stream of 1959: that the liberation of the American Negro required confronting economic forces and arrangements that according to Hansberry, racism exists to perpetuate. This, however, was not the reason for the enthusiasm with which the play was greeted by the White critical establishment" (B. Keppel quoted in Lipari, 2011: 199).

There is also criticism Hansberry received as supporting dominant patriarchy through making Lena Younger give the rest of the money to Walter Lee. Margaret Wilkerson, for example, says Hansberry affirms Walter's patriarchal aspiration: "Wilkerson argued that Hansberry set up the character Lena Younger as a matriarchal figure who is critiqued and learns to relinquish her unduly powerful familial role over the course of the play" (Chapman, 2017: 448).

Although some people blamed her for being assimilationist, supporter of bourgeois values and an antifeminist, Hansberry herself was a communist who criticized capitalism and its effects especially on black communities; she was also in favor of black self-determination; and finally she was against sexism as she regarded it another form of oppression like racism:

> As a communist, Hansberry criticised capitalism as an exploitative economic system that intersected with white supremacy to deny black people necessities such as affordable housing, employment opportunities and healthy environments. Through her black nationalism, Hansberry rejected all forms of imperialism, including those practiced by the United States through its Cold War priorities and alliances with European nations, and affirmed the right of all peoples to determine their own destinies. She supported the nationalist movements burgeoning in Africa, Asia and South America throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and among African Americans, she sought to foster familial, communal and personal forms of self-determination. Furthermore, attracted to feminist politics such as that articulated in Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949), Hansberry firmly believed in women's right and responsibility to determine their own destinies in terms of their career aspirations, familial relationships, sexuality, reproduction and political activism. She considered sexism as significant a form of oppression as racism and […] endeavoured to define

> an anti-racist feminism within a black freedom movement that was increasingly invested in black masculinist perspectives and priorities (Chapman, 2017: 449).

In fact, *A Raisin in the Sun* problematizes capitalist desire, integration, assimilation, and white domination, but the play radically turns capitalist desire into a desire for freedom and black oppression is dismantled through an act of desegregation when the Younger family decides to move to the white dominant neighborhood. In the context of 1950s Chicago, desire for a house is not simply the same as an aspiration to attain the American Dream. J. Charles Washington analyzes Lena's desire for the house: "The only way a Black person could escape discrimination in the South of that time was to move to the North. . . . Hers is, in short not the true American Dream, but a second-class version of it reserved for Black Americans and other poor people" (J. C. Washington quoted in Norman, 2010: 30). In the context of black experience desire for a house is the desire to have decent living conditions, desire to have an existence acknowledged, to have an identity.

> The white wall/black hole system is constructed, or rather the abstract machine is triggered that must allow and ensure the almightiness of the signifier as well as the autonomy of the subject. You will be pinned to the white wall and stuffed in the black hole. This machine is called the faciality machine because it is the social production of face, because it performs the facialization of the entire body and all its surroundings and objects, and the landscapification of all worlds and milieus. The deterritorialization of the body implies a reterritorialization on the face; the decoding of the body implies an overcoding by the face; the collapse of corporeal coordinates or milieus implies the constitution of a landscape (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 181).

Deleuze and Guattari address the issue of racism in the chapter titled "Year Zero: Faciality" in *A Thousand Plateaus*. The connection Deleuze and Guattari make with 'face' and race should be read in its face value, but also in broader terms. Deleuze and Guattari consider the concept of "face" as a standard since some power structures of society set it as such. Faciality is the social construction of the face. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, face is offered as an abstract machine which presents faces (certain labels) to people in return to their need. Concrete faces are not created by individuals say Deleuze and Guattari. "They are engendered by an abstract machine of faciality (visageite), which produces them at the same time as it gives the signifier its white wall and subjectivity its black hole" (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 168). Rather than using

the word “have a face” it is “sliding into” a face: “You don't so much have a face as slide into one” (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 177). That means certain types of faces/identities are ready made for people and they slide into one of them in order to obtain recognition in the social field. “The abstract machine of faciality inscribes the surfaces of the body with a subjective depth and connects its expressions to a system of prescribed identities, emotions and other internal subjective attributes and states” (Beckman, 2011: 70). Therefore, faciality is rather like an umbrella term; as it is related with ‘prescribed identities’ Deleuze and Guattari deal with religion, racism and capitalism in this chapter and connect them with the concept of faciality.

Deleuze and Guattari use the concepts of ‘signifying regimes’ and ‘post-signifying’ regimes in order to explain how meaning in language is produced. These two regimes are intertwined together in their conceptualization and the ‘face’ is an outcome of signifying regimes. Signifying despotic regime explains that the circulation of meaning comes out from a single authority. The omnipotent despot is the source where meaning comes out, but it is also always distributed by representatives; since it is from a single source and always mediated, people cannot interpret the message and signs correctly. Yet, the despot’s orders are orders anyway and have to be conformed to. However, post-signifying regime provides people the space to object to the despot and as a result develop a subjectivity. There is the possibility of ‘becomings,’ in other words, ‘lines of flight’ which help to fight against the hegemonic forces of despotic signifying regimes. Lines of flight provide the chance to deterritorialize, it is multiplicity. “Lines of flight or of deterritorialization, becoming-wolf, becoming-inhuman, deterritorialized intensities: that is what multiplicity is” (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 32). Therefore, in post-signifying regimes people can turn away from the authority, challenge the subjectivities created by the despot and produce their own subjectivities. However, both of these regimes always work hand in hand; that’s why creation of subjectivities does not weaken the power of the despot, but subjectivities become normalized in time. When certain faces, subjectivities are created by the despot, also a space for deviants, lines of flight, is created, but in the end, they too are turned into fixed subjectivities. In short, faciality works in both of these regimes.

> At every moment, the machine rejects faces that do not conform, or seem suspicious. But only at a given level of choice. For it is necessary to produce successive divergence-types of deviance for everything that eludes biunivocal relationships, and to establish binary relations between what is accepted on first choice and what is only tolerated on second, third choice, etc. The white wall is always expanding, and the black hole functions repeatedly (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 177).

Both signifying and post-signifying regimes work through binary oppositions. In the signifying regimes the despot names the binaries; for example, he claims there is only white man and black is the Other. But in post-signifying regimes subjectification is at issue and subjectivities are not forced into binary oppositions, yet how they conform to the norm becomes the matter. Deviation from the norm does not necessarily cause the rejection of subjectivities; however, according to Deleuze and Guattari, they are placed in 'black holes' where the subject absorbs the despot's signifiers. Due to Deleuze and Guattari there are degrees of deviances from the white man's face, and race is a matter of deviance. There is only one face as a representative and that is the face of Christ, and race is simply a face that deviate from it. No one is outside this system of signification.

> A ha! It's not a man and it's not a woman, so it must be a transvestite: The binary relation is between the "no" of the first category and the "yes" of the following category, which under certain conditions may just as easily mark a tolerance as indicate an enemy to be mowed down at all costs. At any rate, you've been recognized, the abstract machine has you inscribed in its overall grid. It is clear that in its new role as deviance detector, the faciality machine does not restrict itself to individual cases but operates in just as general a fashion as it did in its first role, the computation of normalities. If the face is in fact Christ, in other words, your average ordinary White Man, then the first deviances, the first divergence-types, are racial: yellow man, black man, men in the second or third category. They are also inscribed on the wall, distributed by the hole. They must be Christianized, in other words, facialized (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 177-178).

Therefore, a standard is set for the symbol of face, and the face of Jesus Christ is the standard. That is also why Deleuze and Guattari named the chapter "Year Zero-Faciality" as the time Christ was born is also when humanity started counting time onwards. This is also when the faciality machine started functioning since they consider Christ as the symbol of privileged white man.

> If it is possible to assign the faciality machine a date—the year zero of Christ and the historical development of the White Man—it is because that is when the mixture ceased to be a splicing or an intertwining, becoming a total interpenetration in which each element suffuses the other like drops of red-black wine in white water. Our semiotic of modern White Men, the semiotic of capitalism, has attained this state of mixture in which signifiance and subjectification effectively interpenetrate. Thus it is in this semiotic that faciality, or the white wall/black hole system, assumes its full scope (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 182).

White man is an archetype, it defines a model for individuals to fit into, and capitalism depends on that as well because people serve the system without any trouble like this. The white wall-black hole relationship distributes the faces, they are layers of distinctions where each layer labels the person to a spot so that the system works smoothly. The face is signification. White wall is considered as a field and the face as signification registered on this field. Black hole, on the other hand, stores subjectivities and generates subjects. Faciality machine creates signifiers, inscribes them on the white wall, and distributes and fixes subjects in the black hole. Faciality is where all forms of discriminations such as racism and sexism spring.

The face is a political production, and the system it points at as a signifier is based on inequality. The face of the Christ is set as the all-encompassing face, everything else is a deviation. The machine of faciality distributes the rights to people according to the level of their conformity. Therefore, breaking the white wall and negation of the black hole is crucial. In order to do that, Deleuze and Guattari suggest dismantling the faces and embracing the form of "becoming." Becomings do not make people stay in their black holes and simply accept a face created before. It is a matter of daring to dismantle the face by using probe-heads. The face is dismantled by the invention of a new use. Probe-head is used in order to invent a new use for the face. Probe-head is how the face is deterritorialized.

> Beyond the face lies an altogether different inhumanity: no longer that of the primitive head, but of "probe-heads"; here, cutting edges of deterritorialization become operative and lines of deterritorialization positive and absolute, forming strange new becomings, new polyvocalities. Become clandestine, make rhizome everywhere, for the wonder of a nonhuman life to be created. Face, my love, you have finally become a probe-head... Year zen, year omega, year co... Must we leave it at that, three states,

> and no more: primitive heads, Christ-face, and probe-heads? (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 190-191).

When the handling of the problem of racism in Lorraine Hansberry's play *A Raisin in the Sun* is considered in terms of the concept of 'faciality,' it is seen that in the context of the implementations of the Reconstruction Period such as 'the Black Belt,' and acts of violence towards black people during the time, the play is a resistance against systematic black oppression. Rather than being pro integration, assimilation, or being anti-feminist, or supporting black people's right to own possessions as part of capitalist desire, the play is a criticism of racism, sexism and capitalism as their interdependence is explained in Deleuze and Guattari's concept of 'faciality.'

> Perhaps one of Hansberry's most significant contributions to the public discourse of her era may be her comprehensive grasp of what Sojourner Truth first publicly articulated in her 1851 "A'n't I a Woman?" speech, what Barbara Smith theorized as the "simultaneity of oppression," and what Kimberlee Crenshaw developed as the concept of "intersectionality."26 That is, Hansberry's writing, whether in her plays, speeches, or essays, frequently examined the ways in which race, gender, and class oppression are co-implicated and interdependent. According to Patricia Hill Collins, intersectionality "highlights how African-American women and other social groups are positioned within unjust power relations, but it does so in a way that introduces complexity to formerly race-, class-, and gender-only approaches to social phenomena."27 Thus, the tensions between the characters of Mama and Walter Lee in the play should not be seen, as some white critics suggested, as the expression of "typical" U.S. intergenerational struggle. Nor should they merely be seen, as some black critics suggested, as the expression of integrationist and assimilationist aspirations; instead, they evoke the complex and historically grounded experiences particular to black Americans, such as the intersection of capitalism, slavery, reconstruction, northern racism, and sexism (Lipari, 2004: 86).

Hansberry herself also considered counter attacking the white capitalist hegemony important since she saw racism as a problem of systematic oppression:

> At this moment the paramount crime in the United States is the refusal of its ruling classes to admit or acknowledge in any way the real scope and scale and character of the oppression of Negroes. For that oppression is not a random helter-skelter hit or miss matter of discrimination here and there against people who just happen to be a different color. It is not that at all. It is, as that ruling class perfectly well knows, a highly concentrated, universal and deliberate blanket of oppression pulled tightly and securely over 20 million citizens in this country. This matter of admitting the true nature of the problem before setting about rectifying it is of utmost importance (Hansberry quoted in Lipari, 2004: 82).

The Younger family's desire to live in another house is not the same as Willy Loman's middle-class strive which Arthur Miller also criticizes in his play *Death of a Salesman*. Similarly, it is not 'lack of ambition' that keeps them in the ghetto conditions. They simply live in this house under these conditions because they have to, they have no other choice. Lorraine Hansberry points to the 'social organization' that keeps black people under these circumstances:

> This is the Ghetto of Chicago. These people live here because rents in their ghetto are proportionately higher than in any other place in the city; therefore even slight improvement would be of a nature to exhaust them financially since the hard-earned combined wages of the three income-making members must feed, clothe and house five people. [. . .] Thus, they live here. Not indolence, not indifference, and certainly not the lack of ambition imprison them, but various enormous questions of the social organization around them which they understand in part, but only in part (Hansberry quoted in Tritt, 2008: 54).

In the play reference to Langston Hughes' poem and taking the lines "dream deferred" is connected with the theme of American Dream. "The theme of the American Dream and the possibilities for the Black man to reach and to accomplish this dream are recurrent in Hughes's poetry" (Dualé, 2018: 2). The meaning of American Dream has turned into a nightmare for black people who migrated to North with the hope of finding better conditions in vain. "Martin Luther King's dream owes to Hughes's poetry and vision as both men articulated the dream of better lives for the oppressed and marginalized" (Dualé, 2018: 2). Dream of a better life but constant deferral of the attainment of prospects has become what American Dream means for black people. The situation is also the same for the Youngers. The Younger family moved to the North in search of a better life, but Big Walter lost his life before seeing any achievement towards that, and even though they all toil each and every day ironically only his death brings the money that might provide a decent house for the whole family.

> Questions about suffering, especially unrequited suffering, are surely germane in Raisin, as they are in Sinclair's novel. Like so many who toil constantly to improve their lot, Walter Sr. "couldn't never catch up with his dreams," growing "thin and old before he was forty [. . .] working and working and working like somebody's old

> horse [. . .] killing himself . . .” (46, 129). For Big Walter, typical of so many Southern blacks who fled to the North in search of a better life, as for Jurgis, who represents thousands of immigrants who have traveled to America hoping for a better existence, “the American Dream and the ethic of work become a nightmare of effort without reward [. . .] the hope of upward mobility [. . .] a chimera” (Bloodworth, Upton 47). Trapped in an unsuccessful cycle of striving, dreams remain, as expressed in Langston Hughes’s poem, “deferred” (Hansberry, Raisin Screenplay 3). Writers such as Hansberry and Sinclair, realistically bringing to life the individual struggles of Walter, Jurgis, and their families, have put a face to these individuals, even as they have universalized their experience, depicting them as part of a “herd” (Tritt, 2008: 53-54).

As a communist black feminist writer Hansberry criticizes racial capitalism. Her own words, “[t]he desire for the possession of "things" has rapidly replaced among too many of us the impulse for the possession of ourselves, for freedom” (Hansberry, 1981: 9) explain her depiction of American Dream in the play. Walter Lee Younger is the central figure through which she exemplifies her statement. Walter has a gendered discourse and he associates manhood with having material things. His lack of power is reflected in his sexist language. “Walter Lee defined manhood in "extracultural terms, in the taking over and running the world, in the bossing of secretaries, and he is frustrated that he cannot have the sort of power which he assumes will guarantee his manhood"” (S. Parks quoted in Copenhaver, 2002: 160).

> WALTER (Straightening up from her and looking off) That’s it. There you are. Man say to his woman: I got me a dream. His woman say: Eat your eggs. (Sadly, but gaining in power) Man say: I got to take hold of this here world, baby! And a woman will say: Eat your eggs and go to work. (Passionately now) Man say: I got to change my life, I’m choking to death, baby! And his woman say (In utter anguish as he brings his fists down on his thighs) Your eggs is getting cold! (Hansberry, 1994: 33-34).

Walter is a spokesperson of racist and sexist discourse in the Younger family. He is an example of how the system is internalized by individuals. Rather than the system he accuses black women for holding his kind back when he says, “We one group of men tied to a race of women with small minds!” (Hansberry, 1994: 35) to Ruth. Later he also tells Ruth, “we all tied up in a race of people that don’t know how to do nothing but moan, pray and have babies!” (Hansberry, 1994: 87). This discourse Walter uses is one of the reasons why the play is blamed for being assimilationist. He also seems to accept the capitalist values as he identifies success with money and achievements in business. He even decides to accept the money to leave the neighborhood from Mr.

Lindner after being conned by his friend who escaped taking his money. However, in Deleuze and Guattari's terms Walter is simply a subject of the black hole who conforms to societal norms of success and "being man." And his later action at the end of the play when he turns down the offer of money is an act of resistance from within the system, he becomes a probe-head as his action deterritorializes the system of segregation and opens up new possibilities of becoming. That is also why Walter Lee is an affirmation of life compared to Willy Loman, he must live to bring difference:

> In purposeful contrast to the doomed figure of Willy Loman, Walter Younger's "typicality is capable of a choice which affirms life." Walter's designation as dramatic though not tragic stems from his rich racial heritage, from his ability to "draw on the strength of an incredible people who, historically, have simply refused to give up" (Hansberry quoted in Foertsch, 2009: 421).

Lena, on the other hand, is a strong figure, she belongs to the generation that immigrated to the North escaping from slavery with the hope of a better life. "*Her dark-brown face is surrounded by the total whiteness of her hair, and, being a woman who has adjusted to many things in life and overcome many more, her face is full of strength*" (Hansberry, 1994: 39). She has generational difference with her children. Some critics put Lena against Walter Lee as the matriarchal power figure.

> The liberal turn in the black freedom movement also opened the way for a theory of black matriarchy to garner political steam in the 1950s and early 1960s.6 In popular media as well as scholarly publications, social scientists and journalists had begun to blame black women's participation in the workforce and their rare professional successes for black people's ongoing socioeconomic oppression and familial 'deviance'. Not yet defining the black family as 'pathological' for its supposed matriarchal structure, commentators nevertheless used black working mothers as scapegoats. In doing so, such commentators attributed black people's degraded status at the bottom of US socioeconomic structures to black women's work and familial leadership rather than to systemic racial capitalism (Chapman, 2017: 447).

However, Hansberry also criticizes patriarchal attitude of civil rights movement then. "In the course of her most famous play, Hansberry used her characters Lena Younger, her son Walter Lee and her daughter Beneatha to advance an interrogation of bourgeois 'money values', black patriarchal aspiration and black matriarchy theory" (Chapman, 2017: 448). Lena is a strong woman who has overcome many difficulties, and instead

of putting her as a figure of matriarchy who castrates her son, or later simply giving all the power to him when she gives the rest of the money, her experience in the past becomes a model of strength for Walter Lee where he finds the courage to turn down Mr. Lindner. When Walter Lee decides to accept Lindner's offer Lena says: "Son I come from five generations of people who was slaves and sharecroppers but ain't nobody in my family never let nobody pay 'em no money that was a way of telling us we wasn't fit to walk the earth" (Hansberry, 1994: 143).

> Lena, coming from a different generation, does not understand her children's views on race. She and Walter, Sr. moved from the South to the North in order to escape the more overtly racist South. Instead, they faced more covert racism that relegated her husband to a life of manual labor and her son to being a chauffeur. Lena cannot understand her daughter's focus on Africa because Lena sees her heritage as beginning when her family was brought to this country as slaves. She takes pride in the fact that her family overcame that hardship and has survived and endured for six generations. It is this pride in family that she reminds Walter Lee of when he is considering selling out to Lindner, and from that pride, Walter Lee draws the strength to turn down Lindner's offer (Copenhaver, 2002: 72-73).

Racism has shifted meaning as well compared to Lena's time. It is a good example to Deleuze's concept of repetition and difference. It is a single term, the same one, but what it means to Lena, Beneatha and Walter Lee are all different. It is again a proof against Hegel's concept of progress, racism changes shape in time as capitalism always finds a way to make reuse of it just as it renews itself. However, this repetition and difference opens up space for the virtual. It might be considered as a map where things to repeat and do differently exist together. Deleuze calls this map the 'virtual' where there is the innate potentiality of the new lies. Everything moves in relation to each other, including the concepts, just like the universe or human beings in it. Each repetition brings different combinations, different possibilities. There are intensities between differences and virtual is the result of those intensities, it is the lines of flight.

> The very structure of *A Thousand Plateaus* as a series of plateaus, which the authors suggest can be read in any sequence, supports a philosophy of events: whatever the seeming consistency of a plane or point of view it is always possible for a potentiality to alter the very nature of what might seem to be possible. In Deleuze's work this attention to singularities, events, the aleatory, the virtual and the incorporeal – as well as the imperative of counter-actualisation, or thinking of the larger range of potentials from which this actual world has been generated – appears to legitimate a philosophy

> of becoming against history. That is, even when history is an attempt to denaturalise or de-universalise the present by showing how things might have been otherwise, it tends to focus on possibility rather than potentiality, or the possible rather than the virtual (Colebrook, 2009: 5).

Beneatha is this potential, the virtual, within the family. Cheryl Higashida asserts that Hansberry supported 'Black internationalist feminism,' and she analyzes that in the past fifty years of her time "racism, patriarchy, and homophobia have combined potently with anticommunism to marginalise and silence radical Black women" (C. Higashida quoted in Cannon, 2017: 215). Hansberry wrote her play and selected her characters accordingly also to fight against racism, patriarchy, and homophobia along with anticommunism. Therefore, Beneatha is not a traditional female character in the play. "It is through Beneatha's plot and interactions with the other characters, including her suitors, that Hansberry explored the question of black women's particular liberation" (Chapman, 2017: 463). Compared to Walter Lee whose desiring-production is subjugated to material gains and power, or Ruth and Lena who are stuck in their traditional roles of motherhood and doing the house chores while at the same time working to earn money, Beneatha is a character in a process of 'becoming,' she wants to become a doctor and gain her independence. Her focus is her freedom. When Walter Lee loses all the money including Beneatha's college tuition, they decide to stay in the new house which most probably means all of them having to work, including Beneatha, to pay for the mortgage. "Beneatha is the only character who could potentially feel consequences from her non-traditional behavior" (Copenhaver, 2002: 175). She has two suitors, and one of them, George Murchison, is rich; however, Beneatha does not see him as savior, but rather he disdains her. "As well, through Beneatha's hesitation to commit to a sexual relationship and a connubial future with Asagai, Hansberry leads audiences to question hetero-patriarchal assumptions about sexual politics, the role of women in societies and women's ability to determine their futures independent of men and marriage" (Chapman, 2017: 463). On the other hand, Hansberry draws a path of self-determination for Beneatha. Asagai proposes her to join him in Africa, in leaving her answer indefinite, Hansberry strengthens the idea of Beneatha as 'becoming':

> Asagai hopes for a helpmeet; Beneatha dreams of collective and personal self-determination. Given Beneatha's pattern of astute assessment and feminist consciousness, we can be sure she will soon recognise this discrepancy. Will Asagai support her personal, professional and political goals, or will he, like Walter Lee, admonish her to 'go be a nurse like other women – or just get married and be quiet'?69 In leaving Beneatha's plot unconcluded, Hansberry implies the hope that Beneatha will choose to build a future for herself and, whether she marries Asagai or not, refuse to settle for the limits the men surrounding her would impose (Chapman, 2017: 463-464).

Through her strong female characters and an emphasis on self-determination Hansberry creates the 'virtual' for black women. They are the potential, lines of flight from the marginalizing white supremacy and also from the liberal patriarchal vision.

> Lena is the "black matriarch incarnate" and Beneatha is characterized as the dreamer.4Ruth is the peacemaker who embodies her biblical namesake as a faithful wife and daughter-in-law. She bridges the gap between old and new with quiet strength and determination. Through her characters, Hansberry allows the audience to view feminism through the eyes of African American women (Mason, 2015: 3).

Adrienne Rich attests to Hansberry's feminism and while commenting on the female characters in her play she acknowledges the fact that black women are 'twice oppressed' once for their race and twice for their gender: "Obviously the most oppressed of any oppressed group will be its women… since women… are oppressed in society, and if you've got an oppressed group, they're twice oppressed" (A. Rich quoted in Bigsby, 2000b: 279).

African-American image, Hansberry thinks, is at the center of racism in America:

> Hansberry believed him to be an image that had been created in the American consciousness and kept in its place as an "image of the unharried, unconcerned, glandulatory, simple, rhythmical, amoral, dark creature who was, above all else, a miracle of sensuality" (Nemiroff 199). This image is what she held responsible for the status quo faced by blacks and their continuous exclusion from the larger American society. She felt that the time was ripe for blacks to replace this image with the real one and integrate into their homeland (Saber, 2010: 454).

According to Deleuze and Guattari's concept of faciality what creates this exclusion for the black population from the larger society is strangely not because of the fact that

racism discriminates but because it tries to unify everyone under one image, 'the face.' It is a matter of being not the same' rather than being different. Whoever does not fit into the White man's image falls outside the circle of sameness:

> The problem with racism is not that it discriminates, nor that it takes one natural humanity and then perverts it into separate groups. On the contrary, racism does not discriminate enough; it does not recognise that 'humanity,' 'Caucasian' and 'Asian' are insufficiently distinguished. Humanity is a virtuality or majority of a monstrous and racial sort. One body – the white man of reason – is taken as the figure for life in general. A production of desire – the image of 'man' that was the effect of history and social groupings – is now seen as the ground of desire. Ultimately, a metalepsis takes place: despite seeming differences, it is imagined that, deep down, we are all the same. And because of this monstrous production of 'man in general', who is then placed before difference as the unified human ground from which different races appear, a trajectory of extinction appears to be relentless. Man's self-evident unity, along with the belief in a historical unfolding that occurs as a greater and greater recognition of identity (the supposed overcoming of tribalism towards the recognition of one giant body of human reason), precludes any question of humanity's composition, its emergence from difference and distinction and the further possibility of its un-becoming (Colebrook, 2013: 36).

Just as black women being twice oppressed, this difference and distinction of the African American image from the Face constitutes greater pressure on black women as it is also combined with capitalist notion of beauty. Hansberry, indeed, approaches the issue of assimilation and dismantles it through this idea of sameness and difference in the concept of faciality. Kinky hair is a distinct feature of African American face, and Hansberry uses Beneatha's appearance to discuss the issue:

> Most of the concern over physical appearance is focused on Beneatha, who is beginning to see her appearance as tied to her identity as a person. Asagai comments on Beneatha's hair and describes it as "mutilated" because she processes it to conform to the notion African- American hair looks better if it is less kinky (Copenhaver, 2002: 170).

Asagai brings Beneatha a traditional African woman's dress, then he comments on her hair as 'mutilated' because he thinks she is trying to be the same as the white face. It is an example of how face is connected with subjectivity. To be more like an American subject and also to reach the notion of beauty of the face, African American women try to tame the kinky hair:

ASAGAI (Coming to her at the mirror) I shall have to teach you how to drape it properly. (He flings the material about her for the moment and stands back to look at her) Ah Oh-pay-gay~day, oh-gbah-mu-shay. (A Yoruba exclamation for admiration) You wear it well . . . very well . . . mutilated hair and all.
BENEATHA (Turning suddenly) My hair what's wrong with my hair?
ASAGAI (Shrugging) Were you born with it like that?
BENEATHA (Reaching up to touch it) No ... of course not.
(She looks back to the mirror, disturbed)
(Smiling) How then?
BENEATHA You know perfectly well how ... as crinkly as yours . . . that's how.
ASAGAI And it is ugly to you that way?
BENEATHA (Quickly) Oh, no not ugly . . . (More slowly, apologetically) But it's so hard to manage when it's, well raw.
ASAGAI And so to accommodate that you mutilate it every week?
BENEATHA It's not mutilation! (Hansberry, 1994: 61-62)

What reactions other characters show when Beneatha lets her kinky hair be indicate where they stand in the white wall black hole system. Although Ruth is another strong woman in the play, she, for example, is at the same time a traditional woman who accepted 'sliding into the face" provided. She supports Beneatha marrying George since he is rich and powerful, and when she sees Beneatha with kinky hair she says: "You expect this boy to go out with you with your head all nappy like that?" (Hansberry, 1994: 80). Getting so used to black women trying to slide into the face Walter gets shocked when he first sees Beneatha's hair and then he also says "Well, I'll be damned. So that's what they mean by the African bush . . ." (Hansberry, 1994: 85). George, on the other hand, the most assimilated black identity in the play reacts accordingly. With the power he feels through his capitalist achievement his racist discourse is no different than a white face. His tone is cynical and bossy while speaking to Beneatha: "Look honey, we're going to the theatre we're not going to be in it ... so go change, huh?" (Hansberry, 1994: 80). They have all accepted how the machine of faciality works and any deviations from the face seems unacceptable to them. With the force of Ruth, Beneatha goes and changes her traditional African dress, but her act of not changing her kinky hair is a deterritorialization of the faciality machine.

While answering accusations of assimilation like this, Hansberry is also not defending integration as she is ironic about the white fear of integration. When Beneatha asks why the white people do not want them in their neighborhood, Ruth's answer is noteworthy:

> BENEATHA What they think we going to do eat 'em?
> RUTH No, honey, marry 'em (Hansberry, 1994: 121).

"[This comment] leaves the audience to decide whether or not all races can live together harmoniously in the same neighborhood" (Mason, 2015: 9). Interrace marriage is a nightmare for the white face. It is one more deviation in the faciality machine. The faciality machine functions by distributing signifiers on the white wall and fixes subjects in the black hole. And since integration is moving away from sameness, from the white face, it is unwanted by white people. Acceptance of difference and deviation is the greatest fear of this system and Hansberry ridicules it here.

> Improvement associations combined their battle language of patriotic rights with an emotive rhetoric of "forced mongrelization" (Hirsch "Massive Resistance" 544). Hansberry understood that, in the North, in spite of its language of property rights and patriotic militarism, "Neighborhood defense became more than a struggle for turf. It was a battle for the preservation of white womanhood" (Sugrue 562). (Gordon, 2008: 129)

This racist discourse fearful of integration is represented through Mr. Lindner. Lindner is representative of the white authority. He is the voice of the white face: "What do you think you are going to gain by moving into a neighborhood where you just aren't wanted and where some elements—well—people can get awful worked up when they feel that their whole way of life and everything they've ever worked for is threatened" (Hansberry, 1994: 119). In his polite tone Lindner is actually threatening the Youngers implying that something like the bombings in other neighborhoods might happen if the white face feels the threat of integration approaching.

By the end of the play Walter Lee changes his mind about accepting Lindner's offer not being able to accept it in front of his son Travis. Lena Younger stops Ruth sending Travis downstairs, trying to affect Walter Lee's decision:

> RUTH: Travis, you go downstairs.
> MAMA (Opening her eyes and looking into WALTER'S): No. Travis, you stay right here. And you make him understand what you doing, Walter Lee. You teach him good. Like Willy Harris taught you. You show where our five generations done come to. (WALTER looks from her to the boy, who grins at him innocently) Go ahead, son (She folds her hands and closes her eyes) Go ahead (Hansberry, 1994: 147).

With pressure from the women around him Walter finally realizes that he should not yield to money values in exchange for their freedom. "So Hansberry's women characters, Lena Younger especially but also Walter's Lee's wife Ruth and his sister Beneatha, confront, challenge and push him to act from a better, finer set of values than he is wont to do" (Chapman, 2017: 455). Hansberry sees Walter Lee as a confused African American identity and explains that the change in him happens thanks to the mother's confrontation:

> [Walter Lee] is representative of those people in our culture who are [confused] and the play makes the statement at the end that when money intrudes on those things which we know that we have to have for any kind of moral health as a people, and I mean all Americans, by heavens, let us choose for the other thing, not for the money. The focal moment of that play very much hangs on the denunciation of money values. When the mother confronts the son who is considering this betrayal of his heritage of a great people and says: 'I want what the bourgeois has'. The mother says to him from her resources as a daughter of the Negro peasantry, of the Negro slave classes: 'I come from five generations of slaves and sharecroppers and ain't nobody in my family never taken no kind of money that was a way of telling us we wasn't fit to walk the earth (Hansberry quoted in Chapman, 2017: 455).

Therefore, Hansberry makes women part of the fight and do not give up on black women's liberation for the sake of the fight against racism. She criticized misogynistic approaches like the black matriarchy theory that claims black people cannot advance because strong matriarchal figures emasculate men in the family.

> In her subtly incisive way, Hansberry insisted on a vision of black freedom that would not sacrifice black women's liberation. Using her play and the platform its success afforded her, she critiqued the misogyny of the black matriarchy theory rising around

> her, tackled the illusion that integration and bourgeois patriarchal empowerment would ameliorate the effects of white supremacy and racial capitalism, and offered instead a radically gendered vision of freedom based in affirmative self-determination for black women as well as black men (Chapman, 2017: 464).

In Deleuze and Guattari's understanding life tends towards difference and becoming. Life is creative and varied. The machine of faciality that serves the capitalist system, on the other hand, try to eliminate difference and variety as sameness means better control of society. That's why assimilation is wanted so that it makes the machine work. Hansberry attacks assimilation in her work and life, what she defended in the play is the acknowledgement of the rights of black people.

> The symbol of the raisin marks a withering wish, but the Youngers do leave the ghetto by the end. They keep their racial pride which might connote that though the grape dries up in the sun and becomes a raisin, it keeps the sweet taste until the end. Hansberry regards integration in terms of being seen and acknowledged in the larger American community. She touches upon political themes and attacks any inclination towards assimilation as acculturation (Saber, 2010: 467).

With Younger's move into the white neighborhood Hansberry does not promote assimilation or integration into white culture. It is rather an act towards a claim for the existence of African American. The identity to be created for the African American is neither based on white capitalist values nor the traditional African identity. Besides endorsing women's self-determination, that's also why Hansberry does not show Beneatha leaving for Africa. What is offered is a hybrid identity for the African American. This hybrid identity is exemplified in the tribal dance that Beneatha and Walter Lee make up. They both do not know exactly how the dance is, but they depend on their heritage and their imagination:

> At the end of the play, Walter decides to move into the white neighborhood even though he knows the future for them will not be easy. The end expresses that their survival in America is more important than going back to Africa, the place where they have limited knowledge; also, assimilation of white capitalist values is not the best way of surviving, especially as the failure of Walter's investment so clearly demonstrates. Based on African and American heritages, they have to create their own identities, like they create their own dance. The moving, performing, dancing body inscribes two heritages, and also it metaphorically expresses that African Americans are creating and will keep on producing their own identity in America (Shih, 2014: 280).

The comparison between George Murchison and Asagai also enhances this theme of white capitalist America and traditional roots in Africa.

> In George Murchison, a rich young African American college student, and Asagai, a poor Nigerian college student—both suitors of Beneatha—Hansberry focuses on the conflicts between wealth and position versus heritage and tradition. Murchison offers Beneatha a life of opulence and comfort, while Asagai offers her a life steeped in ancestral tradition but devoid of creature comforts. Hansberry does not attempt to resolve this conflict, choosing rather to leave Beneatha undecided at the end of the play, suggesting the difficulty of such a choice. The Beneatha-Asagai relationship also introduces into the drama the theme of pan-Africanism, a theme prevalent in African American drama of this period. Through the romantic involvement of these two, Hansberry manages to link the African struggle for independence with the African American struggle for self-identity and self-determination (Williams, 2009: 1590).

It is Du Bois's 'double-consciousness' where he defined a dual position for the African American. "The assimilationist favored submission to, and the nationalist endorsed isolation from, the white world; one ignored black culture whereas the other defended black values" (Martins, 2010: 27). What creates the new and revolutionary is focusing on difference. "The catalyst will favor neither assimilationism nor nationalism, but will project hybridity, plurality, and will critically articulate and combine the two positions" (Martins, 2010: 27). Hansberry's play shows that it is also important to remember the Southern roots for black people as the Southern history is also part of their identity. "Despite the history of enslavement, lynching, and Jim Crow, African Americans have a history in the South that extends well beyond abuse and subjection, and Hansberry, in her canonical play, works to reclaim that history for the Younger family and, by extension, her audience" (Murray, 2015: 277). Therefore, the Youngers have created their identity not only in the North but also with their connection to the South. Reclaiming history is important for a sense of belonging and their proud fight against slavery should be remembered. It is when mother Lena reminds Walter Lee their history in the South that she is proud of, Walter Lee changes his mind about accepting Lindner's offer. In Deleuzian terms this hybrid identity is the potential for 'the virtual,' 'the lines of flight' between intensities.

Desire for material gains is acculturation for the black people. Deleuze and Guattari claim that before capitalist desire there was desiring potentials. Desire is the truth in the capital that people can hold on to dismantle capitalism. In *A Raisin in the Sun* Hansberry foregrounds the desire for freedom for black people and dismantles racial capitalism. Younger's decision to move in the house is their desire to have human conditions, to be seen, to claim their identity, and an act towards desegregation.

> [If] there are no waving flags and marching songs at the barricades as Walter marches out with his little battalion, it is not because the battle lacks nobility. On the contrary, he has picked up his way, still imperfect and wobbly in his small view of human destiny, what I believe Arthur Miller once called "the golden thread of history." He becomes, in spite of those who are too intrigued with despair and hatred of man to see it, King Oedipus refusing to tear out his eyes, but attacking the Oracle instead. He is that last Jewish patriot manning his rifle in the burning ghetto in War- saw; he is that young girl who swam into sharks to save a friend a few weeks ago; he is Anne Frank, still believing in people; he is the nine small heroes of Little Rock; he is a Michelangelo creating David, and Beethoven bursting forth with the Ninth Symphony. He is all those things because he has finally reached out in his tiny moment and caught that sweet essence which is human dignity, and it shines like the old star-touched dream that is in his eyes (Hansberry quoted in Saber, 2010: 463).

It is important to remember that Deleuze and Guattari resist the creation of identity as it perpetuates the white wall black hole system. Identities gaining power is ultimately what leads to totalitarianism. "The demand for representation makes use of all powers in a totalizing way. As a result, an empirical subject, from which identity is derived, is constituted" (Jing, 2009: 16). However, there is no total way out of the system of representation. The world of signification is simply the world we live in. Therefore, Hansberry's play should be considered revolutionary as it came out at a time when black people could not find proper representation. *A Raisin in the Sun* is still a resistance against the faciality machine as it multiplies difference instead of sameness and dismantles capitalist desire.

3.2. “Funnyhouse of a Negro” by Adrienne Kennedy

3.2.1 Plot:

The main character Negro Sarah in *Funnyhouse of a Negro* is a crossbred who has a white mother and a black father. Other characters in the play, the Duchess of Hapsburg, Queen Victoria, Jesus, and Patrice Lumumba are all parts of Sarah’s psyche, and each of them forms ‘one of herselves’ as Kennedy indicates in her stage directions. Sarah wants to escape from her black heritage, therefore hangs on to her white roots trying to be ‘whiter’ by studying English at the university, having white friends and a white boyfriend, and keeping a huge statue of a powerful imperial figure Queen Victoria at her house. However, no matter how hard she tries, she cannot release herself from her black origins, ‘her father’s ghost’ keeps visiting her. In the end, Sarah’s desire “not to be” overrides her frantic attempts of creating an identity, and she commits suicide.

3.2.2. Analysis of "Funnyhouse of a Negro"

First coproduced by Edward Albee in 1964, Adrienne Kennedy's one-act play *Funnyhouse of a Negro* brought the playwright an Obie award, and the play has been followed by an impressive body of one-act plays and other works by Kennedy. Kennedy's plays have been performed in the USA and abroad and have been translated into many different languages. The production of *The Owl Answers* and *A Beast Story* followed *Funnyhouse of a Negro*, and *A Rat's Mass* was presented in 1966. After that the production history of her plays was as follows: *A Lesson in Dead Language* (1966), *Sun* (1968), *An Evening With Dead Essex* (1974), *A Movie Star Has to Star in Black and White* (1976), *Lancashire Lad* (1980), *Black Children's Day* (1980), *Robert* (1983), and *A Diary of Lights* (1987). Although she has been a very productive writer, Kennedy's work had stayed unknown to the public and had not been taken to the anthologies up until very recently. After her collected plays *Adrienne Kennedy in One Act* (1988) was published, along with her autobiography *People Who Led to My Plays* (1987), her experimental prose writing *Deadly Triplets* (1990), and her more recent plays *The Ohio State Murders* (1990), and *She Talks to Beethoven* (1991), she has started to receive critical acclaim.

As her prose works *People Who Led to My Plays* and *Deadly Triplets* show, her personal experiences have an important role in the formation of her plays; also, Kennedy herself says that "autobiographical work is the only thing that interests me" (Kennedy quoted in Bryant-Jackson, et. al., 1992: ix). Apart from the autobiographical structure, Kennedy frequently uses the middle-class black family as a metaphor that refers to social and political issues to explore the problems of race, family relationships and violence in the American society, and their influence on the psyche of the female individual. Paul Bryant-Jackson poses it in American transcendentalism in the 19th century, the theater of the absurd in the 20th century, and the black women's autobiographical work in the feminist tradition. However; it is difficult to situate Adrienne Kennedy's work into a certain literary tradition or approach as many different perspectives upon her work show.

Achieving a sense of consistency and continuity is necessary to have a sense of identity as people try to understand themselves and the world through a system of signification. To achieve this, human beings often hold on to 'sameness,' trying to resemble others, projecting their selves onto others. For the same reason, they identify with the characters they read about or with the subjects of works of art. Therefore; identification or the act of identifying with are different from the concept of identity, which defines the definitive, unique features of a human being. As Elin Diamond emphasizes the imbrication of these concepts and says, "If we think of identity as a mark of a separate and unified subjectivity, identification is rejection of separateness; it denies the other's difference by allowing the subject the excitement of trespass, the thrill of being the other" (Diamond, 1993: 86). In *A Thousand Plateaus* Deleuze and Guattari discuss racism under the title "Year Zero: Faciality" in a similar way, racism is understood within the system of signification as an act of identification. According to Deleuze and Guattari racism is not a matter of discrimination but rather a matter of sameness-difference. Racism does not designate people as Other, but the faces that deviate from the representative Face stands out as it does not conform to the male white Face, the face of Christ. It is only a matter of not being the same as the White Face:

> European racism as the white man's claim has never operated by exclusion, or by the designation of someone as Other: it is instead in primitive societies that the stranger is grasped as an "other."12 Racism operates by the determination of degrees of deviance in relation to the White-Man face, which endeavors to integrate nonconforming traits into increasingly eccentric and backward waves, sometimes tolerating them at given places under given conditions, in a given ghetto, sometimes erasing them from the wall, which never abides alterity (it's a Jew, it's an Arab, it's a Negro, it's a lunatic . . .). From the viewpoint of racism, there is no exterior, there are no people on the outside. There are only people who should be like us and whose crime it is not to be. The dividing line is not between inside and outside but rather is internal to simultaneous signifying chains and successive subjective choices. Racism never detects the particles of the other; it propagates waves of sameness until those who resist identification have been wiped out (or those who only allow themselves to be identified at a given degree of divergence). Its cruelty is equaled only by its incompetence and naivete (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 178).

Adrienne Kennedy is a playwright who problematizes the issue of identification in her theater by focusing on the overlap of identity and identification in her plays. Sigmund Freud had developed his theories on identification by defining the

subject as in relation to an outside object. Freud saw that relation as a psychoanalytic one, however; Deleuze and Guattari condemn the very Oedipal structure that is based on 'lack' for schizophrenia as one cannot bear the social repression: "Is the schizophrenic sick and cut off from reality because he lacks Oedipus, because he "is lacking" in something only to be found in Oedipus—or on the contrary is he sick by virtue of the oedipalization he is unable to bear, and around which everything combines in order to force him to submit (social repression even before psychoanalysis)?" (Deleuze, et. al., 1983: 91) What psychoanalysis does is a reduction of identity and desire to 'lack;' however, social, historical and political factors create pathologies. Psychoanalysis, unfortunately, does not take these factors into account.

> In this case as in many others, the utilization of the Lacanian concept of foreclosure leads to the forced oedipalization of the rebel: the absence of Oedipus is interpreted as a lack with regard to the father, a gaping hole in the structure; next, in the name of this lack, we are referred to the other Oedipal pole, the pole of imaginary identifications within the maternal undifferentiated. The law of the double bind operates relentlessly, ruthlessly, flinging us from one pole to the other, in such a way that what is foreclosed in the Symbolic must reappear in the Real in a hallucinatory form. But in this fashion the entire historico-political theme gets interpreted as a constellation of imaginary identifications depending on Oedipus, or on that which the subject "lacks" in order to become oedipalized (Deleuze, et. al., 1983: 90).

In Kennedy's play, *Funnyhouse of a Negro*, these psychoanalytic roots of identification are connected with its social and political relations. By historicizing identity and identification Kennedy also offers a Brechtian approach of the concepts. "Her ability to weave identification and history, the psychic and the social, suggest that identification is not only a private psychic act: identifications have histories and thus permit access to subjective, cultural, and political readings" (Diamond, 1993: 87). She shows identification in its historical grounds, connects the psychic and the social; and by this way she suggests that identification is not only a private act, but also a political one with its historical and social basis. Even if it looks like a private, psychological situation Sarah's situation has extrafamilial, social, political reasons. Therefore, it is possible to read the play through Deleuze and Guattari's Schizoanalysis:

> Hellenists were right to remind us that, even in the case of worthy Oedipus, it was already a matter of "politics." They are simply wrong in concluding from this that the libido has nothing to do with any of it. Quite the contrary: what is invested by the libido throughout the disjoined elements of Oedipus—especially given the fact that these elements never form a mental structure that is autonomous and expressive—are these extrafamilial, subfamilial gaps and breaks (coupures), these forms of social production in conjunction with desiring-production. Schizoanalysis therefore does not hide the fact that it is a political and social psychoanalysis, a militant analysis: not because it would go about generalizing Oedipus in culture, under the ridiculous conditions that have been the norm until now. It is a militant analysis, on the contrary, because it proposes to demonstrate the existence of an unconscious libidinal investment of sociohistorical production, distinct from the conscious investments coexisting with it (Deleuze, et. al., 1983: 97).

What's more; Kennedy, rather than a representation of politics of race or gender, makes the very question of representation her central concern and presents the politics of representation. It is possible to say that she creates poststructuralist pieces of art by problematizing mimesis and realistic representation. *Funnyhouse of a Negro*, as the play that brought Kennedy first recognition as a playwright, is a good example of this concern of hers which focuses not on the representation but on the un-representability of race. Although she started writing before the postmodern era Kennedy's work shows poststructuralist features in their engagement with the minority subjects, gendered and racial identities, and in the way they deconstruct the historically-socially constructed versions of these subjectivities, which also constitute the radical politics of her work. Fragmentation and discontinuity, as basic elements in her plays, are the tools she uses for the deconstruction of gendered or racial identities, and to reveal the constructed nature of these identities. Kennedy does not present essentialized protagonists; her characters also stand out as fragmentary beings, physically created as crossbreeds, and psychically torn between two identities as White or Black. They can neither assume the white identity as 'the superior race,' or can take pride in being Black. The central image in *Funnyhouse* of a Negro is the mirrors signifying Sarah's fragmentation. It is also significant that the one who is distorting Sarah's identity is a man, Raymond. Through making Raymond the funnyman, Kennedy also targets the paralyzing of the male dominant signifying system that claims coherence and consistency: "The walls of his room, behind the blinds, are all mirrors, endlessly reflecting and splitting Sarah into distorted fragments, while he, like God the Father, remains coherent and consistent" (Diamond, 1992: 136). With his

supposed coherence and consistency, it looks like Raymond, as the funnyman who is reflecting, says the final word in the play, but after seeing the whole picture in fragments his account has no more truth value for the audience than the other versions. Different fragments in the play make the reader question the very act of representation as it becomes an endless mimicry with repetitions and differences. Fragmentation and discontinuity ultimately create multiplicity in terms of subjectivity. “The tension between the traditional notion of the subject as being identical to itself and the understanding of subjectivity as multiplicity is made explicit in the confrontation between psychoanalysis and schizoanalysis” (Žukauskaitė, 2015: 8). The text, open to Schizoanalysis, encourages an individuality that rests on the flows of desire. Schizophrenic creation depends on breaks, flows and disruptions. It is crucial to remember that schizophrenic creations “do not represent schizophrenia; they don't offer us representations of schizophrenia; they are, in Deleuze and Guattari's vernacular, schizophrenia 'in person'. It is not the author that is schizophrenic in other words, although that may also be the case, but the work itself” (Buchanan, 2008: 33). In other words, though the character Sarah herself has a fragmented identity, also the text itself is in fragments, distortions, and repetitions.

What makes Kennedy’s work political is the fact that her works constitute a radical voice against the racist Euro-American discourse which persistently creates stereotypical racialized images. She enacts the effects of racist and gendered histories on her characters and presents a critique of the ‘given’ histories of African American women. These characters are mentally traumatized identities as a result of the imperialist practice of African American enslavement. Deleuze and Guattari also show the path to delirium not as the family but as the political and historical factors:

> In contrast to Freud, then, Deleuze and Guattari play down the significance of the father and play up the significance of the political and historical content. The psychoanalyst tells us that the father is important precisely because Schreber doesn't talk about him. We reply that we have never seen a schizophrenic delirium that is not firstly about race, racism, politics, that does not begin in all directions from history, that does not involve culture, that does not speak of continents, kingdoms, and so forth. We state that the problem of delirium is not connected to the family and concerns the father and mother only in a very secondary way, if it concerns them at all (CY, 80). (Buchanan, 2008: 35)

In *Funnyhouse of a Negro* Kennedy addresses the colonial past and bases the colonized female identity by referring to the colonial history through symbols such as the statue of Queen Victoria of England, who was also the Empress of India at her time, and Patrice Lumumba, appearing as a ghost, who was an important figure in the struggle against colonialism and was killed for his fight. These symbols as hallucinations or floating images correspond to the traumatized psyches of Kennedy's characters who suffer from a deep psychological struggle because of their colonized histories. Her crossbreed characters experience a crisis of identity because they cannot reconcile their Black and White heritage. Neither blackness nor whiteness can provide them with coherent subjectivity. They are traumatized beings who cannot find their 'selves' among the given clichés. They are fractured identities who are psychologically abused by the racist discourse of the colonial past and of the 1960s America. This trauma leads her characters to assimilation, but this wish also has traumatic outcomes, their ending is generally bleak like a punishment for that wish. But the characters have a complex political position: Kennedy criticizes assimilation by failure of the character, but there is no easy solution for them; on the other hand, they cannot find an empowered identity through their African background either since she deconstructs the essentialist positions for African American subjects.

While there is a tendency to define her work as postmodern or postcolonial today, Kennedy's reception in the mid-1960s among her fellows was mostly critical. She was not placed within the Black Power movement of the time which foregrounded Black unity, promoted the rejection of American values through the teachings of leaders like Malcolm X, and shaped by the anticolonial struggles of figures such as Patrice Lumumba, and Franz Fanon because she was criticized for creating characters who are traumatized and unable to embrace their black identities. On the other hand, having a somewhat privileged and elite background (coming from a relatively wealthy family, able to attend college) also distanced her from the Black Arts Movement. Her traumatized characters were seen as self-denigration, since the purpose of Black Arts Movement was "to build a stronger and more militant psychology to offset a defeatist

psychology conditioned by a history of forced servitude, discrimination, and racial denigration" (M. Williams quoted in Boucher, 2006: 87). For this purpose, in the theatre of the Black Arts Movement, positive images of black identity were foregrounded, and being black was presented as a reason to be proud. They used a didactic naturalist form to 'represent' the 'real' black experience. The movement's purpose in creating such works was to generate a positive image of black identity and to encourage political action. Adrienne Kennedy, on the other hand, was distinguished with her departure from the naturalist movement. She avoided creating essentialist identities, and she did not write out of responsibility to contribute to the creation of 'black consciousness.' Her goal in writing was not political, but artistic. However, the outcome was political anyway, as she deconstructed and questioned the essentialist notions of identity and assimilationist politics in the USA and focused on the annihilation of the idea of wholeness in African American sense of being. Kennedy was way ahead of her time also in foregrounding the female black identity in a feminist fashion when masculinist black nationalism's naturalist representations of the female experience were popular. Like the contemporary feminist African American writers, Kennedy focused on the individual experience of the black female rather than general issues of race and black history. Instead she used black history foregrounded in the individual stories of the black female focusing on the traces of a racist, assimilationist history in the personal experience relating herself to the motto of the radical feminists, "personal is political". Including 'personal' to the realm of the political can also be regarded as a schizophrenic act, or an unconscious revolutionary investment in Deleuze and Guattari's terms, since it aims the questioning of the dominant patriarchal system which keeps the private domain untouchable, and it disrupts the power structures by unveiling the political subordination of women. The unconscious revolutionary investments can be considered like the virtual that creates breaks within the supposed wholeness of the system and produces 'lines of flight.'

> Deleuze and Guattari make a distinction between preconscious revolutionary investments and unconscious revolutionary investments: preconscious revolutionary investments aim to create a new social body and a new form of power, whereas unconscious revolutionary investments imply a break with any social organization and, therefore, function at the limit of the social. In other words, if the preconscious revolutionary investments make a break between two forms of socius or change one

> form with another, the unconscious revolutionary investments introduce a break within the socius itself. In this sense sociality encounters its own limits and is reduced to a state of the body without organs (Žukauskaitė, 2015: 10).

However, deconstruction of unified subjectivities, questioning the very system of representation resulted in exclusion for Adrienne Kennedy. Kennedy was not very popular even though her play *Funnyhouse of a Negro* was produced by Edward Albee in 1964. She was not accepted much among African American writers or the feminist community because she was expected to create stable black subjectivities.

> During the 1960s and 1970s, many within the activist African American community insisted that [didactic, militant messages about race were] what their playwrights should have been writing…. They objected to [Kennedy's] characters, who were confused about their identity and place in the world, and who did not proclaim an uncomplicated pride in being black (Solomon, 1992: xii).

Since her characters are unable to belong to a certain group or identity, Kennedy herself was also ostracized from literary communities and movements. In the 1960s these unstable, ambiguous characters were seen as a threat to both Black Nationalism and to the prevalence of European-American white culture. Nevertheless, she has kept creating characters who do not fit into any kind of border. She disrupts the fixities of racial boundaries and portrays culturally ambiguous crossbreeds who are psychologically dislocated as they are neither white nor black.

Kennedy's multiple identifications in a character represent diverse social relations and psychic patterns. In her identifications "traces of hysterical mimicry (of playing all the parts), the rage of ambivalence, the punishing constraints of parental ego-ideals are all in evidence" (Diamond, 1993: 90). Kennedy defamiliarizes the concept of identity as she devastates the expectations of a stable identity which has continuous and constant references. Her characters are incapable of establishing themselves a continuous, say, 'black,' 'white' or 'female' identity. There are the ruptures of history and society, as well as the psyche that interrupts the process. Hysteria is a form of interruption in the process of 'identification' in Kennedy's plays. The theme of hysteria which is constant in the exploration of gender issues, this time

is used to question racial identities which is another political issue because in Kennedy "'character' is always an effect of, therefore problematized by, contradictory social and cultural identifications, the dramatist initiates a discourse on spectatorial reception of which even Brecht might approve: a rethinking of identification for political ends" (Diamond, 1993: 93). Also, in Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis delirum is defined as racial since race helps the body to imagine itself as unified, and it, in the end, even results in destruction of civilizations.

> All delirium is racial, which does not necessarily mean racist. It is not a matter of the regions of the body without organs 'representing' races and cultures. The full body does not represent anything at all. On the contrary, the races and cultures designate regions on this body – that is, zones of intensities, fields of potentials. Phenomena of individualization and sexualization are produced within these fields. We pass from one field to another by crossing thresholds: we never stop migrating, we become other individuals as well as other sexes, and departing becomes as easy as being born or dying. Along the way we struggle against other races, we destroy civilizations, in the manner of the great migrants in whose wake nothing is left standing once they have passed through (Deleuze, et. al., 1983: 85).

In *Funnyhouse of a Negro* the 'Negro' Sarah, in a state of delirium identifies herself with different 'selves' who are fragments of Sarah's mind instead of a unified subjectivity. They are not representative of the real historical people that their names carry but stand for the current state of Sarah's mind. Hysterically Sarah is seen playing all those historical characters; the Duchess of Hapsburg, Patrice Lumumba, a hunchbacked Jesus, and Queen Victoria, who sometimes haunt her one by one, and sometimes in chorus. Sarah feels herself in between her crossbreed genes; "my father is the darkest, my mother is the lightest … I am in between" (Kennedy, 1997: 5). Obsessed with her mixed background, she tells her personal story of miscegenation and rape through these various historical characters; therefore, blending her personal history with the colonial history, religious background and the political movements in the emerging African nations. These clashing figures inhabiting her selves also clash with her 'own self,' emphasizing the political and social backgrounds of her personal identity crisis.

> Sarah is the progeny of Europe and Africa, two mighty continents engaged in mortal combat. The Duchess of Hapsburg and Queen Victoria between them represent the royal line beginning with the Holy Roman Empire, which solidified the power of Europe and thrust England into preeminence as a colonial power. Jesus Christ suggests the religion that became the rationale for conquest. Patrice Lumumba, the martyred leader, represents the emerging African nations. In the play these figures constantly clash… Thus Sarah's "personal identity crisis" is at once a crisis with political and social resonance (M. B. Wilkerson quoted in Sözalan, 2006: 144-145).

Deconstructing the idea of a unified and whole character, Kennedy portrays Sarah as a fragmentary being having contradictory selves. Sarah is split into different clashing selves; Kennedy focuses especially on these moments of clash between different identities. With all these selves Sarah is black and white, or male and female, dead and alive, young and old, hairy and bald, indifferent and revolutionary, lascivious and spiritual, majestic and humble at the same time. For example; Victoria and Lumumba are contradictory in one being the queen of a colonial empire, the other a figure of anticolonialism; while Jesus stands for love, the Duchess stands for lasciviousness; Lumumba is a militant who fights against colonialism, Jesus on the other hand is a passive figure who emphasizes forgiveness; finally while Duchess is a scandalous woman, Victoria is famous for her ethics:

> She portrays her central character not as unified or whole but as a collage of multifaceted and contradictory selves (who are not only black and white, or male and female, but also father's daughter and mother's daughter, ruler and martyr, stoic and revolutionary, dead and alive, carnal and spiritual, young and old, hairy and bald, glamorous and humble, or proper and lascivious). The antithesis between Victoria and Lumumba may thus be seen as that between empire and anticolonialism; Jesus and the Duchess of Hapsburg may relate to each other as love and lust; the Duchess and Victoria may represent the conflict between a scandalous and a proper woman; Lumumba and Jesus may embody militancy and forgiveness (Sollors, 1991: 509).

In her prose autobiographical book *People Who Led to My Plays* Adrienne Kennedy explains how she identifies these figures. Jesus reminds her of a Christmas pageant. "I got to wear a white robe, and walk off the stage accompanied by music, carrying the baby Jesus. And I sat in the hall the rest of the afternoon in my costume at the school Christmas party. Everyone talked to me. I had never received so much attention" (Kennedy, 1996: 11), and an Easter sermon; "The minister preached violently of the crucifixion, Jesus, Judas, betrayal and finally Jesus Christ arising from

the dead on Easter morning. My father started sobbing. […] I had never seen him cry" (Kennedy, 1996: 21), a savior who loves children; "'Jesus loves you,' Sunday school teachers repeated every Sunday, winter, spring, and summer. 'Jesus loves all the little boys and girls'" (Kennedy, 1996: 11), and after she learns about her parents' separation he becomes a punishing Jesus; berserk, evil, sinister; "My mother has always said holding her family together was the most important thing in the world. Suddenly that spring Jesus became a character in the play I was writing, and a surprising Jesus, a punishing Jesus; berserk, evil, sinister" (Kennedy, 1996: 123).

Patrice Lumumba, on the other hand, was assassinated in 1961 when Kennedy was living in Ghana. Lumumba, whom she also connects with her father, was a black hero figure representing a search for African origins for Kennedy: "There was no doubt that Lumumba, this murdered hero, was merged in my mind with my father" (Kennedy, 1996: 119-120).

Queen Victoria as another figure Kennedy uses in the play, an image of white arrogance, a myth of royal origins, is also referred to in her autobiography showing her white roots in England. This causes an interest in England in her and when she stays in London she sees the statue of Queen Victoria, and she feels deeply affected by this powerful female figure: "The statue we saw of Victoria in front of Buckingham Palace was the single most dramatic, startling statue I'd seen. Here was a woman who had dominated an age. In my play I would soon have the heroine, Sarah, talk to a replica of this statue. […] The *statue* would reveal my character's secrets to herself" (Kennedy, 1996: 118).

The last persona Sarah identifies herself with is the Duchess of Hapsburg, Carlotta, who was the wife of the Hapsburgian Emperor of Mexico Maximilian I. In 1863, Maximilian had been sent to Mexico by Napoléon III of France to establish French supremacy. However; the Mexican enterprise failed, and Maximilian I. was executed upon Benito Juarez's victory as a result of which Carlotta turned insane. Adrienne Kennedy meets the Duchess of Hapsburg in the movie *Juarez* (1939) by William Dieterle; the movie impressed Kennedy so much that in 1957 her husband,

son and she visited Chapultepec Palace, where the Hapsburgs had lived; “I bought many postcards of the palace and the Duchess of Hapsburg and saved them. One day the Duchess of Hapsburg would become one of my characters’ most sympathetic alter egos or selves. […] European royalty in an alien landscape. Soon my Duchess of Hapsburg would exist in an alien persona, that of the character of the Negro writer” (Kennedy, 1996: 96-97).

Kennedy does not present Sarah’s selves as fixed symbols. Although in her prose work Kennedy gives some explanation about these characters, it is difficult to say that these characters stand for a definite meaning. And all these characters have a common concern for their family ties. Some of the dialogues and monologues show how these characters are united with each other. They all share repetitions and similar lines, sometimes telling the same story at the same time as if there was only one self. All of a sudden, their mother, father, and the first person singular ‘I’ become the same. Their speeches are mixed and repeated by one another. For example; the part about the father returning is mentioned by the Queen, the Duchess, and Jesus a few times; and also repeated in the section below by all the selves:

> ALL: He never tires of the journey, he who is the darkest one, the darkest one of them all. My mother looked like a white woman, hair as straight as any white woman’s. I am yellow but he is black, the darkest one of us all. How I hoped he was dead, yet he never tires of the journey. It was because of him that my mother died because she let a black man put his hands on her. Why does he keep returning? He keeps returning forever, keeps returning and returning and he is my father. He is a black Negro. They told me my Father was God but my father is black. He is my father. I am tied to a black Negro. He returned when I lived in the south back in the twenties, when I was a child, he returned. Before I was born at the turn of the century, he haunted my conception, diseased my birth … killed my mother. He killed the light. My mother was the lightest one. I am bound to him unless, of course, he should die.
> But he is dead.
> And he keeps returning. Then he is not dead.
> Then he is not dead.
> Yet, he is dead, but dead he comes knocking at my door (Kennedy, 1997: 22-23).

All the repetitions, historical and political references in Kennedy’s play can be read through Deleuze’s concept of time. Deleuze’s philosophy of time provides him to

define time as a process and becoming. “The innovations on time allow him to explain and develop a philosophy of process and becoming without having either to ground it on a prior foundation dependent on some kind of metaphysical identity, or to give it some kind of independent experiential or empirical basis, or to make mystical and quasi-religious claims for its legitimacy and form” (Williams, 2011: 1). Time is a process and it is not based on any sameness or similarity. “This philosophy of time is therefore one of difference as becoming, where difference is free of any roots in identity claims or in analogies based on sameness and similarity” (Williams, 2011: 2-3). Difference is regarded as difference in itself. Repetition is also an important part of identity.

> If the concept of difference in itself allows Deleuze to move away from fixed definitions and values, the concept of repetition allows him to develop the process and materialist aspects of his philosophy. These aspects have already been encountered here in the guise of Deleuze’s principles regarding passivity. Pure difference happens to us – it is not the result of direct actions. This explains the central role taken by the forgetting of identity in *Difference and Repetition*. Repetition is a process that underlies all identities. Free will is, therefore, an illusion. Things are not simply made to happen – they also always emerge through an unconscious repetition (Williams, 2013: 91)

There are flows and differences in life everywhere and in every living being. Deleuze does not see difference negatively; individual is not part of any ‘lack’. System of signification is based on repetition rather than difference. Deleuze and Guattari explain how ‘faciality’ is based on sameness. Racism is considered under faciality and it is seen that it tries to unify rather than discriminate, it is a form of territorialisation. Racism tries to create the illusion of stability; it is a way of totalizing rather than excluding.

> According to Deleuze and Guattari, modern racism operates through the erasure of exteriority. The simple formula it presents works by totalising, such that ‘there is no exterior, there are no people on the outside. There are only people who should be like us and whose crime it is not to be’ (1987: 178). As a product of faciality, racism operates on the logic of the same and ‘propagates waves of sameness until those who resist identification have been wiped out (or those who only allow themselves to be identified at a given degree of divergence)’. Consequently, faciality and racism do not operate through essentialising opposition marked by binary categories such as black / white or self / other. Instead, the faciality machine presents racial difference as a range

> of deviations from the dominant standard – the Christ, White-Man face (Opondo, 2013: 251).

Race is a totalizing concept of fixity; it tries to fix identities in order to categorize according to how much people deviate from the 'face.' Therefore, repetition is an important element in creating similar identities. History is constituted of repetitions and differences. History is a series of events that happen one after the other and repetition in time is crucial for the totalizing systems in order to create stability. However, Deleuze puts repetition as form in theater in a different place as a tool that disturbs theater of representation.

> The theatre of repetition is opposed to the theatre of representation, just as movement is opposed to the concept and to representation which refers back to the concept. In the theatre of repetition we experience pure forces, dynamic lines in space which act without intermediary upon the spirit, and link it directly with nature and history, with a language which speaks before words, with gestures which develop before organized bodies, with masks before faces, with spectres and phantoms before characters – the whole apparatus of repetition as a 'terrible power' (Deleuze quoted in Dolphijn, 2013: 141).

Adrienne Kennedy makes use of this 'theatre of repetition' with her elusive and ambiguous language, gestures, masks and phantoms in a powerful way. Kennedy's choice of historical characters as Sarah's selves can also be considered in these terms, they are the phantoms repeated in Sarah's personal history. Further, Sarah's fear of rape seen repetitively in different selves shows how individual history has social and political connotations. Sarah's female selves, the Queen and the Duchess mirror her mother. The opening dialogue between the Queen and the Duchess, which is in a way a repetition of the above part, and the mother's similar words after a few seconds show how the mother and Sarah fear rape by the father:

> VICTORIA. He never tires of the journey, does he, Duchess? (Looking at herself in the mirror.)
> DUCHESS. How dare he enter the castle of Queen Victoria Regina, Monarch of England? It is because of him that my mother died. The wild beast put his hands on her. She died.
> VICTORIA. Why does he keep returning? He keeps returning forever, coming back ever and keeps coming back forever. He is my father.
>
> […]

> MOTHER. Black man, black man, I never should have let a black man put his hands on me. The wild black beast raped me and now my skull is shining (Kennedy, 1997: 6-7).

Also, Sarah's male selves are like his father. Sarah's father tried to be like Jesus and Lumumba. Contradictorily, he wanted to be a holy figure with his missionary activities, but revolutionary like Lumumba at the same time. "In the play Lumumba comes out of the darkness as a dark, faceless, unidentified Man and echoes Sarah's obsessions about hair loss and her dream of being surrounded by whiteness. Portraying Jesus as dwarfed and deformed perhaps suggests what Christianity is for Africans and Black Americans" (Curb, 1980: 182-183). Christian missionary activities as an act of colonialism of the West in Africa, stands contradictory to the revolutionary acts of Lumumba, thus the character Jesus who appears as a figure of peace and reconciliation in the Bible, here shows up deformed and announces that he is going to Africa to kill Lumumba because he wants to get rid of his blackness that he hates. His Lumumba part wants the black race to rise from colonialism, but in preaching Christianity, the white man's religion that supports the colonial purposes, he is guilty also for the cultural rape of his people in Africa. Therefore, Sarah's father can neither become Jesus nor Lumumba. According to Sarah's account the father tried to kill himself since he blames himself for betraying his mother, for sending his wife to an asylum, and for making Sarah despise him. Sarah claims she has killed her father, but the audience do not know if it is true or not. Like she was the one sending Jesus to the cross she feels guilty for her father's death, but still she cannot forgive her father for being 'the black beast rapist of her mother' (Kennedy, 1997: 8). She accuses her father not only for 'tainting' the European whiteness of the mother with African blackness, but also for failing to save Africa from the 'rape' of colonialism. Sarah's fear of rape is echoed throughout the play by her mother's lines: "Black man, black man, I never should have let a black man put his hands on me. The wild black beast raped me and now my skull is shining" (Kennedy, 1997: 7).

Sarah's personal history is blended with the colonial history, religious background and the political movements in the emerging African nations through the

use of these historical figures. Therefore; Sarah's fear of rape vocalized through the mother figure is rooted in the collective memory of black women who were often the victims of institutionalized rape by their white masters during slavery. History and repetition show itself in Sarah's unconscious. As bell hooks says these women were exploited not only racially but also de-humanized by sexual exploitation: "The female slave lived in constant awareness of her sexual vulnerability and in perpetual fear that any male, white or black, might single her out to assault and victimize" (b. hooks quoted in Curb, 1992: 143). On the other hand, "the black beast rapist" was the other side of the same colonial discourse creating the darker male figure as a rapist figure of the light skinned or white women. This racist cultural stereotype is also a distortion by the racist discourse that imagines the darker the color the higher the potential of rape was. Sarah's other selves echo this rape fear which has its roots in the colonial history of the black race.

Sarah's self-hatred stems from the fact that she has been taught all that is good is white. Therefore, she thinks as a crossbreed her blood is tainted. With regards to machine of faciality her miscegenation is a deviation from the Face. The creation of the face on the White Wall/black hole system is political; it is totalitarian and authoritarian.

> The order is totally different: despotic and authoritarian concrete assemblage of power —► triggering of the abstract machine of faciality, white wall/black hole —> installation of the new semiotic of signifiance and subjectification on that holey surface. That is why we have been addressing just two problems exclusively: the relation of the face to the abstract machine that produces it, and the relation of the face to the assemblages of power that require that social production. The face is a politics (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 181).

Therefore, Sarah's self-hatred and psychological situation is political. Sarah's visions of good and evil associated with whiteness and blackness clash in her consciousness up until it totally destroys her. She wants not to be (Kennedy, 1997: 8). Her fragmentary selves, as signs of her distorted vision of herself, do not represent 'real' historical figures as their names suggest. Rather they become figures for Sara's current state of mind, they are repetitions with a difference. Through these various historical

characters, the reader/audience learns about Sarah's personal story of miscegenation and rape. The political and social background of her personal identity crisis is emphasized by her different selves.

> The rooms are my rooms; a Hapsburg chamber, a chamber in a Victorian castle, the hotel where I killed my father, the jungle. These are the places myselves exist in. I know no places. That is, I cannot believe in places. To believe in places is to know hope and to know the emotion of hope is to know beauty. It links us across a horizon and connects us to the world. I find there are no places only my funnyhouse (Kennedy, 1997: 9-10).

In *Funnyhouse of a Negro* the processes of the unconscious and its social-political connections are reflected not only in theme but also in form. Imagery becomes an important formal element in the play; images operate on the level of the surreal and they implant themselves in the minds of the audience, appealing to intuition rather than rationality (Barnett, 1996: 149). Among the flow of images in the play, 'the funnyhouse' is the prevalent image. Sarah is a prisoner among the funnyhouse images of her fragmentary mind. Samuel Grossman who describes Kennedy's imagery as "penetrating . . . but impenetrable" (Grossman quoted in Curb, 1980: 190), notes that "the unifying and structuring device of *Funnyhouse* is the carnival funhouse itself with its distorting mirrors in imprisoning rooms linked by an endless maze of corridors filled with mirrors where one is forced to view horrifying grotesque images of self" (Grossman quoted in Curb, 1980: 190). Sarah imprisons herself in a house full of books, antiques, and statue of the White culture because she fears the invasion/rape of blackness that her father signifies. The dream like setting, her funnyhouse, constantly transforms itself and becomes places which are both real and unreal. According to Kennedy, the title of the play was inspired by an amusement park in Cleveland " "whose gates are flanked by two enormous grimacing figures—a metaphor for America 'where real places don't exist, only bizarre houses' " and where one can feel the "white world … ridiculing the Negro" " (Fabre quoted in Sollors, 1991: 514). Therefore; the funnyhouse stands as the main imagery to show that the white world distorts the sense of identity of black people. Curb says, "Both Queen and Duchess serve as barricades against the possibility of self-recognition, as mirrors of whiteness against Sarah's fear of blackness within" (Curb, 1985: 306). In Kennedy's *Funnyhouse*

different truths coexist like the distorted images of a funnyhouse mirrors, the audience sees all the distorted images of Negro Sarah and neither one is truer than the other. Through distorted funnyhouse images Kennedy creates endless mimicry and makes representation itself questionable.

Other than the prevalent imagery of the funnyhouse, the political use of images extends also to the imagery of death as a warning against assimilation. Images of death in the play start as early as the first stage direction: “It is a white satin Curtain of a cheap material and a ghastly white, a material that brings to mind the interior of a cheap casket, parts of it are frayed and look as if it has been gnawed by rats” (Kennedy, 1997: 5); “the rest of the stage is in unnatural BLACKNESS. The quality of the white light is unreal and ugly” (Kennedy, 1997: 5). The Queen’s chamber resembles an ebony tomb, black ravens are flying above, both the Queen and the Duchess are dressed in royal gowns of white similar to the white of the curtain, they are wearing white masks or white powder on their faces, “and possess a hard expressionless quality and stillness as in the face of death” (Kennedy, 1997: 5-6). All the other selves of Sarah are dead figures, and her mother is wearing a white nightgown carrying a skull across the stage. And Sarah’s white boyfriend Raymond “is tall, white and ghostly thin” (Kennedy, 1997: 11). Although Sarah is keen on whiteness and the White culture and have a dream to live in rooms with European antiques and her Queen Victoria statue, “photographs of Roman ruins, walls of books, a piano, oriental carpets and to eat [her] meals on a white glass table” (Kennedy, 1997: 9 [Also repeated several times throughout the play]) and be with her white friends; Kennedy uses death imagery to show that this whiteness that Sarah so much admires and wants to be a part of is deathly and will lead to her destruction. No matter how much she wants to “become even a more pallid Negro” (Kennedy, 1997: 8), she will always be described as ‘black’ and seen as different in a racist society.

Rosemary Curb’s interpretation of symbolic meaning of the mother’s hair loss and Sarah’s kinky hair is interesting:

> The mother's long straight hair is associated not only with her whiteness but also with her virginal innocence. After Sarah's father had raped her mother (symbolically a second deflowering), the woman lost her hair and went insane. Since according to folk medicine loss of pubic hair is a symptom of venereal disease, Sarah's mother's baldness can be seen as an external manifestation of her sexual corruption. Since Sarah exhibits "unmistakable Negro kinky hair" (p.255), she seems to have inherited her father's sensuality and guilt and has merited her mother's rejection. Every one of Sarah's selves is obsessed with losing hair. Since Sarah is the product of rape, she not only suffers for her mother's baldness and insanity but longs for the day her mother will favor her with a forgiving smile (Curb, 1980: 183).

Apart from the disintegration of self, the loss of hair also stands as a political image which signifies Sarah's assimilation into white society. While talking about her white friends and their influence on her, Sarah tells us that she wavered in her opinion of herself, does not trust herself, and that caused the fall of her hair: "I will mistrust them, as I do myself, waver in their opinion of me, as I waver in the opinion of myself. But if I had not wavered in my opinion of myself, then my hair would never have fallen out. And if my hair hadn't fallen out, I wouldn't have bludgeoned my father's head with an ebony mask" (Kennedy, 1997: 9). Sarah's kinky hair is a mark of her black heritage, since she assumed the dominance of white culture in her identity, and disregards her African American heritage with the fall of her 'kinky hair' she, in a way, loses the traces of her black roots when she loses her 'kinky hair.' On the other hand, since she is not accepted in the white culture, her sense of self shatters. According to Werner Sollors the hair as an image attains a life of its own, and the fact that her birth is associated with the Mother's hair loss may strengthen Sarah's tragic death wish, her desire 'not to be' (Sollors, 1991: 517). Since she is denied a sense of belonging in the white culture, her hatred of herself, her black heritage gradually increases, as we see later in Patrice Lumumba's similar monologue using the word 'despise' for herself:

> My white friends, like myself, will be shrewd intellectuals and anxious for death. Anyone's death. I will despise them as I do myself. For if I did not despise myself then my hair would not have fallen and if my hair had not fallen then I would not have bludgeoned my father's face with the ebony mask (Kennedy, 1997: 15).

As a result, Sarah desires not to exist anymore because she is culturally displaced and therefore psychologically disintegrated.

The intense imagery and repetitive sentence sequences give a dream-like structural pattern to *Funnyhouse of a Negro*. Kennedy disrupts the expectations of a classic narrative pattern changing it with a different/parallel story each time the reader/audience thinks s/he is making a deduction. Stories change as the characters/Sarah's selves recount their versions, sometimes conforming and sometimes negating the other's version. According to Herbert Blau, this narrative slippage causes a sense of discomfort on the part of the audience and subjects them to a kind of mental miscegenation:

> The disjunct mental state and the changes of costume, role, sexual identities are like adulterate racial mixtures in the obsessive stream of thought, a form of mental miscegenation. The desperate selves of the associative play are sometimes projected in narrative and sometimes objectively there, but no sooner does one feel located than there are displacements of space and time (H. Blau quoted in Brown, 2001: 288).

The reader/audience, indeed, goes through a similar experience as Sarah through these narrative displacements; when the narrative constantly shifts the reader/audience is also dislocated like Sarah, who shifts between her clashing identities, being forced to go over their conventional notions of selfhood and identity. As well as having separate selves represented as separate characters, Kennedy disrupts the reader/audience's expectations also by presenting a non-linear plot without a chronological narrative progression to portray the fragmented mental states of Sarah. The story accumulates with each character's repetitions and additions, and different layers of the story are exposed. Images are repeated in the same way as dialogues to reinforce the psychological effect on the reader/audience. For example; the falling hair image is first introduced in the prologue by the mother figure who carries a bald head while she passes across. In the later scenes with the Duchess and the Queen pieces of fallen hair is seen on the pillow, and after that Sarah carries a patch of hair missing from her head. Here the repetition of the image also emphasizes the feeling of disintegration that Sarah goes through. Another example to the narrative dislocation happens when the reader/audience witnesses the account of the landlady and Raymond. According to the landlady's version, Sarah's father was not killed by Sarah, but he hung himself in a

Harlem hotel when Lumumba died (Kennedy, 1997: 24); and due to Raymond's version the father never hung himself, instead he lives a well off life like white people: "I know the man. He is a doctor, married to a white whore. He lives in the city in rooms with European antiques, photographs of Roman ruins, walls of books and oriental carpets. Her father is a nigger who eat his meals on a white glass table" (Kennedy, 1997: 24). With these two different versions added to the final of the story and repetitions throughout the play, it becomes impossible on the part of the reader/audience to decide which version is 'truer.' The ambiguity of character and action thus reinforced by form, and the idea of mimetic representation is questioned by Kennedy through these repetitions and additions/versions. There are different versions of truth that are never resolved. But whether the narrative is true or not is not important here. The play problematizes/dramatizes the very nature of narrative itself questioning its authority and power. Deleuze and Guattari claim that there is no 'truth' or 'reality' to represent, but rather they see it as an assemblage, a field of multiplicity where everything flows at the same time including the semiotic, material and social.

> There is no longer a tripartite division between a field of reality (the world) and a field of representation (the book) and a field of subjectivity (the author). Rather, an assemblage establishes connections between certain multiplicities drawn from each of these orders, so that a book has no sequel nor the world as its object nor one or several authors as its subject. In short, we think that one cannot write sufficiently in the name of an outside. The outside has no image, no signification, no subjectivity. The book as assemblage with the outside, against the book as image of the world. A rhizome-book, not a dichotomous, pivotal, or fascicular book. Never send down roots, or plant them, however difficult it may be to avoid reverting to the old procedures. "Those things which occur to me, occur to me not from the root up but rather only from somewhere about their middle. Let someone then attempt to seize them, let someone attempt to seize a blade of grass and hold fast to it when it begins to grow only from the middle."22 Why is this so difficult? The question is directly one of perceptual semiotics. It's not easy to see things in the middle, rather than looking down on them from above or up at them from below, or from left to right or right to left: try it, you'll see that everything changes. It's not easy to see the grass in things and in words (similarly, Nietzsche said that an aphorism had to be "ruminated"; never is a plateau separable from the cows that populate it, which are also the clouds in the sky) (Deleuze, et. al., 1987: 23).

Instead of a single truth or reality, Deleuze and Guattari defend multiplicity. They also see thought as 'becoming': "All of thought is a becoming, a double becoming, rather than the attribute of a Subject and the representation of a Whole" (Deleuze, et. al.,

1987: 380). Therefore, Schizoanalysis propels a new individuality in line with the flows of desire and the difference this multiplicity brings forth. Schizophrenic creation, for this reason, is based on breaks, flaws and disruptions, and foregrounds 'becoming' rather than identity construction. Challenging representation, flaws and disruptions have the power of 'the false' also in antiracist confrontation:

> When Deleuze engages the term 'race', he specifies two meanings – a race-tribe and a milieu-space. In the first, race describes an alterity that is recalcitrant to governmental striations. Deleuze and Guattari's striated spaces are subjected to the state's coding machine, which turns smooth spaces into striated ones where meaning is manipulable and fixed. Posited as smooth, race conjures fantastic spaces – the Orient, the Gobi Desert. These fantastic and singular forms constitute race in ways that teeter towards two interlinked forms of racism, 'a dominant and all-encompassing fascism, or into a sect and a folklore, microfascisms' or 'a phantasy that reactivates all the fascisms in a different way' (1988: 379–80). To combat these racisms, one must do something other than travelling 'to escape phantasy' or 'by invoking a past, real or mythical'. Deleuze importantly points out that truth presented by travel and history is not only what counters the falsity of exoticised and Other-ed margins. The antiracist confrontation is rather with the powers of the false, the power to create fantasy in the first place (Isaki, 2013: 116-117).

Deleuze is against setting a fixed identity; identity construction is totalitarian and despotic, which disregards difference and multiplicity in life. Fighting racism cannot be through identity construction. "The dismantling of race / face, therefore, involves an abandonment or evacuation of the self and of the love of the habits associated with it in order to become imperceptible. As Deleuze and Guattari put it, rather than creating a new identity, the way out is 'to be nobody, to no longer be anybody' (1987: 197)" (Opondo, 2013: 251). Sarah achieves 'not to be' via her multiple constitution rather than her suicide. Schizophrenic creation of Sarah in *Funnyhouse of a Negro* is subversive as Kennedy disrupts the system of signification propelled by the machine of faciality through Sarah's multiplicity, and the textual and formal ambiguity. Kennedy foregrounds the historical and political grounds of identification and dismantles it by her schizophrenic creation.

CONCLUSION

The Relationship Between Theatre and Politics

Practitioners of theater have tried to influence the possible actions of their audience, but theater has also become a political means which they use to shape the structure of communities and culture. It has always been easier to measure the immediate response of the audiences once the theatrical work is realized as a live performance; however, political changes in a community or culture aimed by the theatrical practitioners are more difficult to detect since that kind of change entails more comprehensive and resistant modifications in culture and society. A research of the latter kind is more the subject of sociological and historical studies. Therefore; it is not the purpose of this study to prove this kind of performance efficacy is possible.

However; it is for sure that such efficacy is the essential aim of many performances and dramatic texts. Even when some performances aim merely to entertain the audience, it has social and political repercussions in the society such as encouraging escapism. While on the other hand, some performances engaging in current moral issues intend to achieve more 'serious' changes in the social and cultural structure of society. Therefore; whether intentionally or not, there is a political bottom-line to theatrical performance. It is important to note that, this relationship between politics and theatrical performance comes not from within, it will not be right to say that this relationship is ‘natural’ within theater, but rather it is the natural consequence of an artistic genre that is necessarily in a relationship with the wider social order in its discursive productions and its institutional structures.

What if we leave the empirical field work to find out about social and cultural consequences of theatrical performance to sociologists and historians, and instead focus on the cultural and material tools of dramatic writing that are most likely to produce an efficacious result? It is possible to change the question asked and look at the subject from a broader point of view abandoning the individual productions or performances, to analyze the dramatic text in relation to cultural and social change in specific localities. When the political potential of the dramatic text is considered in

relation to its particular historical context and literary tools, perhaps it is possible to understand the relationship between theater and politics. In order to evaluate the political effect of theater one can consider the dramatic text both in terms of form and content. Edward Albee claims that drama is an act of aggression: “It's an act of aggression against the status quo, against people's smugness” (Albee quoted in Fisher, 1995-6: 19). A politically alternative theater questions and resists the status quo with its political agenda that is against the dominant socio-cultural practices and with its innovative form.

> How political effect is to be evaluated? How the degree to which an audience is politically activated/mobilized is to be measured? Should one go by the intensity of revolutionary sentiment displayed inside the theatre, by the debates a performance generates, by the degree of popular success, by the degree of critical acclaim, or by the extent to which it resists the status quo? Certainly, all these factors should be taken into consideration without limiting political efficacy of a performance to either of them. But even then, it is difficult to determine what concrete political changes a performance effected in the social realm. Thus, it would be futile to argue, for example, that Tony Kushner's *Angels in America* is politically more effective than Arthur Miller's political drama *The Crucible*. What one can evaluate, however, is the clarity of a political agenda, and the methods of translating it on the stage, as well as the relationship of aesthetic choices to dominant cultural practices. In the same way, political theatre, ultimately, constitutes itself not only in the act of critiquing the status quo, but also in the act of resisting it. In this regard, form is indisputably as politically important as content, regardless of whether it is innovative or conventional. Concurrently, innovative form alone cannot carry the political message of a performance by itself, but does need a substantial and clear political argument to back it up (Hussein, 2014: 137).

Therefore, theatrical language, which should be thought not only as the written text but also as all formal devices in the text, plus the socio-political agenda it is engaged with as content can have a subversive character that criticize and resist the dominant cultural practices, and thus theater becomes a part of culture contributing to social change. Stephen Greenblatt gives a description of the power of language to appeal to a reader's most fundamental emotions. Symbolic is regarded in terms of an economy laying bare the constructed nature of that economy. It is specifically the appeal to the reader’s emotions that makes a change in cultural economy possible. What is creative and also subversive in literature is using the language in an innovative way and manipulating that symbolic economy:

> "In any culture there is a general symbolic economy made up of the myriad signs that excite human desire, fear, and aggression. Through their ability to construct resonant stories, their command of effective imagery, and above all their sensitivity to the greatest collective creation of any culture - language - literary artists are skilled at manipulating this economy." (Greenblatt quoted in Robson, 2008: 3)
> […]
> Thinking about the symbolic in terms of economy allows us to see how images, objects, narratives, and representations are produced, reproduced, consumed, traded and circulated, and how they change value as they move from one area of a culture to another (Robson, 2008: 3).

Martin Esslin, who theorized the concept of absurd theater and wrote *The Theatre of the Absurd*, claims that "[t]he theatre is the place where a nation thinks in public in front of itself" (Esslin quoted in Saddik, 2007: 1). The notion of theater representing 'reality' dates back to antiquity, to philosophers Plato and then to Aristotle's formulations of mimesis. Since then representation and reality have become important concepts in theories of literature and theater. Erich Auerbach detects Stendhal and Balzac as the writers who initiated modern realism and realism after them has ever developed in different forms:

> When Stendhal and Balzac took random individuals from daily life in their dependence upon current historical circumstances and made them the subjects of serious, problematic, and even tragic representation, they broke with the classical rule of distinct levels of style, for according to this rule, everyday practical reality could find a place in literature only within the frame of a low or intermediate kind of style, that is to say, as either grotesquely comic or pleasant, light, colorful, and elegant entertainment. They thus completed a development which had long been in preparation (since the time of the novel of manners and the comedie larmoyante of the eighteenth century, and more pronouncedly since the Sturm und Drang and early romanticism). And they opened the way for modem realism, which has ever since developed in increasingly rich forms, in keeping with the constantly changing and expanding reality of modem life (Auerbach, 200: 554).

Before the European influence of realism and anti-realistic experiments on the American stage, the years between 1900 – 1915 American theatre did not produce much unique works. Melodrama and comedy of manners were common forms. "Though the American social and political landscape was transformed by the same cultural forces, the American drama of the first 15 years of the twentieth century reflected instead a theatrical business structure that resisted new forms and a literary culture that produced few new works of drama, however much a series of uniquely

American responses to modernity occurred" (Bryan, 2007: 3). There were ethnic theaters since the late eighteenth century, these groups were mostly playing classics such as Shakespeare. In 1820s new plays were created by and for working class immigrants in search of entertainment, and what they created was ethnic stereotypes on the stage, minstrel shows were a result of this period.

> The comic caricature was most prevalent in blackface minstrelsy, where the actor, mostly played by Irish actors at first, blacked up. ''Blacking up'' was a technique whereby actors applied burnt cork to their faces and performed condescending ''imitations'' of African Americans. By the 1920s, almost every great Jewish American comedian began blacking up in vaudeville and burlesque (Al Jolson, for example) (Shteir, 2007: 18-19).

Realism in the treatment of issues of ethnicity and race on the stage became more prominent after the Civil War as the number of immigrants were rising. "As waves of new immigrants arrived, immigrant actors brought with them greater understanding of their lives to the stage; new plays portrayed new circumstances of immigrant life" (Shteir, 2007: 20). At the end of nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth ethnic theaters and stereotypical figures were merged into popular entertainment forms such as burlesque.

> The rise of vaudeville both diluted and popularized the Irish, German, and blackface caricatures created during the nineteenth century. In his book *The Voice of the City*, Robert Snyder observed that vaudeville offered something for everyone. This hardly meant that vaudeville presented every ethnicity equally; in fact, many of the old stereotypes remained (Shteir, 2007: 21).

There were more artistic forms of Jewish theater but by the end of 1920s that movement also weakened with the effort of creating an American identity, "[m]ore common were multi-ethnic comedies revealing America's wish for everyone to be equal" (Shteir, 2007: 31). In 1930s with the Great Depression and workers movements ethnic theaters and the representation of American identity had already begun to change:

> By the early 1930s, the Yiddish theatre, like many other ethnic theatres, continued to decline. In 1935, under the auspices of the Works Project Administration (WPA), the Federal Theatre Project resuscitated some ethnic theatres in order to employ actors and generate theatre. The WPA included a German theatre, a Yiddish theatre, and an African American theatre. However, ethnic theatre must have appeared museum-like to the Depression-era audiences clamoring for political change. During the Depression, the proletariats were, for the most part, attempting to unite as workers rather than as ‘‘ethnics.’’ The Prolet-Bühne and the Workers Laboratory Theatre emerged as laboratories to create new work about class injustice. Langston Hughes's *The Scottsboro Boys*, about nine black men being tried for raping a white woman, was gaining root in America. In the Group Theatre, Clifford Odets wrote *Waiting for Lefty* (1935). The idea of what ethnic theatre could be and do – and what it meant to be an American – had already begun to change (Shteir, 2007: 32).

After 1915s with the effect of European avant-garde movements, modernism, and feminism American theater began to be aesthetically and politically more sophisticated. Against the commercial theater Little Theatre Movement emerging in different cities of the USA provided non-commercial alternatives. The Provincetown Players was among these groups in the movement and two important playwrights, Susan Glaspell and Eugene O'Neill emerged from this group. Christine Stansell describes the bohemian community in Greenwich Village which also included the Provincetown Players:

> the first full-bodied alternative to an established cultural elite. . . . They developed an unrivaled vision of feminism – with its powers to recast men's and women's lives – as a critical ingredient of modern culture. . . . They injected into politics of the left a new cultural dimension, as well as psychological identifications between working-class and middle-class people. . . . They made Greenwich Village into a beacon of American possibility in the new age (Stansell quoted in Gainor, 2007: 36).

Glaspell and her friends, in their modernist spirit, adopted experimentation as a method on stage and social criticism of realistic representation: "They embraced the spirit of experimentation that informed the visual and literary artistry of their bohemian colleagues; their Village stage became a crucible for a modern American theatre that strove to integrate social critique and the avant-garde" (Gainor, 2007: 36). Glaspell regarded theater as a form of activism, and she believed in the power of theater to change. In an interview Glaspell explained her political activism through theater:

> ‘‘Of course I am interested in all progressive movements, whether feminist, social, or economic . . . but I can take no very active part other than through my writing’’ (Rohe 1921: 4). Glaspell reveals here that she saw her writing as political activism, and that she consciously chose to focus her energies on developing material for a platform that she believed could have the power to effect real, substantive change (Gainor, 2007: 37).

Representation of all characters' perspectives, focusing on the social context of their actions, along with her feminist political stance underscores Glaspell's realist, modernist aesthetics. "While her commitment to feminism informs every play she wrote, she is also careful to construct a balanced dramatic environment through which we come to understand fully the women's lives she depicts and the contexts for their choices and actions" (Gainor, 2007: 37). By deploying European conventions of realism, expressionism and symbolism to the American context Glaspell also contributed to the creation of a unique modern American drama. "Glaspell's deep engagement with feminist issues and with other women's activism came increasingly to dominate her work for the Players, amid generalized Village concerns with World War I, with growing social and economic inequities in the United States, and with the relationship between art and politics" (Gainor, 2007: 39).

Thus, modern American drama was emerging, and the artist was trying to represent more than the 'realities' of the world. Emotions and imagination had shifted that reality with an intention to change it. In such a scene Eugene O'Neill was part of the Provincetown Players. "[Pro-modernist critics] celebrated any American dramatic experiment which shrugged off stage literalism and stale imitation, even when the play in question had to be praised with numerous caveats" (Beard, 2007: 53). O'Neill's both expressionistic and realistic plays were success in such a context. Popular American plays constituted of melodramas and comedy of manners were giving way to European realism in America with the initiation of these playwrights in the Little Theatre Movement. Experimentation marks the stage in the period after 1920s. O'Neill was experimenting with enriching character rather than plot with the intention of manifesting mood on stage:

> He is uninterested in creating the metaphysical image physical; instead, he is determined to manifest mood on stage. This notion of mood is frequently accomplished through innovative use of patterned sound. O'Neill's stage directions are replete with sounds: live accordion music underscoring a sailor's storytelling, the ship's whistle calling men to watch, bells announcing the time, men snoring in their bunks, and long periods of silence (Beard, 2007: 59).

With the form of art shifting to expressionism with the influence of German expressionist drama, what was being foregrounded with representation was the inner condition of characters in the face of a painful outside reality. This also provided criticism of that reality:

> German expressionist drama strives to communicate the emotional experience of a single person through the exterior elements of people and things. The emotions communicated are nearly always painful. This desire to ''express'' strong emotional states is typically seen in exaggerated language and distorted visual representations. The typical German expressionist plot focuses on a central anti-heroic character as he journeys from one place to another (Beard, 2007: 60).

Expressionism in American drama started to fade away with the Great Depression as aesthetics was among the least of concerns in the midst of an economic crisis. "The social and economic climate of the 1930s had little tolerance for expressionism's brand of modernist stridency and aestheticism" (Beard, 2007: 67). Still it is important to remember that expressionism in American literature was concerned with the social reality and the expressionistic plays had the political intention of changing that reality. "American expressionism was never an art estranged from the real world; its goal was to be immersed so deeply in the problems of modernity that it would transcend the mask of physical reality (Beard, 2007: 67). 1920s also had given rise to social problem plays, Maxwell Anderson being the prominent author of the genre. "Maxwell Anderson gained a solid enough foothold with his social problem plays of the 1920s (tallying five Pulitzer Prize nominations) that he stood ready to blossom with his great verse dramas of the 1930s and after" (Londré, 2007: 87). Untraditional subjects such as abortion or sex before marriage were also included in the plays of 1920s and radicalized the period thematically as well. African American theater was also emergent; however, "[w]ith the notable exception of Garland Anderson's Appearances (1925), few non-musical works by blacks make it to the New

York stage in the 1920s, yet many one-act and full-length plays by Willis Richardson, Langston Hughes, Zora Neale Hurston, Georgia Douglas Johnson, Eulalie Spence, May Miller, and Marita Bonner hold lasting literary interest" (Londré, 2007: 79). During the Harlem Renaissance (1917-35) comedy and musicals were outside the scope of African American theater; instead plays were focusing on recognition and the representation of black identity: "All four – pageant, folk, social issue, and history – directly respond to W. E. B. Du Bois's call in 1903 to create ''art of the black folk [that] compels recognition,'' in order to be rated as ''human'' (Bean, 2007: 91). 1930s, on the other hand, was marked by political plays on the side of the alternative theater. "Viewed against events of the decade (especially the Depression and the coming war) and considered through the lens of contemporary criticism, the dramatic literature of the 1930s reverberates with sociopolitical commentary" (Fletcher, 2007: 106). During the depression years Clifford Odets, Lillian Hellman, Elmer Rice, and Thornton Wilder were added to the list of prominent playwrights of 1930s. "Social, political, and personal indecision, confusion, or sheer helplessness comprised America's zeitgeist of the 1930s" (Fletcher, 2007: 116).

When it comes to 1940s and 50s, during the years of the World War II and the postwar period, the reflection of the social context could be observed in theatrical representation. The social background was marked by racial segregation, consumption culture, anti-feminist backlash, and fear of communism:

> During the Truman years, the Marshall Plan that achieved economic reconstruction abroad was accompanied by a new wave of manifest destiny, a policing of the world by a nuclear power in the name of spreading democracy. At home, expansion and prosperity contributed to social dislocation as whites moved to the suburbs, leaving behind urban ghettos and sowing seeds for racial, class, and ethnic dissension, while the Kinsey reports that demystified the physiology and psychology of sex did little to bring about widespread acceptance of transgressive sexuality. The Eisenhower period, often too simplistically seen as a time of homogeneous belief in such traditional values as work, family, and religion, revealed its own fault lines in the regimentation and conformity of a reorganized economy that prized commodity consumption over production and loyalty over initiative, in the repression of just how inequitable and intolerant society was, and in a retrenchment of women's roles, resulting in feelings of anonymity and apathy, restlessness and psychic anxiety. If the Cold War mentality that generated paranoia and suspicion over the threat of Communism was used to justify forced loyalty oaths, blacklisting, witch-hunts, and even executions, more positive signs of the guarantee of civil rights could be seen in the outlawing of

> restrictive housing covenants and the end of segregated schools. Such is the background against which the playwrights of the period dramatize the war and its aftermath, relations between the sexes, the tension between the individual and society, and the realities of ethnic, sexual, and racial difference (Adler, 2007: 159-160).

During this period contemporary American drama was launched as ways of anti-realistic, anti-mimetic representation increased in this period.

> Since the Second World War, the ways in which America has of up to up in as thought 'in public in front of itself' through drama and performance have taken various forms, from the conservative conventions of domestic realism that typically reassert the dominant social order, to more anti-realistic, anti-mimetic dramatic modes that question and resist these restrictive definitions of what it means to be, or to actually count as, an 'American' on the stage in terms of ethnicity, social class, gender, sexuality and race (Saddik, 2007: 1-2).

Classical mimetic theory is based on Aristotle's idealist philosophy. In Aristotle's formulation of mimesis imitation by the artist is towards the 'ideal' rather than the world of objects. Idealist philosophy claims that the world of objects is already an imitation of the world of ideas; therefore, it is already imperfect. According to Aristotle the artist should take this world of ideas into consideration and try to re-create it in the work of art. Hence, classical realism in terms of Aristotle's formulation of mimetic theory is political because the 'ideal' is framed by the State. Agusto Boal explains Aristotelian notion of mimesis/imitation:

> For Aristotle, 'imitate' meant: To recreate that internal movement of things toward their perfection. Nature was for him this movement itself and not things already made, finished, visible. Thus, 'to imitate' has nothing to do with improvisation or 'realism,' and for this reason Aristotle could say that the artist must imitate men 'as they should be' and not as they are (Boal quoted in Saddik, 2007: 3).

Imitation of men 'as they should be' in Aristotelian formulation means certain properties promoted in the society rather than simply and directly reflecting how they are. Since the answer to who defines how things 'should be' in Aristotelian terms is the State, mimesis means the representation of the status quo. "Aristotelian drama is therefore involved in (re)presenting the status quo for the purpose of re-establishing

the dominant social order, things ‘as they should be’ according to the lawmakers, or the ruling class” (Saddik, 2007: 3).

Therefore, anti-realism, or anti-mimetic theory of theater, developed in Europe by Bertolt Brecht and Antonin Artaud is a revolutionary political movement as it denies the audience Aristotelian catharsis and push the audience to question the status quo rather than simply accept it. Instead of a single truth coming out of a single source that holds power, anti-realist representation fights against the hegemony of dogmatism and argues for pluralism and multiplicity. It does that both through form and content:

> Anti-realism is concerned with eschewing the reproduction of surface reality, distorting these surfaces through stage settings that are not faithfully specific of a certain time or place, and presenting characters who, rather than representing a psychologically consistent identity, play with the boundaries between actor/character/real person, the blurred line between ‘acting’ and ‘being’(Saddik, 2007: 2).

With a distrust to fixed realities and meaning construction, after two World Wars literature has sought to represent the fragmented, alienated individual rather than the certainties and absolutes.

> The primary literary response after the First World War was part of a broader wave of cultural modernism, which strove to destroy the old forms and ‘make it new’, in the words of American poet Ezra Pound. Yet the modernists were still searching for absolutes, the codes of a fixed and immutable reality that would give order and meaning to the world through concepts such as ‘human nature’ and a unifying religious or spiritual sensibility. After the violence and atrocities of the Second World War, however, the fragile foundations of meaning and truth were shaken even further (Saddik, 2007: 5-6).

As a result, the emergence of contemporary American drama in the 1940s and 50s with the effect of European movements continued together with realism but later especially formally moved further away from realistic representation in the postmodern times. Bertolt Brecht, Antonin Artaud, Jean Genet, Luigi Pirandello, Martin Esslin, Eugène Ionesco, Samuel Beckett, Arthur Adamov, and Harold Pinter were among the European writers and theoreticians that affect American theater in the second half of

the twentieth century with their anti-realistic experiments and new conceptualizations in dramatic form and content. After the Second World War Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller were two prominent figures in American drama. Social problems, criticism of capitalism and American dream, and utilizing from anti-realistic methods were their common properties. “Both essentially followed the conventions of domestic realism, yet freely utilised anti-realistic devices in order to most effectively convey their visions for the stage” (Saddik, 2007: 40). Thus, they can be considered intermediary playwrights in the postwar period before a full conception of contemporary anti-realistic theater. “Williams and Miller, can serve as examples of early responses by American dramatists to the events that shaped the second half of the twentieth century, as they began to question the viability of the American dream, examine the tension between the individual and the collective in that context, and explore issues of identity in terms of role playing and authenticity in American culture” (Saddik, 2007: 41).

African American theater in 1960s and 1970s, on the other hand, was focusing on building up an identity for the black community. Black Arts Movement (BAM) appeared during this period with playwrights such as Amiri Baraka, Ed Bullins and Ron Milner. Different from the peaceful and passive attitude of Civil Rights Movement, BAM was advocating a militant, aggressive and political stance in artistic production. In his manifesto Amiri Baraka defined revolutionary theater as a ‘theatre of assault,’ and exposing the insides of black people. To him there is this anger and frustration of black experience to be represented on the stage (Saddik, 2007: 74). Thus, he claimed a political role to theater searching for social change. “This theatre was to be ‘a social theatre’ that would attack anglo-patriarchal standards and translate art into social change, a ‘political theatre, a weapon to help in the slaughter of these dimwitted fatbellied white guys who somehow believe that the rest of the world is here for them to slobber on’” (Saddik, 2007: 74). Adrienne Kennedy and Ntozake Shange, again, were among the anti-realist writers with their experimental approach to dramatic form; they “were also instrumental in opening up new avenues for African-American voices with their plays that pushed boundaries and challenged traditional dramatic form” (Saddik, 2007: 72). And they developed a language that represents the fragmented

experience of the postmodern times: “Their highly symbolic language and fragmented structures reflected the cultural experience of being a black woman in America, and were followed more recently by Suzan-Lori Parks, who uses fragmented repetitive language to comment on established historical narrative” (Saddik, 2007: 72).

When it comes to 1970s and after, American theater has sought a more anti-realist form and content in line with the postmodern and post-structuralist approaches of the era. Linear plot has left its place to a fragmented structure, and rather than a fixed unified subjectivity characters have been presented in fragments. Drama has become more self-conscious experimenting with its boundaries of language, form and content. Though dramatic content has not left its social and political concerns. “The new honesty in the theatre after the 1960s and 1970s that Tennessee Williams hailed […] allowed playwrights to explore issues such as race, gender and sexuality during the latter half of the twentieth century at a level that had not been previously done” (Saddik, 2007: 155). Also, when reality is represented, its constructed nature has been laid bare. David Mamet, Sam Shepard, David Henry Hwang, Paula Vogel, Maria Irene Fornes, Lisa Loomer, David Rabe, Lanford Wilson, Tony Kushner are among the prominent playwrights of this period of contemporary American theater.

> Fragmented narrative as opposed to seamless narrative plot, the deconstruction of character, an acknowledgement of popular and mass culture, and a self-consciousness of performance marked a type of drama that had been increasingly influenced by the theories of Brecht and Artaud and by the theatrical innovations of the 1960s. These postmodern experiments with language, form and content tend to differ widely from each other; at times they retain many of the features of traditional realistic representation yet deal with contemporary social and political concerns, only playing tangentially, if at all, with anti-realistic dramatic conventions. More often, however, they rebel more drastically against realist attempts to order and represent the external world; instead they present reality as a subjective construct rather than as an objective truth which is perceived by the artist. Experimentation with theatrical conventions and the subjective representation of the artist’s personal vision replace mimesis in their works, as these artists are more interested in redefining what constitutes meaning and experience and testing the limits of drama as performance. What they tend to have in common, however, is a sense of drama as ‘play’ within a postmodern sensibility that blurs boundaries between role-playing and authenticity, or appearance and being, in order to question the reliability of ‘truth’ in dealing with salient issues affecting the instabilities of social identity (Saddik, 2007: 129-130).

This study focuses on exemplary pieces of early/modern and contemporary American drama that appeared as an alternative to melodramas and commercial Broadway theaters and musicals, and it has sought to understand the relationship between politics and tools of representation in American drama. It is seen that although plays of the early/modern period historically are closer to realistic representation as form, they still challenge the political aims of conventional realism of preserving the status quo as they resist the dominant ideology and do not comply with the socio-political order considering the characters, actions and themes they employ. In that sense it is good to note that realism as a form is not uncomplicated as realistic plays can also call for change in the social order and question the status quo. For example, "[r]ealistic plays (such as Ibsen's *A Doll House* (1879) or *Ghosts* (1881)) often do imply the need for social change in their representation of oppressive social realities, and therefore can serve to question, rather than reinforce, the status quo" (Saddik, 2007: 5). Among these early/modern plays in this study Eugene O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape* and Susan Glaspell's *Trifles* have an experimental form with their expressionistic stage setting, while Lorraine Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun* has a more realistic stage setting. After 1950s the effects of experimental avant-garde theater in Europe are also seen in the American stage and drama. Therefore, the plays chosen from the postmodern era, David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*, Tony Kushner's *Angels in America*, and Adrienne Kennedy's *Funnyhouse of a Negro*, are all anti-realistic both thematically and as form since they all employ experimental techniques in character, stage setting and language. However, all the plays chosen for the research are examples of political theater because of their anti-Aristotelian, anti-mimetic ways of representation; they all question reality and representation, foreground the possibility of different versions of truth and rupture the concept of fixed identity while emphasizing multiplicity and diversity. For this reason, the relationship between politics and these texts is explained based on the theoretical formulations of Deleuze and Guattari. The research proposed a cultural materialist reading of the plays through Deleuze and Guattari's model of semiotics in order to understand how certain dramatic texts can be subversive against the dominant ideology and intend social change.

In Deleuze and Guattari's theory 'deterritorializing mechanisms' is at the core of their formulation. According to them capitalist mode of production has the schizophrenic tendency to 'deterritorialize' which is a powerful tool to surpass capitalism. Deleuze and Guattari claim that if the processes of deterritorialization are accelerated the capitalist mode of production can be surpassed because the capital will not be able to recover them anymore. The processes of deterritorialization create 'lines of flight' which multiply at such a pace that the capital cannot control them. As a result, 'lines of flight', the processes of escape, is of prominence in order to conceive an alternative to the dominant ideology. Art and literature also take part in this praxis by creating 'lines of flight.' In the light of this theory, this research analyzed certain examples of dramatic texts from American theater with the purpose of understanding and clarifying how these texts produce their 'deterritorializing mechanisms' so that they have become an alternative to the products of mainstream culture.

Starting with Eugene O'Neill who sought a way out the orthodoxies and challenged conventional forms as a playwright, the study focuses on his play *The Hairy Ape* and his innovative, experimentalist ways of representing reality. In the play O'Neill criticizes class discrimination, commercialism and materialism in the American society through a subversion of conventional dramatic forms and the 'reality' constructed by the dominant ideology with the use of expressionistic techniques. He problematizes the issue of identity (especially class identity) by questioning Yank's quest for belonging and human beings' separation from nature. Reading the play through Deleuze and Guattari's concepts Yank's quest is, indeed, a desire to have a fixed subjectivity; however, the more he delves deep into his search the more he is thwarted because he keeps making rhizomatic connections rather than stabling himself to an identity position. Yank cannot fit into any identity because life is constituted of differences. The Capitalist machine represses this difference; hence, going back to the collective primitive existence, identifying with a primitive self-image is not possible. Even though Yank tries to identify with the ape at the end of the play through his attempts of backward evolution, his effort is futile since the mirror Yank holds towards the ape with hopes of true identification does not reflect back. Yank cannot reach his desire to find an identity because he cannot get anything other

than an image. In short, in O'Neill's politics of representation he exposes the renunciation of difference by the Capitalist machine in search for an identity. Instead, via his search Yank goes through many different becomings, the final one happens when he opens the cage of the ape and he dies.

The second part of the first chapter which deals with the representation of class relations in contemporary American drama analyses David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*. David Mamet has targeted the commodity culture and the insufficiency of language to express human needs and desires. The lack of sense of belonging and the need for community in the society, according to Mamet, can be addressed through theater, which makes theater a political art. Theatrical action, to Mamet, provides a political function to theater as it is possible to reach the ideal society through it. Mamet criticizes capitalism using the American dream as a metaphor. His characters suffer from a sense of loss and failure while trying to chase a myth. In his critique of this myth in *Glengarry Glen Ross* David Mamet chooses the salesman figure to show the emptiness of American dream since the sales profession stands just like the prototype of American capitalism as it promises abundant wealth through hard work. The happiness and self-improvement promised to salesmen is through the material gains of a capitalist society. In Deleuzian terms Mamet's characters are Oedipal figures who falsely replaced immanent desire in life with desire that is based on material success; therefore, they suffer from an eternal 'lack.' In order to satisfy this feeling of lack they try to find identification through their business and the power they exert on others. Via his critique of capitalism in the play with his schizophrenic, rhizomatic writing style Mamet displays an act of resistance to the capitalist system and power relationships as he multiplies differences and deterritorializes language and social codes. Representation of reality in fragments in Glengarry Glen Ross is indicative of Mamet's rhizomatic writing style. Mamet's language is self-reflective on language's inability to represent reality; therefore, when his characters are unable to communicate their desires through language, it is a deterritorialization of language's function as a communicative device. Also, Mamet's criticism of Oedipal characters with no identity outside the culturally coded power of domination is a deterritorialization of the social codes. Although Mamet's reception by the critiques is contradictory as some regard

him a misogynist while others value his work, it is, indeed, a reinforcement of the fact that his rhizomatic style offers multitudes of readings of the play. In Deleuze and Guattari's terms Mamet's text *Glengarry Glen Ross* is schizophrenic because it escapes the limited confines of Oedipal desire and maintains its own desiring-production. Just like the exposure of incongruent flows of a schizophrenic in the social body, schizophrenic writing displays and subverts the incongruence of capitalism with immanent desire and its flow. Mamet questions the devastating conditions of the capitalist world and deterritorializes the repressive social codes by his rhizomatic writing.

The second chapter deals with politics of gender in drama. The first example from the early modern period is Susan Glaspell's *Trifles*. Glaspell took part in the suffragette movement and First Wave Feminism of the period and her play, *Trifles*, focuses on challenging the stereotypical female roles, women's confinement and isolation. She sought to find ways of expressing women's lives and she was in search of empowering women rather than victimizing them. The way she represents female power rather than their victimization and her fight against female stereotypes become a source of inspiration even today for contemporary feminist critics. However, while showing two women bonding with the victim, Minnie, who murdered her husband as a result of the mistreatments against her, Glaspell does not provide a fixed, higher moral ground for women. She, instead, criticizes the social order and conventional gender roles by subverting classic detective fiction through presenting inefficient and powerless male detection with the use of an expressionistic setting. She also denies fixed categorizations by providing different readings through a negation of narrative closure. She makes the reader active participants in solving the crime while at the same time preserving the power of indignation even though she subverts the conventional form of detective fiction. Subversion of the old detective fiction by the use of expressionistic techniques is important because in Deleuzian terms the old form perpetuates the 'trinity of falsehood,' which is: informant-corruption-torture. The form implies a deep complicity between law enforcement and criminals as it maintains the idea of fixed truth to be deduced and induced from male reasoning. Deleuze regards parody as a powerful tool in the subversion of this form. Through the use of an

expressionistic setting that foregrounds the domestic sphere that is conventionally regarded as women's domain, Glaspell turns male logic, the power of reason, upside down. Giving the so-called trifles, 'the unimportant womanly matters' the main role in solving the crime she provides a parody of male logic that is so often promoted in conventional detective fiction. Drawing their power from the female experience and intuition women take active part in reading the language of 'trifles' as they themselves can relate to the isolation and oppression Minnie has gone through. She focuses on the circumstances that drive Mrs. Wright to murder and thus provides a different reading of 'truth,' which makes the reader question the reading of the 'truth' and reality. Via her subversions Glaspell exposes what Deleuze calls 'the trinity of falsehood'—informant, corruption, torture—prevalent in fictive realities of social life. Glaspell not only draws attention to the fictive aspect of reality by the connection between the real crime story she herself reported in 1901 but also subverts conventions with placing a woman as the killer of her husband since it is a challenge to the social construction of femininity. Finally, the non-linear plot and absence of the central character, Minnie, from the stage Glaspell presents another subversion of classic detective fiction. In conventional detective fiction the reader first learns about the characters, then the murder happens, the reader is active in finding the murderer within the plot development, and finally the murderer is found and punished. In *Trifles*, however, the murder has already happened at the beginning and the supposed murderer, Minnie Wright, is absent among the characters, already in jail. When the play ends there is no proper closure assuring the reader a hundred percent if Minnie really did kill her husband or not. The non-linear plot and absent main character as the absent center make Glaspell's writing rhizomatic in Deleuzian terms which is a method of subversive writing as it does not satisfy the reader by meeting the conventional expectations and it pushes the audience to its limits of thinking. The void that occurs with the absence of the main character is filled by the fragments of clues of her memories, struggle and fears. This brings an awareness to her friends on the stage and the audience. Therefore, with the use of rhizomatic writing Glaspell makes the audience question absolute truths and subverts male power of falsehood.

In the second part of chapter two Tony Kushner's *Angels in America: A Gay Fantasia on National Themes* is analyzed in order to delve into representation of politics of gender in an example of contemporary American drama. In the play Kushner goes back in time and focuses on the AIDS epidemic and the crisis it caused in the 1990s. Thematically the indifferent attitude of Reagan administration against the epidemic and its victims, mainly the minorities and the gay community, is used to refer not only to issues of gender but also to race, ethnicity, religion and class relations. Therefore, the play deals with issues of difference and inclusion by highlighting the victimization of the gay community because of AIDS epidemic. Unlike mainstream history, the play foregrounds the untold story of the neglected and the marginalized and reclaims the history of gay community in America. In Deleuzian sense, the play provides a re-reading of history focusing on desire and the potential for change. The play constructs a counter-narrative of 'national themes 'and recounts the history of the United States by including homosexuals, drag queens, Jews, and Mormons as the Other, failure of liberal politics against the new conservatism and the relationship between sexuality and power. While criticizing American bourgeois individualism in the play, Kushner also still believes in the possibility of radical democracy in the U.S. He adopts the epic form as a form of political theater and calls for collective change and social action in the play. In the play, also, the issue of history is problematized referring to Benjamin's Angelus Novus with the angel of America figure. Similar to the work of historical materialist that Benjamin suggests, Kushner appeals to a historical materialist approach by choosing a specific time frame from the recent past of America, rather than an idea of the past as a totality and collects the fragments of the past. Time moves on and history piles up under the feet of the Angel; thus, the Angel of America asks Prior to stop progress for a redemption of history that has caused all the misfortune. However; Prior does not accept the role as it is not possible to stop progress. Instead, the play offers historical reflection as redemptive and revolutionary as change is only possible by reflecting on the past. Kushner's theater of the fabulous is; therefore, historically and politically conscious; it rejects the weak gay identity by embracing the queer and difference, and it resists realistic conventions by making magic and fantasy a part of the theater of the fabulous. The play is an example of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of 'minor literature' as it is immediately social and

political and engages a ‘collective assemblage of enunciation’ since it foregrounds collectivity without disregarding differences, and with its natural and lyrical style shifting between illusion and reality uses language with a ‘high coefficient of deterritorialization.’ Deleuzian fabulation can be applied as a formulation in the analysis of the play for all its components of becoming-other, experimenting on the real, ‘legending,’ inventing a people to come and deterritorialization of language. Gender politics in the play is considered as part of power relationships and it is discussed in the context of conservative absolutism versus inclusive multiplicity. Immanent desire is exemplified in gay identity and sexuality, and that desire brings multiplicity rather than singularity. At the end of the play all identities are gathered in the epilogue reinforcing collectivity, multiplicity, and difference, which emphasizes the potential for change through redemptive historical reflection.

The final chapter in the study is an analysis of the representation of racial conflicts in American drama. The early modern play in the first part is *A Raisin in the Sun* by Lorraine Hansberry. Hansberry’s theme in the play is generated from a Langston Hughes poem, ‘Harlem,’ focusing on the deferred dreams of African Americans in the U.S. as a result of segregation and social discrimination. Hansberry’s realistic representation foregrounds the effects of racism, segregation and discrimination on black people, and at the same time criticizes bourgeois values by picking on American dream and its invalidity for black people and provides a critique of patriarchal structure by way of an untraditional character, Beneatha. Hansberry portrays a realistic picture of disturbing facts of ghetto life for a working-class black family; her realistic characters try to survive under difficult conditions and try to reach a better future. It is important to remember that Hansberry’s realistic depiction is not only to reflect “real life” but also to change it towards a better version, which makes the play political. Her choice of realism during a time of experiments and radicalism in American drama might be an aesthetic limitation; however, for the black theater at that time representation of black experience was crucial to claim their identity in the white dominant theatrical environment. Hansberry, indeed, paved the way for a more experimental and radical black theater to come up a short while later. On the other

hand, Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun* is a political play on racism which thematically displaces capitalist desire and puts a desire for freedom in its place and dismantles white domination through a radical act towards desegregation. She gives a detailed description of the setting in order to reflect on the social-political context of segregation, Chicago ghettoes, and how this life as a result of Black-Belt practice confines black people. She draws attention to the inhumane conditions in the ghetto life which is neither comfortable nor sanitary. The play criticizes the practice of racism by depicting the ghettoized lives of Younger family as they are in this situation just because of their skin color. Deleuze and Guattari explains racism through the formulation they called 'faciality machine' which socially produces face based on the dominant cultural product of Christ. Racism is a reterritorialization of the face. The faciality machine pins the individuals to the white wall and people attain their subjectivity in the black hole. Face is standard because power structures define it so. Therefore, faciality is constructing the face socially. This abstract machine presents faces to people in return to their need. People slide into this ready-made face which means people assume the ready-made identities so that they can achieve recognition in social life. Deleuze and Guattari connects issues of religion, racism, and capitalism with this concept. Since white face is the prescription that the machine of faciality produces, black people are regarded as a deviation. So rather than discrimination Deleuze and Guattari define the situation as difference being regarded as deviation from the Face and as not acceptable. Capitalism also depends on faciality as it labels people so that the system works smoothly. However, it is possible to break the machine of faciality by dismantling the face and embracing the form of 'becoming.' The possibility of 'becomings' is a line of flight that provides the chance to deterritorialize the Face and open up ways for multiplicity. Therefore, Hansberry's play can be read in that perspective as creating a line of flight since the play criticizes capitalist desire, integration, assimilation, and white domination and transforms capitalist desire into a desire for freedom. It also dismantles black suppression with an act of desegregation when the Younger family decides to move to the white dominant neighborhood in spite of all the threats and bribes.

The final play of the study in chapter three analyzes *Funnyhouse of a Negro* by Adrienne Kennedy as an example of anti-realistic play that problematizes racial conflicts. Kennedy examines social and political issues in order to explore the problems of race, family relationships and violence in the American society, and their effect on the female psyche. The playwright problematizes the issue of identification in her theater, and in her approach, she connects the psychoanalytic roots of identification with its social and political relations. Her historicizing identity and identification emphasizes the fact that identifications have histories and; hence, are subjective, cultural and political. In her play identification is not only private to the psyche but also political having a historical and social basis; therefore, it is possible to read the play using Deleuze and Guattari's concept of Schizoanalysis. The reason for that is Schizoanalysis denies Oedipal lack and Freudian Psychoanalysis because the theory negates the social and historical roots of psychological problems. Also, rather than a representation of politics of race or gender, Kennedy makes the very question of representation her central concern and deals with the politics of representation. Un-representability of race becomes an issue in her play; she uses fragmentation and discontinuity as main tools while deconstructing the gendered or racial identities and revealing the constructed nature of these identities. Her protagonist Sarah is not an essentialized identity but a fragmentary being, physically created as a crossbred, and psychologically torn between two identities as White or Black. In the play different fragments push the reader question the very act of representation while the play is becoming an endless mimicry with repetitions and differences. Ultimately fragmentation and discontinuity in the character and narrative create multiplicity rather than a single subjectivity. Her text is, therefore, open to Schizoanalysis since a schizophrenic creation depends on breaks, flows and disruptions in Deleuze and Guattari's formulation. To put it differently, not only Sarah has a fragmented identity as a character but also the text itself is in fragments, distortions, and repetitions. Sarah can attain a coherent subjectivity neither through blackness nor whiteness. Her colonial past denies her identification with her African roots and her self-hatred caused by the machine of faciality stops her identifying with the white. As a result, blending her personal history with the colonial history her state of delirium, where she identifies herself with multiple selves, is the outcome of social and historical factors. In her state

of delirium, repetition becomes an important tool for Kennedy to create a schizophrenic text. Deleuze calls this theater of repetition as opposed to the theater of representation. In Kennedy's theater of repetition, thematically, historical repetition shows itself in Sarah's unconscious just like in the example of her fear of rape having colonial roots. Kennedy also formally uses repetitive imagery in the play which gives it a dream-like structural pattern rather than a classic narrative pattern. Each time the audience thinks s/he is making a logical deduction Kennedy thwarts their effort by changing the narrative with different versions of a similar story. Each self of Sarah recounts a constantly changing story and characters sometimes confirm and sometimes deny the other's version. Hence, the story accumulates with each character's repetitions and additions and different layers of the story come up. Repetition of dialogues and images reinforces the psychological effect on the audience. As a way to fight against racism and other components of faciality, Deleuze and Guattari suggest an abandonment of the self, to be nobody, rather than creating a new identity that would perpetuate the machine of faciality. Similarly, Sarah is successful at totally dismantling the identity not with her non-existence but with her constitution as multiple selves. Kennedy draws attention to historical and political grounds of identification and causes a disruption in the system of signification propelled by the machine of faciality with Sarah's multiplicity and the textual and formal ambiguity.

To conclude, this research has aimed to answer some questions such as: What is the nature of the politics within a dramatic text? What makes a dramatic text political? What are the cultural, material and historical contexts of political texts? Are there common literary tools or strategies used for political efficacy? If yes, what are they? Or is it possible to talk about a heterogeneous strategy of alternative dramatic texts that can be explained based on a theoretical background? This thesis has intended to find answers to these questions and demonstrate the ways in which the political efficacy of particular modern American dramatic texts is related to the general efficacy of the modern and contemporary alternative texts. The study adopted a cultural materialist view and considered the dramatic texts in terms of their historical context and literary tool and theatrical language in order to understand the relationship between theater and politics. Political efficacy of the texts is thought in relation both

to their form and content questioning and resisting the status quo. It is seen that these texts stand against the dominant socio-cultural practices both with their political agenda and innovative form. In other words, theatrical language, along with social and political content it employs, can be subversive and resistant to dominant practices; and hence, bring social change. It is seen that all these texts foreground plurality, multiplicity, sociohistorical context, a radical political stance with a focus on race, gender or class issues. Problematizing the representation of reality and the ways to represent is a common concern for all. And it is seen that, one way or another, all political concerns of race, class and gender are interrelated even though it is possible to focus on one of them. Whether from early/modern period or contemporary period the texts analyzed all become political as they try to find anti-Aristotelian, anti-mimetic ways of representation while they question the constructed nature of reality and want a change in it; therefore, they look for different versions of reality and fight against fixed identities intending multiplicity and diversity. Yet, what discriminates the two literary periods in their approach to representation is the forms becoming more innovative and radical in time. Therefore, the study sought a theoretical model to understand, explain and conceptualize this fact; hence, is the focus on Deleuze and Guattari. Their formulations help to understand and explain how certain texts become politically subversive through deterritorializing mechanisms within signification and as a result create 'lines of flight,' thereby become alternative to mainstream culture and bring about change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Thomas P.: "Fissures Beneath the Surface: Drama in the 1940s and 1950s," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 159-174, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Al-Badri, Hussein: **Tony Kushner's Postmodern Theatre: A Study of Political Discourse**, Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2014, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=1859159, 10 Apr. 2019.

Alexander, Doris: **The Tempering of Eugene O'Neill**, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1962.

Alkalay-Gut, Karen: "Murder and Marriage: Another Look at *Trifles*," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 71-81.

Auerbach, Erich, et al: "Epilogue," **Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature - New and Expanded Edition**, Revised ed., Princeton University Press, Princeton; Oxford, 2003, pp. 554-558, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fgz26.24, 25 Aug. 2020.

Bach, Gerhard: "Susan Glaspell: Mapping the Domains of Critical Revision," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater**

and Fiction, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 239-258.

Barlow, Judith E.: "Susan's Sisters: The "Other" Women Writers of the Provincetown Players," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 259-300.

Barnett, Claudia: "'This Fundamental Challenge to Identity': Reproduction and Representation in the Drama of Adrienne Kennedy," **Theatre Journal**, Vol. 48, No. 2, May 1996, pp. 141-155, (Online) http://www.jstor.org/stable/3208864, 06 March 2013.

Barth, Fredrik: "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries," **Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader**, Ed. by Werner Sollors, New York: NYU Press, 1996, pp. 294-324.

Bates, Thomas R.: "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony," **Journal of the History of Ideas**, Vol. 36, no. 2, 1975, pp. 351-366, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/2708933, 12 Nov. 2018.

Bean, Annemarie: "Playwrights and Plays of the Harlem Renaissance," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 91-105, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Beard, Deanna M. Toten: "American Experimentalism, American Expressionism, and Early O'Neill," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 53-68, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Beckman, Frida: **Deleuze and Sex**, Edinburgh University Press, 2011, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=386924&site=eds-live&scope=site, 3 July 2020.

Beiner, Ronald: "Walter Benjamin's Philosophy of History," **Political Theory**, vol. 12, no. 3, 1984, pp. 423–434, (Online) *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/191516, 16 Aug. 2019.

Benjamin, Andrew: **Walter Benjamin and History**, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2006, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=436233, 5 Aug. 2019.

Benjamin, Walter: "On the Concept of History," Trans. by Dennis Redmond, 1974, (Online) https://folk.uib.no/hlils/TBLR-B/Benjamin-History.pdf, 02 Aug. 2019.

Bennett, Michael I. J., et.al.: "Race Relations Chicago Style: Past, Present, and Future,"

The New Chicago: A Social and Cultural Analysis, Ed. by John Koval, et al., Temple University Press,

2006, pp. 82-93, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=298890, 29 May 2020.

Ben-Zvi, Linda: ""Murder, She Wrote": The Genesis of Susan Glaspell's *Trifles*," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 19-49.

Bigsby, C.W.E.: **Contemporary Writers: David Mamet**, Ed. by. Malcolm Bradbury and Christopher Bigsby, New York: Methuen, 1985.

_____: **Contemporary American Playwrights**, Cambridge University Press, 2000a, (Online) https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=201650&query=tony+kushner#, 6 Oct. 2019.

_____: **Modern American Drama: 1945-2000**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000b.

_____: "David Mamet," **The Cambridge Companion to David Mamet**, Ed. by Christopher Bigsby, United Kingdom, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 1-40.

Bogue, Ronald: **Deleuzian Fabulation and the Scars of History**, Edinburgh University Press, 2010, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=334833&site=eds-live&scope=site, 24 Jan. 2020.

Bowen, Croswell: **The Curse of the Misbegotten: A Tale of the House of O'Neill**, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Boucher, Georgie: "Fractured Identity and Agency and the Plays of Adrienne Kennedy," **Feminist Review**, No. 84, Postcolonial Theatres, 2006, pp. 84-103, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/30232741, 06 March 2013.

Brah, Avtar: **Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities**, London: Routledge, 1997.

Bram, Christopher: **Mapping the Territory: Selected Nonfiction**, Open Road Media, 2009, ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=1807505, 7 Nov. 2019.

Brook, Vincent: **'You Should See Yourself': Jewish Identity in Postmodern American Culture**, Rutgers University Press, 2006, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=340814. 12 Nov. 2019.

Brown, E. Barnsley: "Passed Over: The Tragic Mulatta and (Dis)Integration of Identity in Adrienne Kennedy's Plays," **African American Review**, Vol. 35, No.2, Summer, 2001, pp. 281-295, (Online) http://www.jstor.org/stable/2903258, 06 March 2013.

Bryan, Mark Evans: "American Drama, 1900-1915," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David

Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 3-17, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Bryant-Jackson, Paul K., et. al. "Preface," **Intersecting Boundaries: The Theatre of Adrienne Kennedy** Ed. by Paul K. Bryant-Jackson and Lois More Overbeck, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992, pp. ix-xiv.

Buchanan, Ian: **Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: A Reader's Guide**, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2008, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=766045, 1 July 2019.

Carter, Steven R.: **Hansberry Drama: Commitment Amid Complexity**, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Case, Sue-Ellen: "Towards a Butch-Femme Aesthetic," **Discourse**, vol. 11, no. 1, 1988, pp. 55–73, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41389108, 16 Aug. 2020.

Chapman, Erin D.: "Staging Gendered Radicalism at the Height of the US Cold War: *A Raisin in the Sun* and Lorraine Hansberry's Vision of Freedom," **Gender & History**, Vol.29 No.2 August 2017, pp. 446–467, (Online) http://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2099/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=5005c63a-a602-41a2-be0a-19c26e090b88%40pdc-v-sessmgr04, 22 May 2020.

Colebrook, Claire: **Understanding Deleuze**, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 2002.

_____: "Introduction," **Deleuze and History**, Ed. by Jeffrey A. Bell, and Claire Colebrook, Edinburgh University Press, 2009, pp.1-33, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=434291, 5 August 2019.

_____: "Face Race," **Deleuze and Race**, Ed. by Arun Saldanha and Jason Michael Adams, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2013, pp. 35–50, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b6b4.6, 16 June 2020.

Collini, Stefan: "On Variousness; and on Persuasion," **New Left Review**, no. 27, May 2004, pp. 65–97, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=13320364&site=ehost-live, 13 Aug. 2020.

Copenhaver, Bonny Ball: **A Portrayal of Gender and a Description of Gender Roles in Selected American Modern and Postmodern Plays**, Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2002, (Online) https://dc.etsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1789&context=etd, 19 May 2020.

Coyle, Martin, et al.: **Encylopedia of Literature and Criticism**, Ed. by Martin Coyle, et al., London: Routledge, 1991.

Cunningham, Frank R.: "Eugene O'Neill and Reality in America," **Realism and the American Dramatic Tradition**, Ed. by William W. Demastes, Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1996.

Curb, Rosemary K.: "Fragmented Selves in Adrienne Kennedy's 'Funnyhouse of a Negro' and 'The Owl Answers,'" **Theatre Journal**, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Vol. 32. No.2, May 1980, pp. 180-195, (Online) http://www.jstor.org/stable/3207111, 06 March 2013.

_____: "Re/Cognition, Re/Presentation, Re/Creation in Woman-Conscious Drama: The Seer, the Seen, the Scene, the Obscene," **Theatre Journal**, vol. 37, no. 3, 1985, pp. 302–316, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3206850, 06 March 2013.

_____: "(Hetero) Sexual Terrors in Adrienne Kennedy's Early plays," **Intersecting Boundaries: The Theatre of Adrienne Kennedy**, Ed. by Bryant-Jackson and Overbeck, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992, pp.142-156.

Czerepinski, Jackie: "Beyond the Verge: Absent Heroines in the Plays of Susan Glaspell," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp.145-154.

Dean, Anne: **Language as Dramatic Action**, London and Toronto, Associated University Presses, 1990.

_____: "The Discourse of Anxiety," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 47-62.

Deleuze, Gilles: "Qu'est-ce Que L'acte de Creation? (What is the Creative Act?)," **Par Gilles Deleuze, Conférence donnée dans le cadre des "Mardis de la Fondation**," le 17 Mars 1987, (Online) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKd71Uyf3Mo&feature=youtu.be, 07 July 2019.

_____: "Society of Control," [first published in L'autre journal, Nr. I, Mai 1990,] **The Funambulist**, (Online) https://thefunambulist.net/history/deleuze-foucault-and-the-society-of-control, 16 July 2019.

_____: "The Philosophy of Crime Novels," **Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953-1974**, New York: Semiotext(e), 2004, pp. 81-85.

Deleuze, Gilles, et. al.: **Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia**, Trans. by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, Helen R. Lane, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

_____: **Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature**, Trans. by Dana Polan, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

_____: **A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia**, Trans. by Brian Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Deranty, Jean-Philippe: "Existentialist Aesthetics," **Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy**, Spring 2019 Edition, Ed. by Edward N. Zalta, (Online) https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/aesthetics-existentialist/, 20 Aug. 2020.

Diamond, Elin: "Mimesis in Syncopated Time: Reading Adrienne Kennedy," **Intersecting Boundaries: The Theatre of Adrienne Kennedy**, Ed. by Paul K. Bryant-Jackson and Lois More Overbeck, NED - New edition ed., University of Minnesota Press, 1992, pp. 131–141, (Online) *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttt562.14, 3 Aug. 2020.

_____: "Rethinking Identification: Kennedy, Freud, Brecht," **The Kenyon Review**, vol. 15, no. 2, 1993, pp. 86–99, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4336842, 6 March 2013.

_____: **Unmaking Mimesis: Essays on Feminism and Theater**, London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Diggins, John Patrick: **Eugene O'Neill's America: Desire Under Democracy**, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Dolphijn, Rick, et. al.: "A Thousand Tiny Intersections: Linguisticism, Feminism, Racism and Deleuzian Becomings," **Deleuze and Race**, Ed. by Arun Saldanha and Jason Michael Adams, Edinburgh University Press,

Edinburgh, 2013, pp. 129–143, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b6b4.11, 17 June 2020.

Dualé, Christine: "Langston Hughes's Poetic Vision of the American Dream: A Complex and Creative Encoded Language," **Angles**, 7 |2018, (Online) URL: https://doi.org/10.4000/angles.920, 16 July 2020.

Dymkowski, Christine: "On the Edge: The Plays of Susan Glaspell," **Modern Drama**, Volume 31, Number 1, Spring 1988, University of Toronto Press, pp. 91-105.

Eagleton, Terry: **Literary Theory: An Introduction**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Egri, Peter: ""Belonging" Lost: Alienation and Dramatic Form in Eugene O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape*," **Critical Essays on Eugene O'Neill**, Ed. by James J. Martine, Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1984, pp. 77-111.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika: **Theatre Sacrifice, Ritual: Exploring Forms of Political Theatre**, London: Routledge, 2005.

Fisher, James: ""The Angels of Fructification": Tennessee Williams, Tony Kushner, and Images of Homosexuality on the American Stage," **The Mississippi Quarterly**, Vol. 49, No. 1, Winter 1995-96, pp. 13-32, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/26475957, 4 Jan. 2020.

_____: "The Advantage of Controversy: Angels in America and Campus Culture Wars," **Theatre Symposium, Vol. 15:**

Theatre and Moral Order, Ed. by M. Scott Phillips, University of Alabama Press, 2007, pp. 123-132, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=1659008, 22 Oct. 2019.

Fletcher, Anne: "Reading Across the 1930s," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 106-126, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Floyd, Kevin: **The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Foertsch, Jacqueline: "Against the 'Starless Midnight of Racism and War': African American Intellectuals and the Antinuclear Agenda," **Philological Quarterly**, vol. 88, no. 4, Fall 2009, pp. 407–430, (Online) *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=57631781&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Foucault, Michel**:** "Two Lectures," **Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977**, Trans. by Colin Gordon et al., ed. Gordon, New York: Pantheon Books, 1980, pp. 78-108.

_____: **The History of Sexuality**, Vol. 1., London: Pelican Books, 1981.

_____: **Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984**, Ed. by. James D. Faubion, Vol. 3, London: Penguin Books, 1994.

Freedman, Jonathan: **Klezmer America: Jewishness, Ethnicity, Modernity**, Columbia University Press, 2008, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=3029396, 12 Aug. 2019.

Friedman, Jonathan C.: **Rainbow Jews: Jewish and Gay Identity in the Performing Arts,** Lexington Books, 2007, (Online) http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=1354873, 17 Nov. 2019.

Gainor, J.Ellen: **Susan Glaspell in Context : American Theater, Culture, and Politics, 1915-48**, Vol. 1st pbk. ed, University of Michigan Press, 2004, (Online) http://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2072/eds/ebookviewer/ebook?sid=1bea06de-f3b3-474e-9a0f-908b32e45dc8%40sdc-v-sessmgr02&ppid=Page-__-1&vid=0&format=EK, 25 July 2019.

Gainor, J. Ellen, et. al.: "Glaspell Susan and Sophie Treadwell: Staging Feminism and Modernism 1915– 1941," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 34-52, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Geis, Deborah R.: "David Mamet and The Metadramatic Tradition: Seeing "The Trick From The Back,"" **David Mamet: A Casebook**, Ed.by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing, 1992, pp. 49-68.

_____: ""You're Exploiting My Space": Ethnicity, Spectatorship, and the (Post)colonial Condition in Mukherjee's "A Wife's Story" and Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp.123-130.

Glaspell, Susan: **Trifles**, (Online) http://www.one-act-plays.com/dramas/trifles.html, reprinted from *Trifles*, Susan Glaspell, New York: Frank Shay, 1916, Access: 30 July 2019.

Going, William T.: "Eugene O'Neill, American," **Papers on Language & Literature**, vol. 12, no. 4, Fall 1976, p. 384, (Online) *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=7728679&site=ehost-live, 22 March 2017.

Gordon, Michelle "'Somewhat Like War': The Aesthetics of Segregation, Black Liberation, and 'A Raisin in the Sun,'" **African American Review**, vol. 42, no. 1, Spring 2008, pp. 121–133, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=36902365&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Gottlieb, Richard: "'The Engine' That Drives Playwright David Mamet," **New York Times**, January 15, 1978, pp. D1-4.

Grace, Wendy: "*Faux Amis:* Foucault and Deleuze on Sexuality and Desire," **Critical Inquiry**, vol. 36, no. 1, 2009, pp. 52–75, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/606122, 8 July 2020.

Hansberry, Lorraine: "The Negro Writer and His Roots: Toward A New Romanticism," **The Black Scholar**, vol. 12, no. 2, 1981, pp. 2–12, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/41068050, 29 May 2020.

_____: **A Raisin in the Sun**, New York: Vintage Books, 1994, pp. 5-16.

Hare, David: **Obedience, Struggle and Revolt: Lectures on Theatre**, London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2005.

Harris, Susan Cannon: **Irish Drama and the Other Revolutions: Playwrights, Sexual Politics and the International Left**, **1892-1964**, Edinburgh University Press, 2017, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1pwt39g, 8 June 2020.

Hedges, Elaine: "Small Things Reconsidered: "A Jury of Her Peers" **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 49-69.

Hickman, S. C.: "Deleuze: The Philosophy of Crime Novels," **Socialecologies**, 2012 (Online) https://socialecologies.wordpress.com/2012/12/22/deleuze-the-philosophy-of-crime-novels/, 30 July 2019.

Hudgins, Christopher C.: "By Indirections Find Directions Out," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 19-46.

Hudgins, Christopher C. et. al.: "Introduction," **Gender and Genre: Essays on David Mamet**, Ed. by. Christopher C.Hudgins and Leslie Kane, New York, Palgrave, 2001, pp. 1-14.

Hutchison, Cristine: "Center and Periphery: Mormons and American Culture in Tony Kushner's Angels in America," **Peculiar Portrayals : Mormons on the Page, Stage and Screen**, Ed. by Mark T. Decker, and Michael Austin, Utah State University Press, 2010, pp. 5-36, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=3442814, 23 Oct. 2019.

Ingle, Zachary: "'White Fear' and the Studio System: A Re-Evaluation of Hansberry's Original Screenplay of 'A Raisin in the Sun,'" **Literature Film Quarterly**, vol. 37, no. 3, July 2009, pp. 184–193, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=43250052&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Isaki, Bianca: "Colourblind Colonialism in the '50th State of America,'" **Deleuze and Race**, Ed. by Arun Saldanha and Jason Michael Adams, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2013, pp. 113–128, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b6b4.10, 16 June 2020.

Jacobs, Dorothy H.: "Levene's Daughter: Positioning of the Female in Glengarry Glen Ross," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 107- 122.

Jing, Wu: **The Logic of Difference in Deleuze and Adorno: Positive Constructivism VS Negative Dialectics,** Doctoral dissertation, The University of Hong Kong, 2009, (Online) http://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/130908, 26 Jan 2019.

Kalb, Jonathan: **Great Lengths: Seven Works of Marathon Theater**, University of Michigan Press, 2011, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=3415019, 13 Nov. 2019.

Kane, Leslie: "Introduction," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. xvii-xxxii.

Kelleher, Joe: **Theatre and Politics**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Kennedy, Adrienne: **People Who Led to My Plays**, New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1996.

_____: **Funnyhouse of a Negro**, New York: Samuel French, 1997.

Kershaw, Baz: **The Politics of Performance: Radical Theatre as Cultural Intervention**, London: Routledge, 1992.

Kilner-Johnson, Allan: '[God] Is A Flaming Hebrew Letter': Esoteric Camp in *Angels in America*, **Literature and Theology**, Vol. 33, Issue 2, June 2019, Pages 206–222, (Online) https://doi.org/10.1093/litthe/frz003, 5 Aug. 2019.

Kirby, Michael: "On Political Theatre," **The Drama Review: TDR**, vol. 19, no. 2, 1975, pp. 129–135, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1144954, 14 Aug. 2020.

Kodat, Catherine Gunther: "Confusion in a Dream Deferred: Context and Culture in Teaching A Raisin in the Sun," **Studies in the Literary Imagination**, vol. 31, no. 1, Spring 1998, pp. 149-164, (Online) *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=952152&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Kushner, Tony: **Angels in America: A Gay Fantasia on National Themes**, **Part One: Millennium Approaches**, New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1993a.

_____: **Angels in America: A Gay Fantasia on National Themes**, **Part Two: Perestroika**, New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1993b.

_____: "A Socialism of the Skin: Our Suffering teaches uf solidarity; or it should," **The Nation,** July 4, 1994, (Online) https://www.thenation.com/article/tony-kushner-socialism-gay-rights/, 18 Dec. 2019.

_____: "Notes about Political Theater," **The Kenyon Review**, New Series, Vol. 19, No. ¾, Summer - Autumn, 1997, pp. 19-34, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/4337551, 14 Nov. 2019.

_____: "How Do You Make Social Change?" **Project Muse: Theater**, Vol. 31, Number 3, Fall 2001, Duke University Press, pp. 62-93, (Online) https://muse.jhu.edu/article/34175, 11 Jan. 2020.

_____: **We Europeans? Mass-Observation, Race and British Identity in the Twentieth Century: Mass-Observation, Race and British Identity in the Twentieth Century**, London: Routledge, 2016.

Lahr, John: "David Mamet: The Art of Theatre XI," **David Mamet in Conversation**, Ed. by Kane, Michigan, The University of Michigan Press, pp. 109-122.

Laughlin, Karen: "Conflict of Interest: The Ideology of Authorship in *Alison's House*," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann

Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 219-235.

Limpár, Ildikó: "A Room With Many Views: The Diorama Room in Tony Kushner's Angels in America," **Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)**, Vol. 18, No. 1/2, Lifelong Search for Meaning: Special Double Issue in Honor Of Professor Donald E. Morse, Spring-Fall, 2012, Centre for Arts, Humanities and Sciences (CAHS), pp. 385-393, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/43488483, 05 Aug. 2019.

Lipari, Lisbeth: ""Fearful of the Written Word": White Fear, Black Writing, and Lorraine Hansberry's A Raisin in the Sun Screenplay," **Quarterly Journal of Speech**, 90:1, 2004, pp. 81-102, (Online) DOI: 10.1080/0033563042000206790, 29 May 2020.

_____: "Lorraine Hansberry (May 19, 1930–January 12, 1965)" **Writers of the Black Chicago Renaissance**, Ed. by Steven C. Tracy, University of Illinois Press, 2011, pp.193-217. ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=3413832, 29 May 2020.

_____: "Hansberry's Hidden Transcript," **Journal of Popular Culture**, vol. 46, no. 1, Feb. 2013, pp. 119–142, (Online) http://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2063/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=85595442&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Londré, Felicia Hardison: "Many-Faceted Mirror: Drama as Reflection of Uneasy Modernity in the 1920s," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp. 69-90, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Long, Thomas L.: **AIDS and American Apocalypticism: The Cultural Semiotics of an Epidemic**, State University of New York Press, 2005, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=3408558, 11 Dec. 2019.

Mael, Phyllis: ""Trifles": The Path to Sisterhood," **Literature/Film Quarterly**, Vol. 17, No. 4, 1989, Salisbury University, pp.281-284.

Makowsky, Veronica: "Forging a Woman's Identity in Susan Glaspell's Fiction," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 317-330.

Mamet, David: **Glengarry Glen Ross**, New York: Grove Press, 1984.

_____: **Writing in Restaurants**, New York, Penguin Books, 1987.

_____: "In the Company of Men," **Some Freaks**, New York, Viking, 1989, pp. 85-91.

Martins, José Endoença: "Black Women's "Two-ness" in African-American Literature: Can Black and White Worlds Join Together?" **Acta Scientiarum: Language & Culture**, *32*(1), 2010, pp. 27-34, (Online)https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2110/10.4025/actascilangcult.v32i1.4767, 30 May 2020.

Marx, Karl: **Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844**, Trans. by Martin Milligan, New York: Prometheus Books, 1988.

Mason, Denise: "The Power of Redemption: The Book of Ruth and a Raisin in the Sun," **Journal of Theta Alpha Kappa**, vol. 39, no. 2, Fall 2015, pp. 1–15, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=110923571&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Minwalla, Framji: "Kushner's Arcades: "The Borders Are Full of Holes,"" **The Playwright's Muse** Ed. by Joan Herrington, Routledge, 2002a, pp. 127-144, (Online) http://ebookcentral.proquest.com, 15 Oct. 2019.

_____: "Interview with Tony Kushner,"" **The Playwright's Muse** Ed. by Joan Herrington, Routledge, 2002b, pp.145-158, (Online) http://ebookcentral.proquest.com, 15 Oct. 2019.

Murray, William: "The Roof of a Southern Home: A Reimagined and Usable South in Lorraine Hansberry's A Raisin in the Sun," **Mississippi Quarterly**, vol. 68, no. 1/2,

Winter/Spring 2015, pp. 277–293, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=123615501&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Mustazza, Leonard: "Generic Translation and Thematic Shift in Susan Glaspell's "*Trifles*" and "*A Jury of her Peers*," **Studies in Short Fiction**, 26. 4, Fall 1989, Newberry College, pp. 489-496, (Online) https://www.coursehero.com/file/33317739/Mustazza-articlepdf/, 02 July 2019.

Nemiroff, Robert: "Introduction," **A Raisin in the Sun** by Lorraine Hansberry, New York: Vintage Books, 1994, pp. 5-16.

_____: **Lorraine Hansberry To Be Young, Gifted and Black: Lorraine Hansberry in Her Own Words.** New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Nielsen, Ken: **Modern Theatre Guides: Tony Kushner's Angels in America**, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012.

Noe, Marcia: "The Verge: L'Ecriture Féminine at the Provincetown," **Susan Glaspell: Essays on Her Theater and Fiction**, Ed. by Linda Ben-Zvi, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 129-142.

Norman, Brian: **Neo-Segregation Narratives: Jim Crow in Post-Civil Rights American Literature**, University of Georgia Press, 2010, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nleb

k&AN=343605&site=eds-live&scope=site, 10 June 2020.

Omer-Sherman, Ranen: "Thresholds of Vulnerable Identities in Tony Kushner's "Angels in America,"" **Shofar**, Vol. 25, No. 4, Summer 2007a, Purdue University Press, pp. 78-98, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/42944416, 05 Aug. 2019.

_____: "The Fate of the Other in Tony Kushner's "Angels in America"" **MELUS**, Vol. 32, No. 2, Thresholds, Secrets, and Knowledge, Summer, 2007b, Oxford University Press, pp. 7- 30, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/30029722, 05 Aug. 2019.

O'Neill, Eugene: "Hairy Ape," **Penguin Plays: Eugene O'Neill**, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1966.

Opondo, Sam Okoth: "Cinema–Body–Thought: Race-Habits and the Ethics of Encounter," **Deleuze and Race**, Ed. by Arun Saldanha and Jason Michael Adams, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2013, pp. 247–268, (Online) JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b6b4.17, 16 June 2020.

Pawling, Christopher: **Christopher Caudwell: Towards a Dialectical Theory of Literature**, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 1989.

Pederson, Joshua: ""More Life" and More: Harold Bloom, the J Writer, and the Archaic Judaism of Tony Kushner's Angels in America," **Contemporary Literature**, Vol. 50, No. 3,

FALL 2009, University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 576-598, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/40664364, 5 Aug. 2019.

Piette, Alain: "The 1980s," **The Cambridge Companion to David Mamet**, Ed. by Christopher Bigsby, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 74-88.

Plato: **The Republic**, Lerner Publishing Group, 2018, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=5444385, 15 Aug. 2020.

Pratt, Lloyd: **Archives of American Time: Literature and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century**, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=3441752, 28 Jan 2020.

Price, Steven: "Negative Creation: The Detective Story in Glengarry Glen Ross," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 3-18.

Rechtien, Renate: "Relations of Production? Christa Wolf's extended engagement with the legacy of Bertolt Brecht," **Bertolt Brecht: Centenary Essays** (German Monitor 41), Ed. by Steve Giles and Rodney Livingstone, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998, pp. 196-211.

Regan, Stephen: "Politics and Performance: The Legacy of Raymond Williams," **The Routledge Reader in Politics and Performance**, Ed. by Lizbeth Goodman and Jane de Gay, London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Robson, Mark: **Routledge Critical Thinkers: Stephen Greenblatt**, London: Routledge, 2008.

Rose, Gillian: **Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials**, London: Sage Publications, 2001.

Rousseau, Jean J.: "Discourse on the Sciences and Arts," Trans. by Ian Johnston, 1750, (Online) http://records.viu.ca/~johnstoi/rousseau/firstdiscourse.htm, 15 Jan 2012.

Rundle, Erika: "The Hairy Ape's Humanist Hell: Theatricality and Evolution in O'Neill's "Comedy of Ancient and Modern Life,"" **The Eugene O'Neill Review**, Penn State University Press, Vol. 30, 2008, pp. 48-144, (Online) http://www.jstor.org/stable/29784854, 14 Jan. 2017

Saal, Ilka: "Broadway and the Depoliticization of Epic Theatre: The Case of Erwin Piscator," **Brecht, Broadway and United States Theater,** edited by J. Chris Westgate, Cambridge Scholars Publisher, 2007, pp. 45-73, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=553311&site=eds-live&scope=site, 13 Jan. 2020.

Saber, Yomna: "Lorraine Hansberry: Defining the Line Between Integration and Assimilation," **Women's Studies**, Jul 2010, Vol. 39 Issue 5, pp. 451-469, (Online) https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr/login?url=http://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2063/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,uid&db=asn&AN=51484869&site=ehost-live, 29 May 2020.

Saddik, Annette: **Contemporary American Drama**, Ed. by Martin Halliwell, and Andy Mousley, Edinburgh University Press, 2007, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=320442, 22 Oct. 2019.

Salutin, Rick: "Theatre: The Most Political Art", **Rabble.ca**., 18 Feb 2005, (Online) http://www.rabble.ca/columnists/theatre-most-political-art, 20 Jan 2012.

Sauer, David Kennedy: "The Marxist Child's Play of Mamet's Tough Guys and Churchill's *Top Girls*," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 131-156.

_____: "Oleanna and the Children's Hour: Misreading Sexuality on the Post/Modern Realistic Stage," **David Mamet**, Ed. by Harold Bloom, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004, pp. 203-227.

Savran, David: "Ambivalence, Utopia, and a Queer Sort of Materialism: How "Angels in America," Reconstructs

the Nation," **Theatre Journal,** The Johns Hopkins University Press, Vol. 47, No. 2, Gay and Lesbian Queries, May, 1995, pp. 207-227, (Online) https://www.jstor.org/stable/3208484, 05 Aug. 2019.

Schvey, Henry I.: "Celebrating the Capacity for Self-Knowledge," **David Mamet in Conversation**, Ed.by Leslie Kane, USA, The University of Michigan Press, 2001, pp. 60-71.

Serttek, Gül Esin: **Deleuze'ün Sinema Felsefesinde Zaman İmgesi**, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Felsefe (Sistematik Felsefe Ve Mantık) Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2013.

Shih, "Yi-chin: Dance Scenes in Lorraine Hansberry's A Raisin in The Sun," **Explicator**, vol. 72, no. 4, Oct. 2014, pp. 278-281, (Online) EBSCOhost, doi:10.1080/00144940.2014.962454, 29 May 2020.

Shilts, Randy: **And the Band Played On: Politics, People, and the AIDS Epidemic***,* New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2007, pp. 154-178.

Shteir, Rachel: "Ethnic Theatre in America," **A Companion to Twentieth-Century American Drama**, Ed. by David Krasner, John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2007, pp.18-33, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=228540, 26 Aug. 2020.

Sierra, Erick: ""Threshold of Revelation": Don DeLillo, Tony Kushner, and an Epistemics of the Encounter,"

Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction, 57:1, 2016, pp. 16-28, (Online) DOI: 10.1080/00111619.2015.1019406, 10 Jan 2020.

Smith, Daniel W.: "Flow, Code and Stock: A Note on Deleuze's Political Philosophy," **Deleuze Studies,** Vol. 5: 2011, pp. 36–55, (Online) DOI: 10.3366/dls.2011.0036, 19 Aug. 2020.

Smith, Kelundra: "The Better 'Angels' of our Nature," **American Theatre**, Production Notebook of Theatre Communications Group, March 18, 2018, pp. 28-32, (Online) https://www.americantheatre.org/2018/02/07/the-better-angels-of-our-nature/, 7 Nov. 2019.

Smith, Terence: **Towards a Minor Theatre**, 1997, (Online) http://homepages.tesco.net/~theatre/tezzaland/thesis/index.htm, 7 Jan 2012.

Sollors, Werner: "Owls and Rats in the American Funnyhouse: Adrienne Kennedy's Drama," **American Literature**, vol. 63, no. 3, 1991, pp. 507–532, (Online) *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2927246, 5 Aug. 2020.

Solomon, Alisa: "Foreword," to Adrienne Kennedy, **The Alexander Plays**, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1992, pp. ix-xvii.

Sözalan, Özden: "In the Eye of the Beholder: The Tell-tale Stage in Susan Glaspell's *Trifles*," **The Stage in the Text: Essays on American Drama**, İstanbul: Okuyan Us, 2006, pp. 21-34.

_____: "The Poetics of Mise en Scéne: Eugene O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape*," **The Stage in the Text: Essays on American Drama**, İstanbul: Okuyan Us, 2006, pp. 35-60.

_____: ""These are the Places Myselves Exist in," Adrienne Kennedy's *Funnyhouse of a Negro*," **The Stage in the Text: Essays on American Drama**, İstanbul: Okuyan Us, 2006, pp. 141-164.

Stanislavski, Constantin: **My Life in Art**, New York: Routledge, 1948.

Stourac, Richard, et. al.: **Theatre as a Weapon: Workers' Theatre in the Soviet Union, Germany and Britain, 1917-1934**, Oxford: Routledge Kegan & Paul, 1986.

Summers, Claude J.: **Gay and Lesbian Literary Heritage**, Ed. by Claude J. Summers, Taylor & Francis Group, 2002, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=1639358, 17 Oct. 2019.

Tekinay, Aslı: **Contemporary American Drama: 1960-2000**, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Publication, 2001.

Tritt, Michael: "A View from the Stockyards: Lorraine Hansberry's Allusion to 'The Jungle' in the Unfilmed Screenplay of 'A Raisin in the Sun,'" **ANQ**, vol. 21, no. 1, Winter 2008, pp. 51-57, (Online) EBSCOhost, doi:10.3200/ANQQ.21.1.51-57, 29 May 2020.

Türkgeldi, Kıvanç: "Hareket-İmge ve Zaman-İmge Kavramları Doğrultusunda "21 Gram"a Bir Bakış," **Akdeniz İletişim Dergisi**, pp. 114-131, (Online) https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/495236, 17 Jan. 2020.

Uma, Jayaraman: "Eugene O'Neill's *The Hairy Ape* – An American Expressionistic Play," **Language in India**, Vol. 10: 7 July 2010, pp. 258-264. (Online) http://www.languageinindia.com/july2010/expressionismuma.html, 18 Dec. 2018.

Vorlicky, Robert H.: "Men Among the Ruins," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 81-106.

Wilkerson, Margaret B.: "From Harlem to Broadway: African American women playwrights at mid-century," **Cambridge Companion to American Women Playwrights**, Ed. by Brenda Murphy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 134-154.

_____: "Political Radicalism and Artistic Innovation in the Works of Lorraine Hansberry," **African American Performance and Theater History: A Critical Reader**, Ed. by Harry J. Elam, and David Krasner, Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2001, pp.40-55, (Online) ProQuest Ebook Central, https://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2187/lib/ozyegin/detail.action?docID=241297, 11 June 2020.

Williams, James: **Gilles Deleuze's Philosophy of Time: A Critical Introduction and Guide**, Edinburgh University Press, 2011, (Online) http://offcampus.ozyegin.edu.tr:2072/eds/ebookviewer/ebook?sid=ba3e1938-e518-4639-85c5-1edb11f5a2c6%40sessionmgr4006&vid=0&format=EB, 16 Jan 2020.

_____: **Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: A Critical Introduction and Guide,** Vol. Second edition, Edinburgh University Press, 2013, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=534511&site=eds-live&scope=site, 6 Aug. 2020.

Williams, Raymond: **Drama in Performance**, Buckingham: Open University Press, 1991.

Williams, Tyrone: **Masterplots II.** Vol. Rev. ed, Salem Press, 2009, (Online) EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=266311&site=eds-live&scope=site, 7 June 2020.

Worster, David: "How to Do Things with Salesmen: David Mamet's Speech-Act Play," **David Mamet's *Glengarry Glen Ross*: Text and Performance**, Ed. by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996, pp. 63-80.

Zeifman, Hersh: "Phallus in Wonderland: Machismo and Business in David Mamet's *American Buffalo* and *Glengarry Glen*

Ross," **David Mamet: A Casebook**, Ed.by Leslie Kane, New York: Garland Publishing, 1992, pp. 123-135.

Žukauskaitė**,** Audronė, et. al.: "Introduction," **Deleuze and Beckett**, Ed. by Audronė Žukauskaitė, S. E. Wilmer, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp. 1-19.

Biography

Gizem Barreto Martins obtained her B.A. from İstanbul University, Department of American Culture and Literature in 2003 and M.A. in the same Department in 2007. In her M.A. thesis, she studied the relationship between language and gender in David Mamet's plays. After completing her M.A., she worked as a Research Assistant and Lecturer, and since 2010 she has been working as an English language Instructor. She has also worked as a freelance translator mainly on literary and academic texts, and she has taken part in university and amateur theaters since 1999.