



ISSN-1449-7751

IN THIS ISSUE



A View Of US-Iran Relations from the Former US Embassy in Tehran

1

BABAK RAHIMI

Changing the Universe

50

IRENE MARQUES

King Kong vs. Rambo: A Cautionary Tale (again)

52

JOHN.MCGOWAN
HARTMANN

NEBULA

A Journal of Multidisciplinary Scholarship

VOLUME 2 • ISSUE 2
JUNE 2005

The *Nebula* Editorial Board

Dr. Samar Habib: Editor in Chief (Australia)
Dr. Joseph Benjamin Afful, University of Cape Coast (Ghana)
Dr. Senayon S. Alaoluw, University of the Witwatersrand (South Africa)
Dr. Samirah Alkasim, independent scholar (Egypt)
Dr. Rebecca Beirne, The University of Newcastle (Australia)
Dr. Nejme Khalil-Habib, The University of Sydney (Australia)
Dr. Isaac Kamola, Dartmouth College (U.S.A)
Garnet Kindervater, The University of Minnesota (U.S.A)
Dr. Olukoya Ogen, Obafemi Awolowo University (Nigeria)
Dr. Paul Ayodele Osifodunrin, University of Lagos (Nigeria)
Dr. Babak Rahimi, University of California (San Diego, U.S.A)
Dr. Michael Angelo Tata, City University of New York (U.S.A)

The *Nebula* Advisory Board

Dr. Serena Anderlini-D'Onofrio, The University of Puerto Rico
Dr. Paul Allatson, The University of Technology, Sydney (Australia)
Dr. Benjamin Carson, Bridgewater State College (U.S.A)
Dr. Murat Cemrek, Selcuk University (Turkey)
Dr. Melissa Hardie, The University of Sydney (Australia)
Dr. Samvel Jeshmaridian, The City University of New York (U.S.A)
Dr. Christopher Kelen, The University of Macao (China)
Dr. Kate Lilley, The University of Sydney (Australia)
Dr. Karmen MacKendrick, Le Moyne College of New York (U.S.A)
Dr. Tracy Biga MacLean, Academic Director, Claremont Colleges (U.S.A)
Dr. Wayne Pickard, a very independent scholar (Australia)
Dr. Ruying Qi, The University of Western Sydney (Australia)
Dr. Ruben Safrastyan, Armenian National Academy of Sciences (Armenia)
Dr. Alberto Sandoval, Mount Holyoke College (U.S.A)
Dr. Judith Snodgrass, The University of Western Sydney (Australia)
Dr. Helga Tawil-Souri, New York University (U.S.A)

Opinions expressed in articles published in *Nebula* reflect those of their respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the journal or its editorial or advisory board members.

Content

- i** **Note on contributors**
- 1** **Crossing over the Wall: A View of US-Iran Relations from the Former US Embassy in Tehran.**
Babak Rahimi
- 15** **Tracing the Discourse of Defiance: Remembering Edward W. Said through the Resistance of the Palestinian Intifada.**
Matthew Abraham
- 25** **Public Consciousness Beyond Theatrical Space: Harold Pinter Interrogates Borders and Boundaries.**
Dilek Inan
- 43** **Mao's Dialectical Materialism as an Individualism: Theory and Practice.**
Kane X. Faucher
- 50** **Changing the universe...**
Irene Marques
- 52** **King Kong vs. Rambo: A Cautionary Tale (again)**
John McGowan-Hartmann
- 57** **Andy Warhol: When Junkies Ruled the World.**
Michael Angelo Tata
- 82** **Coming Into Being and Flowing Into Exile: History and Trends in Palestinian Film-Making.**
Helga Tawil
- 106** **The Importance of the Pedagogy Process.**
Stephanie Watson

Note on contributors

Matthew Abraham

Matthew Abraham is an assistant professor of English at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville (USA). He has recently published “The Rhetoric of Academic Controversy after 9/11: Edward Said in the American Imagination” in *Journal of Advanced Composition* (Fall 2004). Matthew is currently completing a manuscript entitled *The Rhetoric of Resistance and the Resistance to Theory: Controversial Academic Scholarship in the American Public Sphere*. His critical interests focus on public intellectualism, the rhetoric of dissent, and the politics and crises of the Middle East. In 1999 he participated in the School of Criticism and Theory at Cornell University (USA). In his article *Tracing the Discourse of Defiance...* Matthew recalls some of Said’s most passionate commentary concerning the vilification and suppression of the problematic Palestinian identity, both among Western and Israeli ideologues of recent years, as well as celebrating Said’s responses to this crisis of identity in both discourse and praxis.

Dilek Inan

Dilek Inan received his PhD from Warwick University (UK) and he is currently acting as Lecturer of English Literature at Balikesir University in Turkey. Dilek has participated in a number of international conferences, presenting numerable papers on the work of the English playwright Harold Pinter, including his presentations at Ege University’s 9th International Cultural Studies Symposium and at the “Literary London Conference” (Goldsmith’s College, July 2002). His articles have appeared in *Confrontations: Essays in the Polemics of Narration* (North Cyprus: Eastern Mediterranean University Pres, 2004);

Seljuk (January 2002) and in the *Proceedings of the 23rd All-Turkey English Literature Conference* (Istanbul: Koç Kültür Sanat Tanıtım and The British Council, 2002). In his contribution to *Nebula* Dilek interrogates the popular critical assumption that Pinter’s latter plays were ill-conceived, reading them within their political and sociocultural context. *Public Consciousness Beyond Theatrical Space: Harold Pinter Interrogates Borders and Boundaries* provides a thorough investigation of Pinter’s shift into the public domain as a promoter of political conscience.

Kane X. Faucher

Kane X. Faucher is a doctoral student at the University of Western Ontario’s Centre for the Study of Theory & Criticism, and an experimental novelist living in Canada. His works of literary and academic endeavour have appeared recently in *Exquisite Corpse*, *Recherche Litteraire*, *Janus Head*, *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, *3711Atlantic*, *Zygote in My Coffee*, *9, Quill and Ink*, *Jack Magazine* and *Defenestration* (only to name a few). He has provided an editor’s introduction to Che Elias’ novel, *The Pagan Ellipsis*. His novel, *Urdox!* was released in 2004, and *Codex Obscura* (with an introduction by Raymond Federman) will be appearing this summer. His chapbook, *Cystem SansCrit*, has been released by Dusty Owl Press. He is an editorial member of the journal, *Skandalon*, as well as the general editor of the soon-to-be inaugurated journal, *Critical Mass: Theory & Fiction*. In his contribution to *Nebula*, Kane explores the inconsistencies in Mao Tse Tung’s rule as well as elevating his speculation over these irregularities to a form of intellectual intrigue which almost borders on the esoteric, at least, the transcendental.

Carefully written and highly reflective *Mao's Dialectical Materialism as an Individualism: Theory and Practice* will be of great interest to readers of Marxist and Deleuseian critical theory as well as those interested in subversive readings of any kind.

Irene Marques

Irene Marques is a doctoral candidate in the Centre for Comparative Literature at the University of Toronto. Her thesis *Four Writers Being Political on Their Own Terms: Feminist, Class and Cultural Identity Discourses Across Continents* provides a study of works by the Mozambican Mia Couto, the Brazilian Clarice Lispector, the Portuguese José Saramago and the South African J.M. Coetzee. Irene deploys a blend of Marxist, postcolonial and feminist theories as well as Lévinasian and Buddhist philosophies in her academic work. She has recently completed a novel in Portuguese, for which she is presently seeking a suitable publisher in Portugal. Irene has contributed a delightful poem to *Nebula*, entitled "Changing the universe" (is it significant that the "universe" is not capitalized?) which takes us through the vicissitudes of space, time, light, being and non-being.

John McGowan-Hartmann

John McGowan-Hartmann has recently completed his PhD in the Cinema Studies program at the University of Melbourne, Australia, and is currently in the midst of relocating to the United States. His dissertation, *Lighting the Beast: Dinosaurs and Dragons as Archetypal Imagery in Stop-Motion Animation*, explores some of the

ways in which images sourced to the limbic cortex of the human brain find an outlet in new visual technologies. His article, "Animation in Depth: Building a Cinematic Entity" is currently under review, and is slated for publication in *Animation Journal*. His other interests include the ongoing influence of Surrealism on the cinematic form, the changing face of cinematic adaptations, and fishing. A student of stopmotion and its cultural history, he is interested in all things King Kongian. *In his King Kong versus Rambo...John (re)visits the Remake: that rather odd genre of film reproduction, within the context of the upcoming Peter Jackson remake of King Kong. A witty and lighthearted look into the cultural history of the remake, this article does not shun the subjective appraisal of film, where cinema and film belong to the viewer.*

Babak Rahimi

Babak Rahimi received his Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and Political Science at the University of California, San Diego and his Masters in Philosophy at the University of Nottingham. He received his PhD from the Department of Political and Social Sciences at the European University Institute in Florence for his dissertation on the Iranian public sphere in the Safavid period (1564-1590). Recent academic articles were published in *Middle Eastern Review of International Affairs* (Nov. 2004) and *Iranian Studies* (Sept. 2004). He is presently Assistant Professor in the Department of Literature at the University of California, San Diego. In the (northern hemisphere) summer of 2005, Babak will act as senior fellow at the United States Institute of Peace, contributing to work on post-Saddam Iraq. Babak has been a regular contributor to *Nebula* since its inception in June

2004. His articles always provide a fresh perspective coupled with erudition and original research, presented in a lucid style which lends itself to the highest ideals of intellectual objectivity. In *Ishraqat* Part IV (Arabic word for “illuminations”) Babak conducts on-the-ground original research in Tehran. His article is centred around his visit to the former U.S. Embassy in Tehran, which was stormed by students of the Islamist movement of Ayatollah Khomeini in 1979. Babak furnishes the article with photographs he took of the former embassy and its current exhibits in his recent visit to Tehran, whilst paying close attention to the historical context which led to the storming of the embassy.

Michael Angelo Tata

Michael Angelo Tata received his M.A. in Creative Writing/Poetry from Temple University, his M.A. in Liberal Studies from the New School for Social Research, and his Ph.D. in English Literature through the CUNY Graduate Center. His poetry and criticism have appeared in the journals *M/C*, *Ugly Couch*, *Lit*, *Lungfull*, *eye: rhyme, kenning*, *Bad Subjects*, *Found Object*, *Rhizomes* and *to the quick*, as well as the Critical Studies compilation *From Virgin Land to Disney World: Nature and Its Discontents in the USA of Yesterday and Today* (New York: Rodopi, 2001) and the Madonna Studies anthology *Madonna's Drowned Worlds: New Approaches to Her Cultural Transformations* (Newcastle [UK]: Ashgate, 2004). His first chapbook of poems, *The Multiplication of Joy into Integers*, won Blue Light Press's 2003 poetry prize. His poetry has also appeared in the collections *This New Breed: Bad Boys, Gents and Barbarians 2* (Port Orchard [US]: Windstorm, 2004) and *Bordered Sexualities* (San Diego:

Hyperbole Books & San Diego UP, 2005). In his scholarly and rigorous contribution to *Nebula* Michael gives us a glimpse into the world of his doctoral dissertation: Andy Warhol's implication into a world full of chemicals, narcotics, amphetamines, (mass) consumption and of course, art, film and existential wandering. *Andy Warhol: When Junkies Ruled the World* is evidence of rigorous scholarship and years of persistent research, coupled with the skills required to weave fragments into a cogent whole.

Helga Tawil

Helga Tawil recently completed her Ph.D. in media studies at the University of Colorado, Boulder and will be an Assistant Professor at New York University's Department of Culture and Communication as of September 2005. Helga's research is on Palestinian media and Internet growth and their problematic relationship to Western notions of development and modernization. In her academic research, she is also interested in the connection between space, politics and identity. Helga is also a photographer and documentary filmmaker, and in such work focuses on Palestinian social and political issues. More information can be found at www.helga.com. Helga takes us into the world of Palestinian filmmaking, casting an eye over its historical genealogy as well as the inevitable politics that the polymorphous Palestinian identity necessarily implies in the present (and past) historical context.

Stephanie Watson

Stephanie Watson received her Masters of Arts

– English from West Texas A&M University in May this year. She is expecting to receive her Masters of Library Science from the University of North Texas in August 2006. She has recently contributed poetry to *The Legacy* and is presently acting as Teaching Assistant in the Department of English and Modern Languages at West Texas A&M University. She has participated in numerous conferences and presentations including the Film & History Conference, held in Dallas Texas, November 2004, where she presented on “Freedom or Prison: Behind the Veil of the Middle East.” In her contribution to *Nebula* Stephanie highlights the increasingly growing distance between the standards and methods involved in High School education and those expected at University-level scholarship. She delineates a clear and practical method for dealing with the very problem of cogent and coherent writing facing students who are making the transition from High School to University. Those of us who have witnessed the various weaknesses in writing skills among junior-year students, may find this article beneficial to recommend.

Crossing over the Wall: A View of US-Iran Relations from the Former US Embassy in Tehran.

By Babak Rahimi

'I wasn't particularly surprised that they did it, but I wish they hadn't waited so long. If it wasn't an election year they might not have ever gotten around to it. But it's too late. You can't deal with those people. You're not dealing with rational people over there in Iran. It's like talking to a drunk, it doesn't do any good.'

Irving Bierman, in response to U.S. military operation to rescue the American hostages in Iran, aborted due to mechanical problems and a severe sandstorm. Quoted in "Incident Leaves Bay Public Sad, Frustrated," San Francisco Examiner, April 25, 1980

'The United States can distinguish a director and a terrorist but it intends to belittle Iranians and therefore every Iranian should be careful not to be deceived by American dubious olive branches.'

Ezzatollah Zarghami, deputy head of the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB) and a former militant student that participated in the seizure of the American embassy on November 4, 1979, in reply to US refusal to grant visa to Abbas Kiarostami, an Iranian film director, November 4, 2002.



Fig. 1. Embassy front gates.

As I stand facing the low-slung wall of the former U.S. embassy in Tehran, smeared with various anti-American and revolutionary slogans and murals, I find myself imagining the morning of November 4th, 1979. I imagine how between 300 and 400 Islamist students, known as “Students following the Line of the Imam” (Ayatollah Khomeini), surrounded and later stormed the embassy by climbing over the wall and taking 52 American staff members hostage.¹

I could hear the repeated shouts of “*Marg bar America*” (“Death to America”). The noisy crowd is outside the embassy, with pictures of Ayatollah Khomeini, effigies of former US President Jimmy Carter and banners, written with bad English spelling, condemning the great “imperialist” for welcoming the “defunct” shah (the former ruling monarch of Iran) for medical treatment.² The front of the main entrance door, with two metal doors and a bas-relief of an American bald eagle in between, symbolically depicting the outer boundaries of an American diplomatic territory with a shape of a slender rectangular building, marks the central staging place where the Iranian students planned a three day takeover of the embassy. It was here that over several hours students from the University of Tehran stormed the embassy without fear of the intervention of the revolutionary guards or the police.

I wonder how this brick wall witnessed the crossing of the Muslim revolutionary students? I wonder how on that Sunday morning the Embassy staffers felt when they looked out the window seeing the first stirrings of a crowd crossing over the wall? And what emotions did the students have as they marched across the compound toward the ambassador’s residence?

In my mind, I see hundreds of armed students run feverishly and hurriedly on the front lawn of the 27-acre compound. Some students get through windows in the basement and move to the first floor of the Embassy building. Others stand outside the main door by the stairwell, yelling and trying to smash the closed doors.

After a brief resistance by several U.S. Marine guards (a tear gas canister was set off in the central hallway in the second floor), the students enter the building and surround the American staff members. Blindfolded and with hands tied behind their backs, they march out of the front entrance to the Embassy residence. The hostages are not permitted to talk to each other, as the students prepare to make their case for taking over the embassy to the world. At 1:15 p.m. the seizure of the capital embassy is completely.

Later, one of the hostage-takers would speak to reporters by telephone from inside the seized embassy, giving assurance that all the hostages were safe. This phone call signaled the beginning of a political crisis on an international scale; it marked the first day of a siege, in which the American hostages were held for 444 days and which led to the end of diplomatic ties between the two countries. But, more importantly, it marked the beginning of an explosive event in U.S.- Middle East relations, of which echoes can still be heard to this day.

The straining of US-Iranian relations, that began with the Iran Hostage Crisis, is based on a wall of mistrust, and the crossing of the wall continues to be difficult because of Tehran's alarming behavior in making fissile material for nuclear weapons, as well as Washington's lack of an effective foreign policy, both of which prevent the creation of new diplomatic relations between the two countries. After 25 odd years of wariness and tension, it may be argued that both Iran and the United States, and certainly the rest of the world, would be better off if there were a renewal of ties. But how could the two states re-establish relations after years of suspicion, when they regard each other as either a satanic overlord ("Great Satan") or a member of an exclusive demonic association ("Axis of Evil")? In short, how could either make a pact with an untrustworthy devil?

"Nest of Spies"

Since the release of the hostages in January 1981, the former U.S. embassy compound has become a military base of the Iranian revolutionary guards, who have now turned the main embassy grounds into a temporary exhibition, which they call "the Nest of Spies."

I walk the grounds of the Embassy knowing that the students of Imam Khomeini used an American flag to carry away trash from the compound. I stare at the former embassy entrance, where the students walked out the blindfolded American hostages. I walk up to the main building and turn back. There is a forest of signs and banners on the trees of the compound with the words of "*Marg bar America*" ("Death to America"). Facing the front entrance of the Embassy are the smashed up remains of an American airplane that was used in a failed military rescue mission in April 1980, ordered by the former President Carter. A sign that reads: "This is American democracy" is posted on the U.S. military artifact. On the stairs stands a bronze colored statue of an American marine, with hands over his head, symbolizing the submission of American power to forces of good, namely, the followers of Imam Khomeini. There is also a model of the Statue of Liberty with its belly turned into a grotesque looking prison, where a white dove morbidly lies.

Inside the main building, the organizers of the exhibition have turned the central hallway - which runs the length of the rectangular building - and rooms of the second floor, into a series of art galleries with works depicting the satanic nature of the United States and the Zionist entity (Israel). There are also exhibition rooms, devoted to a narrative account of the take-over of the embassy by the students. Here one finds newspaper clips, statements by students and hostages, eavesdropping equipment, and some of the embassy's extensive files and classified material from the political section and safes on the second floor, which the students recovered in the form of shredded items and systemically reassembled.³

There is a soundproof chamber that was used for secret meetings, with bizarre looking dummies of American diplomats sitting around a table, apparently planning their next espionage activity. One could get a glimpse of the Great Satan by looking at these dummies. They look cold, decayed and arrogant, enthroned on their chairs like men of hubris: those esteeming themselves as equal to, or greater than, the gods. Their western attire, their golden-brown and gray hair, their expressionless faces, personify what the students hated the most about the America they perceived in 1979: its arrogance, greed and pride.

The "Nest of Spies" has now transformed the former embassy into a weird postmodern Islamic revolutionary shrine to one of the ideological basis of the Islamic Republic of Iran: anti-Americanism. As I walk through the exhibition hallway, I become dismayed by the ghostly remains of the past. Here, American territory is beset by anti-Americanism.



Fig. 2. Embassy front entrance.

Ghostly Remains: “Operation Ajax”

I enter a room at the end of the large hallway of the embassy, where the sign indicates its former function as the information and communication operative center. While looking at the outdated 70s communication technology, like a huge fax machine that looked more like a huge woodcutter machine, I come across the place where secret materials and files in the communications vault were removed and hurriedly fed to the shredder on the morning when the students seized the Embassy.

I leave the communication chambers and I suddenly become aware of an important and yet horrid historical fact. It was most likely in this very embassy that the CIA and the British SIS orchestrated a coup d’etat that brought down the popular government of Mohammad Mossadeq in 1953. The thought of this makes me reflect on prerevolutionary Iran, and events that led to the eventual take-over of the U.S. Embassy.



Fig. 3. Communication room 1.



Fig. 4. Communication room 2.



Fig. 5. US Embassy Safe.

Originally conceived by the British government and implemented by the US State Department and certain hawks in the CIA, the aim of the coup was to prevent the nationalization of the Iranian oil industry under Mossadeq's government, which denied the British 51% of its ownership and 84% of its profits. Mossadeq's controversial move to nationalize the Anglo-Iranian oil company, marked the first direct confrontation with a foreign power that enabled Iran to affirm its independence from what (colonial British Foreign Secretary) Lord Curzan regarded, in 1919, as a country that remained significant to the "safety of our eastern Empire."⁴

It was perhaps in this very room, the “communication center” section of the Embassy, that CIA agents communicated their plans and ideas to Washington for the return of the Shah under the presidency of Dwight Eisenhower. It was perhaps here in the secret chamber room that the CIA made plans to pay off Iranians to pose as Communists to harass Shi'i religious leaders and stage the bombing of one ulama's (cleric) home in a campaign to turn Iran's religious community against Mossadeq's government. It was most likely in this very Embassy that a group of Iranians were paid off (\$100 each) to organize a demonstration and eventually set the house of the Prime Minister Mossadeq on fire.

However, the objective of the coup was not only to undermine the regime of Mossadeq, which was believed to be flirting with Moscow at the time, but also to curtail the rise of Iranian nationalism that hampered the interests of the US and its allies (United Kingdom) in the country. The best way to topple a popular prime minister who challenged the great powers was to engage in a covert strategic action that maintained the political legitimacy of an incompetent king by making the bribed demonstrators appear to be a popular movement. Accordingly, the installment of the Shah of Shahs, the King of Kings, Mohammad Reza Shah, was to protect British and U.S. interests in a country that, like a number of other post-colonial countries, such as India, was experiencing an upsurge of nationalistic sentiments amidst the Cold War, while superpowers vied for global mastery. As *New York Times* reporter Stephen Kinzer argues in *All the Shah's Men*, “Operation Ajax” was aimed to undermine Mossadeq's government by bribing political figures and military elites, and by organizing rumors and false reports in newspapers to provoke unrest in the country. Based on recently released CIA classified documents, Kinzer shows how the Shah was used by the British and US intelligence agencies, led by Kermit Roosevelt, the grandson of President Theodore Roosevelt, to issue a verdict dismissing Mossadeq's government. For Kinzer, the roots of the events of 9/11 can be linked to collective resentment against the US, which the coup fostered in the Middle East.

Accordingly, the CIA involvement in the overthrowing of Prime Minister Mossadeq's popular government in 1953, looms extraordinarily large in the collective consciousness of Iranians. As a young student at the University of Isfahan explained to me, “America stole from my father and I our democracy. I resent America for that. I am upset how Americans can be so ignorant about their government's past mistakes. Think about the possibility, just the possibility of a democratic Iran existing and growing to this day! I wonder how my life would have been different if America was not behind that coup.”

The above statement represents a view that is shared by many Iranians, especially the younger generation under the age of 30, which comprises 70% of Iran's population. Post-revolutionary Iran continues to be haunted by the ghost of “Operation Ajax” as a mythical presence of a foreign power behind the curtain of domestic politics, making an impression in the Iranian collective consciousness that the ultimate aim of the U.S. is to make Iran its dominion, governed by a puppet regime and administrated through the CIA. However, more importantly, the coup of 1953 identified a future denied, a future that may have, by now, led to a consolidation of a democratic Iran.

Cultivating a Dictator: Chemical Saddam

As I continue my stroll in the large, silent hallway, I come across a huge poster sign with the following words written on it: “The Role of Evil: A Review of the American government’s crime against Islamic Iran.” The poster highlights a series of U.S. involvement in Iranian political affairs, mainly events that mark the U.S. military involvement in the Iran-Iraq war.

It is a known fact that with the Iran-Iraq war escalating in the early 80s, then President Ronald Reagan sent his Middle East envoy, a former secretary of defense, Donald Rumsfeld, to Baghdad with the message that Washington was interested in resuming diplomatic relations. The December 19th 1983 visit by Rumsfeld also involved “topics of mutual interest,” which mainly aimed to curtail the military expansion of Iranian forces into Iraq and thwart the influence of the Shi‘i revolutionary state in the region.

Just three months after the meeting on March 5th 1984, when the Iran-Iraq war had grown into its most brutal stage, the U.S. State Department reported the Iraqi use of “lethal chemical weapons” in the war. In the same month, the United Nations also reported the use of mustard gas, laced with a nerve agent, on Iranian soldiers, since beginning of the conflict 43 months earlier (the Iran-Iraq war began September 1980). But Rumsfeld was back in Iraq later that year, after the 1984 UN report. Rumsfeld traveled to Baghdad during a period when Saddam Hussein was using chemical warfare in defiance of international law, a practice outlawed by the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

While Saddam Hussein continued to acquire chemical weapons and as Iran’s mulla oligarchs, in particular Hashemi Rafsanjani, relentlessly encouraged young Iranians to die a martyr’s death through human wave attacks, on March 29, 1984, American diplomats expressed their satisfaction with relations between Iraq and the United States. Later, military technologies, including \$200 million worth of helicopters, were sold to Iraq, in addition to the significant military intelligence (satellite information) provided to Saddam Hussein’s regime in the war.⁵

The White House continued to supply Saddam Hussein with advanced military technology and battlefield intelligence on Iranian troop buildups. Along with other European states, in particular France and West Germany, China and the former USSR, American corporations supplied the Iraqi regime with material and technology for producing gas or tabun (or lewisite or nitrogen mustard) throughout the war. When in late 1987 the Iraqi air force began using chemical weapons against the Kurds in northern Iraq, the State Department and White House failed to take any action to stop Saddam Hussein.

In fact, as Assistant Secretary of State, Richard W. Murphy, wrote in a September 1988 memorandum, “The U.S.-Iraqi relationship is...important to our long-term political and economic objective.” He adds, “We believe that economic sanctions will be useless or counterproductive to influence the Iraqis.”⁶ Oddly, as the Washington Post article explains, “...the supply of U.S. military intelligence to Iraq actually expanded in 1988,” highlighting the strengthening of U.S.-Iraqi ties way into the late 80s.⁷

It is a strange historical fact that the White House continued to speak of Saddam Hussein as a threat not only to the U.S., but the world from 1990 to 2003, as it watched the dictator brutalize his people and commit atrocities against Iranians in the 80s. How strange, I thought to myself, as I stood in the hallway of the former U.S. Embassy in Tehran, just hundreds of kilometers away, the American forces are busy securing Iraq from the last remains of Saddam Hussein, the same dictator to whom the Republican administration provided military and political assistance in the 80s, which helped him to maintain his brutal regime. What seems ironic is that this very deposed dictator, who was allied to the Reagan administration, especially during the most brutal period of his authoritarian rule, is now locked away by another Republican administration somewhere in Iraq, awaiting his trial for crimes committed against humanity. Yet, for the most part, the infamous U.S.-Iraqi alliance in the 80s is now rarely mentioned as a key factor in Saddam Hussein's continued effort to acquire weapons of mass destruction throughout the 90s.

It is in this regard that I recognize the lifeblood of Iranian anti-Americanism exhibited in the former Embassy: the perceived U.S. hypocrisy. The Jeffersonian spirit to spread democracy around the world appears to have been betrayed by those who claim to be the missionaries of democracies. When it came to the Iran of 1953 and the Iraq of the 1980s it was not, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "the people to whom all authority [belonged]," instead it fell to the hands of the state and the authorities to dictate to people their belonging. Supporting dictators (Saddam Hussein and Shah) or overthrowing democratic governments (Salvador Allende, Chili, and Mossadeq) do not reflect the Jeffersonian vision of America as "unquestionably of the republican sentiment," but present an impression of an advancing empire maintaining dominance over distant lands and shaping political realities around the globe.

Failures of a Culture of Enmity

There is a curious yet disturbing emotion that I experience during my visit to the Embassy. I see paintings, pictures and posters depicting the U.S. as the world's source of evil. There is a slogan depicting one of Ayatollah Khomeini's famous statements: "We will make America face as severe defeat." An artwork by an unknown Iranian artist, displays a plastic baby, symbolizing "the present humanity" attached (by a plastic cable) to four missile bombs which represent America. The first bomb from the left signifies political domination, the second one represents greed, the third violence and the fourth lust. Each symbolizes the roots of evil that eventually will set the world into a massive explosion. In this room, in this building, the U.S. is not only blamed for its support of the two deposed dictators, Shah and Saddam, but also for its "Role of Evil" as an immoral entity in the world. The negative artistic representation of America identifies both internal and external features of the U.S. as an evil entity, depicting a belligerent force to recognize and, ultimately, destroy. By and large anti-Americanism has become one of the main ideological justifications for the Islamic Republic. In a state that espouses the highest religious values and dictates a fundamentalist conception of Islamic faith to its citizens' daily life is an ideological necessity to make a perceived outsider enemy as the source of absolute evil in the world, an evil which should be crushed on the way to achieving national salvation. Such ideology not only legitimizes the Iranian Mullacracy as a

government representing the good, but also aims to unify its citizens against an imaginary demonic enemy, an enemy that transgressed against all the good and embodies all the evil.

It is in this sense that one could recognize the current anti-American exhibition in the former U.S. Embassy in Tehran. What the Embassy provides is a cultural space wherein the Islamic Republic can display an arch-enemy that justifies the state's existence to protect the citizens. And of course the foe here is far more than a military force to confront; the adversary is also a moral and political calamity that corrupts (lust), disfigures (violence) and destroys (greed).



Fig. 6. Artwork: 4 Bombs.

While most Iranians prefer to normalize relations with the U.S., the conservative faction in the government continues to display inherited revolutionary slogans amidst shrinking anti-American demonstrations. On October 31, 2004, for instance, the newconservative lawmakers in the parliament (where a number of controversial votes in February 2004 prevented more than 2,000 reformist candidates to stand in the polls) chanted the usual “Death to America!” after they voted to resume uranium enrichment activities.⁸ The symbolic gesture was in a way to taunt the American and European governments for demanding the Iranian government halt all uranium enrichment-related activities.

Crisis of Legitimacy

Iran is a country that is experiencing a crisis of political legitimacy. As the giant wall murals on the streets outside the Embassy compound continue to lose their revolutionary appeal, Iranians, especially the young,

seek to find ways to crack the regime's political grip on everyday life. Though sentiments of resentment for the U.S.'s involvement in Iranian politics can be heard, Iranians grow more impatient with the regime's empty anti-American rhetoric and failed political policies. They have increasingly questioned, and at times, protested the direction their country is taking. Their curiosity for the U.S. has grown despite the disapproval of the fundamentalist regime.

Especially since the election of Khatami's reformist government to power in 1997, the ideology of anti-Americanism has left a deep cleft between state and society. With various para-statal, clerically-controlled foundations and non-elected governmental institutions, like the expediency council (appointed by Ayatollah Khamenei, the spiritual leader of the Islamic Republic), Iran's reformist faction continues to challenge (both pragmatic and hardliner) the conservatives' grip on power. Despite a most likely victory of the conservatives in the June 17th, 2005 presidential elections, the reformist and various political dissidents (both secular and non-secularist), despondent from the previous parliamentary and presidential elections, continue to advance their dissent in the postrevolutionary public sphere. And it is precisely in such a public sphere, the civic space between the private and the state, that a change of Iran's current political situation should be observed in the future.

I leave the exhibition that morning and come across a young man selling pirated CDs of western pop music on the sidewalk near the Embassy wall. I ask him for the price of one and he points, mistakenly, to a Britney Spears "Oops I did it again" CD. "This one? This is 3000 Toman," he tells me. He smiles and adds, "if you don't buy it now, don't worry. I'm sure one day she'll come here and sing for us in the embassy."

"The Coming Wars"?

In one of his latest articles in *The New Yorker*, Seymour Hersh writes of secret commando teams, with Israeli assistance, conducting covert activities to locate Iranian nuclear facilities for a possible upcoming U.S. military attack on Iran. He writes, "The American task force, aided by the information from Pakistan, has been penetrating eastern Iran from Afghanistan in a hunt for underground installations. The taskforce members, or their locally recruited agents, secreted remote detection devices—known as sniffers—capable of sampling the atmosphere for radioactive emissions and other evidence of nuclear enrichment programs."⁹ According to the article, the U.S. plans to engage in precise air strikes to take out Iran's nuclear installations, a plan which has gained more support in the White House after the CIA's apparent intelligence gathering failure in locating Iraq's chemical and biological arsenal.

Since the publication of the article in January 2005, Hersh's claim has been criticized as mere "fantasy", "ridiculous" and a "hyperventilated assault on Secretary of Defense." He has been even accused of espionage (by some American conservative journalists and columnists).¹⁰ Some have argued that the sources Hersh uses are mostly from disgruntled CIA agents that simply intend to take revenge on the Pentagon. With all that the Bush administration is facing in Iraq, others have suggested that is most likely that Hersh

has been duped into assisting the White House to wage a psychological war on Iran, as the perfect strategic move to derail Iran's advancing nuclear program.

However, while this could be true, the U.S. government has not categorically denied the claim that U.S. troops are on the ground in Iran. Surely, war is a costly undertaking. Despite a military overstretched in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the chances of a U.S. invasion remaining low, due to Iran's large and mountainous geographical makeup, which makes it logistically difficult to invade, one should not, however, discard military action as an option on the table.

With the possible hardliner conservative take over of the presidential office in Iran, it may be the case that the U.S. may advance a more militant foreign policy of sticks (rather than carrots) if Iran persists in producing fissile material over the next few years. If so, and if the E.U. fails to forge an alliance with the U.S. to establish diplomatic ties with Iran (using an effective policy of both carrots and sticks), a conflict of international magnitude may prove to be a possible option.

But, by and large, a hawkish foreign policy built around the use of military action, either overt or covert operations, is bound to face a serious problem of political legitimacy. The future of U.S.-Iran relations would appear as a mere extension of American violation of Iran's national sovereignty. Such policy only builds a higher wall of mistrust and suspicion, rather than paving the path towards the objective of, firstly, preventing Iran from advancing its nuclear program and, secondly, bringing about regime change in an authoritarian state that legitimizes its existence, based on a political culture of anti-Americanism and Islamist nationalism.

However, the most dangerous feature of a military action is the stifling of dissent and the hampering of a growing Iranian public sphere and advancing civil society by the conservative regime, which has certainly been the most visible and legitimate force to challenge the Mullacrats in Iran. With a military action, especially attacks on Iran's nuclear facilities, the Iranian conservatives and their militia could brand any form of opposition (including reformists) as agents of the U.S. and unleash a large scale wave of attacks against the dissidents. Ironically, a move to attack Iran's nuclear program could also be seen by many Iranians, who are in fact against the clerical regime, as a violation of Iran's national sovereignty. If legitimacy is the ultimate prize for future U.S.-Iranian relations, then U.S. military action is far from achieving such an objective.

Predicting how U.S.-Iranian relations might change their course in the next couple of years, at least while President Bush remains in the White House, is a difficult task. Much depends on Tehran and Washington's courses of action, the internal affairs (especially Iran's economic and political situation) of the two countries, and regional changes (mainly Afghanistan and Iraq) that could force either of the two to strengthen ties or continue their policy of disengagement.

However, it remains clear that Washington's stance toward Iran so far has largely failed to change Tehran's behavior, and at times has even added fuel to the regime's anti-American ideology, which certain Mullahs

in the Iranian government advocate on a daily basis.¹¹ The U.S's main objective should be to find a way to create (with the E.U) a policy balanced by rewards and penalties in order to prevent Iran's advancing nuclear program. This, however, would require both Tehran and Washington to begin creating incentives for negotiations and relinquish their ideological hostility against each other.

The task of democratizing Iran should, however, remain in the hands of Iranians (and Iranians alone!), since it is, as Jefferson reminds us, the people who are "in truth[,] the only legitimate proprietors of the soil and government."

Notes

¹ Originally, the students took more than 90 hostages, including 65 Americans. On November 17th, 1979, the non-US hostages and 13 Americans, mainly female and minority Americans, were released, which brought the total of American hostages to 52.

² In November 1979, the deposed shah was admitted to the United States for medical treatment. Reza Mohammad Shah (1919-1980) was suffering from chronic lymphocytic leukemia, and eventually died from it in Cairo in July 1980.

³ By 1990, 65 volumes of the embassy documents were published by the Iranians.

⁴ "Documents on British Foreign Policy 1919-1939", First Series, Vol. IV, London Government Printing Press, pp. 1119-1121, in Stephen Kinzer, *All the Shah's Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror*, New Jersey: Wiley, 2003.

⁵ For declassified documents and National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM 4-82), indicating the White House's interest to review and renew ties with Iraq in the early 80s, see <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB82/index.htm> last accessed 25/05/2005

⁶ Michael Dobbs, "U.S. Had Key Role in Iraq Buildup," *Washington Post*, December 30, 2002. A01

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ The parliament did not, however, force the government to resume uranium enrichment, but only approving an outline of a new bill requiring the government to resume the activities.

⁹ Seymour M. Hersh, "The Coming Wars: What the Pentagon can now do in secret," *The New Yorker*, January 24 & 31, 2005, p. 43.

¹⁰ See, for instance, Michael Ledeen, “The Hersh File: Sy gets it wrong again” January 21, 2005, <http://www.nationalreview.com> last accessed 25/05/2005.

¹¹ Here, I refer to recent remarks by certain American officials that the U.S. should take the name of Mojahedeen Khalq Organization (MKO), Iran’s main opposition group, off the State Department’s foreign list of terrorist organizations. In the post-9/11 era of “War on Terror”, what can be regarded as hypocritical here is the fact that the MKO is a terrorist group, which has engaged in a number of violent activities since the beginning of the Iranian revolution in 1979 (and in fact prior to the revolution), including siding with Saddam’s regime during the Iran-Iraq war in the 80s. MKO’s potential use for espionage purposes in Iran has gained the attention of a number of neoconservative ideologues in Washington since the end of Iraq war in April 2003.

Tracing the Discourse of Defiance: Remembering Edward W. Said through the Resistance of the Palestinian Intifada.¹

By Matthew Abraham

“In human history there is always something beyond the realm of dominating systems, no matter how deeply they saturate society, and this is obviously what makes change possible...”

—Edward W. Said (1935-2003)²

“...the Palestinian actuality is today, was yesterday, and most likely tomorrow will be built upon an act of resistance to this new foreign colonialism. But it is more likely that there will remain the inverse resistance which has characterized Zionism and Israel since the beginning: the refusal to admit, and the consequent denial of, the existence of Palestinian Arabs who are not there simply as an inconvenient nuisance, but with a population with an indissoluble bond with the land.”³

In the summer of 2000, Ari Shavit of Israel’s leading daily newspaper, *Ha’aretz*, spent three days in New York interviewing Edward W. Said. In this interview, which was—in Said’s words—“eminently fair” and accurately reproduced in print throughout Israel—he traced the events surrounding the 1947-49 expulsions of nearly eight-hundred thousand Arab inhabitants in an area known simply as “Palestine,” culminating in the birth of Israel.⁴ He also stressed the necessity of acknowledging what so many are pained to admit: the existence of nearly three million people, currently living under military occupation, who share among themselves the “Palestinian” identity, an identity— that while continuously contested—represents a suffering and tragic dispossession that stands at the very heart of the present Middle East conflict.

In this interview with Shavit, that could have never appeared in an American paper, Said made a prediction: until the Palestinians are recognized by the Israelis as equals, and embraced as such, no workable

solution will emerge to the thirty-five year death struggle. As he stated, in another interview, “Human beings are very stubborn. It takes a slow seeping into the consciousness that the other side is not going to go away. Thinking that the Palestinians are going to simply give up if they are brought to their knees is foolish because they’re not [going to give up].”⁵

The continued cycles of violence and occupation, the effects of which occasionally find their way into the American taxpayer’s consciousness through television images, often have a numbing effect; solutions to the underlying causes of such images seem wholly unrealizable. In Said’s mind, an Israeli/Palestinian bi-national state remained as the one last prospect for peaceful co-existence. Upon hearing this response, Shavit proclaimed, “You sound very Jewish.” Said replied, “Of course, I’m the last Jewish intellectual. You don’t know anyone else. All your other Jewish intellectuals are now suburban squires. From Amos Oz to all these people here in America. So I’m the last one. The only true follower of Adorno. Let me put it this way: I’m a Jewish-Palestinian.”⁶

In reflecting upon Edward Said’s life in the last few months, I’ve continually returned to these last two, somewhat enigmatic, statements: “The only true follower of Adorno...I’m a Jewish-Palestinian.” Along with Erich Auerbach, Adorno was Said’s prototypical exile: someone who was never part of anything for very long, perhaps most at home on a plane, always in and out of activities and places. Said’s restlessness and discomfort with either a programmatic politics or an unreflective group allegiance fit quite nicely with the exilic image of Auerbach composing his *Mimesis* without the proper textual resources in a besieged Istanbul, or of Adorno, fleeing Nazi-Germany for the safety of America to establish the New School for Social Research.

Said seemed to always reject the comforts and easy solidarity of the group, seeking instead the complexities and shades of grey that emerge in solitude and through fits of dissatisfaction with the status quo. As a Palestinian, working in the very finest Jewish critical-intellectual tradition, Said could, indeed, claim the “Jewish Palestinian” appellation for himself.

As a Jewish Palestinian, Said wrestled with the clear dialectic between repression and resistance that animates interactions between the Israeli government and the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza: dialectic between the powerful and the powerless; between the occupiers and the occupied; and between those who inflict humiliation and those whom are continually humiliated. Said continually wondered what actuated someone such as the late Israel Shahak, the great Israeli defender of Palestinian civil rights, and continues to actuate solitary Jewish thinkers, like Noam Chomsky and Norman Finkelstein, to speak out on behalf of the besieged Palestinian population, in the face of overwhelming odds.

All of the silence and polite evasion about the Palestinians of the Occupied Territories, passes under the shameful guise of “professionalism,” “pragmatism,” “realism,” and “responsible journalism”—of course, each of these are the results of doctrinal constraints, and the “requisite commitments” within a properly functioning propaganda system that enforces the necessary illusions of state.⁷

In many ways, Said's persistent efforts to resist and expose the bad-faith hand-wringing and polite evasion that predominates in elite intellectual circles, seemingly whenever the Palestinian issue is mentioned, continues a tradition of resistance writing and activism reminiscent of the Palestinian writer, Ghassan Kanfani, assassinated by Mossad in a car bomb explosion in July of 1972 in Beirut. Kanfani was a "commando who never fired a gun" whose "weapon was a ballpoint pen and his arena newspaper pages. And he hurt the enemy more than a column of commandos."⁸

At the conclusion of Kanfani's most famous novella, *Men in the Sun*, a set of questions that fully resonate with the twentieth-century Palestinian predicament, confronts the reader: "Why didn't you knock on the sides of the tank? Why didn't you bang the sides of the tank? Why? Why? Why?"⁹ Abel Khaizuran, no longer able to maintain his composure, returned to his lorry after disposing of the bodies of Qais, Marwan, and Assad—three Palestinian men, attempting in the early 1960s to cross from Iraq into Kuwait, who had paid Khaizuran to take them across the Iraq-Kuwait border. These men, according to Barbara Harlow, "[left] behind not only the dispossession of refugee life but also a broken and disrupted family tradition."¹⁰

Ultimately, due to the heat of the afternoon sun, the three men suffocated to death inside of an empty water tank attached to Khaizuran's lorry because of a delay at the border crossing. The reader is left to wonder, "Did the men not scream out, to save their lives, because they feared being discovered by the guards at the border crossing, or did they cry out and bang on the side of the tank, with no one to hear them?" Isn't this the Palestinian predicament? No one can hear the cries of the Palestinians because of an inability or unwillingness to listen.

In the context of discussing Kanfani's *Men in the Sun*, Said writes: "The Palestinian must *make* the present since the present is not an imaginative luxury but a literal, existential necessity."¹¹ In his "Homelessness and Worldliness," Bruce Robbins reminds us that "[t]he reality of the Palestinians is not what they have lost, but the state of loss itself."¹² Said describes this experience as cubistic, bringing with it "a burden of interpretation and a multiplication of selves that are virtually unparalleled in modern political or cultural history—a fact made more impressively onerous in that it is all filtered through negation and qualification."¹³

In attempting to capture this "state of loss itself" and these "multiplication of selves" through his actual and scholarly position, it's no accident that words such as "dignity," "defiance," "resistance," "orthodoxy," "authority" and "dogma" appear repeatedly in Said's literary and political writings. Said, of course, embraced the first three terms—dignity, defiance, and resistance—as emancipatory, expansive, and necessary prerequisites to the fulfillment of human freedom; each of them informed the politics of the Palestinian uprising. The latter three terms—orthodoxy, authority, and dogma—often justify the very worst kinds of state worship and unleash a return to repressive religiosity which channels collective passions into the perversions of nationalism.

As a critic Said seemed to be continually balancing the demands of orthodoxy, authority, and dogma against his humanistic commitment to preserving the conditions of possibility for human expressions

of resistance, dignity, and defiance in the face of injustice. He balanced these through the actual and metaphysical condition of exile. Said's criticism of the Palestinian Authority led to the banning of his book, *After Oslo*, on the West Bank. He called the Oslo Accords and the Declaration of Principles what they were: documents intended to transform the Occupied Territories into Bantustans. I use this word "Bantustans" in an attempt to draw parallels between what Israel's leadership was actually offering the Palestinians—something tantamount to what the white minority offered the black majority in South Africa in the 1980s—a national territory governed by black chiefs, such as Butalezzi, who were controlled by white elites. At that time (September 1993), Said held a fiercely unpopular minority position in the context of the continual paeans sung to Clinton and Rabin and the redemption of Arafat in the Western press. In embracing "criticism before solidarity" as a credo, Said enacted a form of oppositional criticism that exists between culture and system.

Through both his daunting scholarly production and inspiring political activism, Edward W. Said enacted a rhetoric of resistance, situated within and often constrained by the harsh political realities of the American and international public spheres. This extraordinary enactment, as an intellectual performance, of Palestinian resistance to the ritual humiliations of life under occupation—torture, deprivation, detention, and dispossession—experienced by nearly three million Palestinians, gave his academic and public careers a distinctiveness unlikely to be matched among future generations of critical intellectuals.¹⁴

By a rhetoric of resistance, I mean the lived strategies and exertions of will that create the existential condition of "no surrender," enabling a beleaguered people to retain a sense of identity in the face of the 1948 *al-nakba* (catastrophe), no matter how under siege, contributing to the formation of a collective memory.

In his essay "Intifada and Independence," Said recounts how Mahmoud Darwish—the Palestinian people's national poet—insisted that Said, who had been asked to translate the 1988 Palestinian Declaration of Statehood from Arabic into English, at the 19th session of the Palestinian National Council in Algiers, tell Yasir Arafat that the phrase "collective memory" (which was to be included in the document) possesses a very precise, technical definition that must be acknowledged and is not simply a poetic phrase devoid of political implication: "Tell him, [Arafat], it has a serious and even scientific meaning,"¹⁵ said Darwish. Said—in struggling to understand the Palestinian condition—sought to understand the form just such a Palestinian collective memory might take:

How does one rise beyond the limiting circumstances, beyond negativity, into a positive affirmation of what we [as Palestinians] are and want? But this is not just a matter of will, it is also a matter of finding the right modality, the right mixtures of forces to harness, the right rhetoric and concepts by which to mobilize our people and our friends, the right goal to affirm, the right past to drop away from, the right future to fight for.¹⁶

Expressions of Palestinian dignity and solidarity present a living, breathing reality that cannot be simply effaced through a convenient re-description of facts. To avoid this living, breathing reality—while overlooking the Western intelligentsia's role in trying to efface it through word and deed—is to miss the main

reason for the necessity of a road map for peace. Indeed, to believe that the road map to peace was necessitated by American and Israeli cooperation and goodwill is to be purblind to the realities of Palestinian life under occupation. As the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza have the right to resist the Israeli occupation under international law, and as the Israeli government with its U.S. patron continues to block an international consensus on a diplomatic settlement in the region, the politics of the intifada are a reminder or how the force of an oppressed people will and can keep superpowers in check. Said reminds us that

[i]t's quite clear that the Palestinians' sheer physical presence has always been the main problem. Whether it's trying to get rid of them or pretending that they weren't there or that they're really not the original inhabitants or something else, all of this is what I call gratuitous epistemological willfulness to pretend that the Palestinians are a negligible quantity. The problem is increasing. It hasn't decreased.¹⁷

We must remember that the first and second Intifadas were uprisings initiated by young Palestinians, the children of the stones, between the ages of 12 and 20. The young often refuse the platitudes about "time and patience" that the old are far too often willing to accept as conventional wisdom. As Said claimed in his *Al-Ahram* essay, "Punishment by Detail":

Hope has been eliminated from the Palestinian vocabulary so that only raw defiance remains, and still Sharon and his sadistic minions prattle on about eliminating terrorism by an ever-encroaching occupation that has continued now for over 35 years.¹⁸

Said's unswerving commitment in advocating the cause of Palestinian self-determination, in conjunction with an engaged form of cultural criticism, defied the constrictive boundaries of mere literary study. This brand of intellectual independence challenged traditional notions of "a career in literature" and the conventional pieties that often tame fierce political stands.

While many often toe some imaginary ideological line in the service of an academic *realpolitik*, demonstrating a greater allegiance to the professional guild structure than to an interrogation of the wider social conflicts that condition our world, Edward Said sought to realize the full dimensions of "intellectual responsibility" in the spirit of Voltaire, Benda, Zola, and Chomsky.

Although the phrase, "speaking truth to power," long ago became an overused cliché, describing seemingly each and every academic position that entailed even the minutest expenditure of political capital, it is well-suited for understanding Edward Said's critical interventions on behalf of one of the most explosive and controversial international issues of the last thirty-five years: Palestinian self-determination. Said's persistence and indefatigable energy in representing the humanity and resilience of his own people, within an American public sphere that often views Palestinians as less than human, affirms the very highest of intellectual ideals in that he is, in the very truest sense, speaking truth to power.

By making the connection between intellectual resistance and the resistance politics of the Palestinian

Intifada, Said drew upon the rhetoric of a nationalist struggle (Third-world struggles) in the formulation of a strategy of intellectual defense. The Intifada, for example, has become a byword for liberation and struggle in the development of a critical outlook that refuses the logic of occupation and military might, enabling the type of risk-taking exemplified by those few willing to cry “J’accuse” when grave injustices, such as human rights abuses, present themselves. Rachel Corrie’s courageous and dignified act of resistance on March 16th of this year in Rafah (Gaza) stands as the most graphic and compelling example.

That an intellectual would look toward these nationalist struggles, inspired by their representation and enactment of the universal values of the Enlightenment (such as freedom and human dignity), suggests a certain desperation, a loss of faith in the intellectual mission itself—a surrender of professional decorum and its prescribed paths for career advancement. As Said states in his *Representations of the Intellectual*, intellectual commitments are often tamed because “[y]ou do not want to appear too political; you are afraid of seeming controversial; you want the approval of a boss or authority figure; you want to keep a reputation for being balanced, objective, moderate; your hope is to be asked back, to consult, to be on a board of a prestigious committee, and so to remain in the responsible mainstream; someday you hope to get an honorary degree, a big prize, perhaps even an ambassadorship.”¹⁹

A commitment to objectivity, detachment and dispassionate analysis often quells the instincts that might compel one to take a stand on either side of the Palestinian Question. In his essay, “The Burden of Interpretation and the Question of Palestine,” Said reminds us that the question—“Where do you stand on the question of Palestine?”—is “shamelessly provocative” and cannot be answered from some Archimedean viewpoint above the political and epistemological fray.²⁰ To even begin to attempt to answer this question is to enter into a multiplicity of discourses that are interactively heterogeneous and heterogeneously interactive that inevitably pits Jewish against Palestinian suffering. Rather than turning to impossible comparisons, assessing alternative narrative constructions may be the key to working through the discursive complexities versus acting out the dynamics of the actual conflict.

In such pivotal texts as *After the Last Sky*, Said establishes a narrative “density” for a people whose narrative has continually been under erasure and attack.²¹ Said’s scholarship and political activism seemed to always place the plight of the Palestinian people and their quest for self-determination in front of an evasive and complicit American audience. As Noam Chomsky has repeatedly pointed out, the “Israel-Palestine” conflict is really the Israel/United States-Palestinian conflict: an acknowledgement of the crucial role played by the American paymasters.

As much as the issue of Palestinian self-determination seemed to be at the forefront of all his critical efforts, Said could not sit by passively, allowing an unreflective Palestinian nationalism, in contradistinction to a repressive Zionist ideology, to emerge. He deftly measured the fundamental transformations of the Palestinian social and political consciousness, as it has evolved during the last thirty-five years of Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.

Through such heroic efforts, Edward Said threatened, what Abdirahman Hussein calls, the triadic

interaction between the discourses of a) American neo-imperialism; b) Zionism and; c) Orientalism.²² To these three discourses, I would add the discourse of the Christian Right and speak of a quaternary, or four-way, dynamic interaction between these co-extensive ideologies.²³

In writing against this overwhelming quaternary structure of neo-imperialist, Zionist, Orientalist and fundamentalist Christian discourses Said found himself facing a seemingly impossible task: he was, in effect, resisting the discourses of the military-industrial complex (*Orientalism*), the war on terror (*Covering Islam*), Israeli expansionism (*The Question of Palestine*) and religious enthusiasm as found in Christian evangelism (*Culture and Imperialism*). Within this quaternary structure, Palestinians are reduced to Iraqis, Saudis, and Afghanis—all are reduced to one seething mass of Arab fanaticism that must be contained and controlled. Said's relentless acts of intellectual resistance against this seemingly metaphysical-but-let's-never-forget-only-political behemoth merits our close attention.²⁴

In his preface to Noam Chomsky's *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, perhaps the most ambitious book ever attempted on the Israel-Palestine conflict, Said writes—in words that we can just as easily use to describe him as Chomsky—that

[t]here is something profoundly unsettling about an intellectual such as Chomsky [Said] who has neither an office to protect nor territory to consolidate and guard. There is no dodging the inescapable reality that such representations by intellectuals will neither make them friends in high places nor win them honors. It is a lonely condition, yes, but it is always a better one than a gregarious tolerance for the way things are.²⁵

Creating facts on the ground—to enforce a false, self-justifying, and comforting reality—will no longer suffice as either an intellectual or rhetorical performance: if we are to count ourselves among those living within a universe that holds out even the slightest concern with fulfilling ethical imperatives, the story of Palestinian dispossession must be heard. Edward W. Said's critical corpus created the conditions of possibility for that story's telling; indeed, Said sought—often demanded—the world's “permission to narrate” the Palestinian viewpoint. Because of his scholarly and political resistance, no one can simply forget the Palestinians. Indeed, that rhetoric of resistance continues because the spirit of dignity and defiance Said exemplified—throughout his life as a literary critic, political activist, and public intellectual—lives on.

Notes

¹ This paper is dedicated to the memory of Professor Edward W. Said and Rachel Corrie of Olympia, Washington.

² *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1983, p. 246-7.

³ Edward Said, *The Question of Palestine*. Vintage Books: New York, 1992, p. 8. Subsequent citations of this work refer to this edition.

⁴ The events of 1947-49 have been extensively researched by Israel's controversial "New Historians," Tom Segev and Benny Morris. See Morris's *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1989); *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2003) and Segev's *The Seventh Million* (Henry Holt: New York, 2000).

⁵ Interview with Edward Said in "Reflections on Exile." Book Notes. Brian Lamb. CNN. July 2001.

⁶ Edward Said, *Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*. Gauri Viswanathan (ed.) Pantheon Books: New York, 2001, p. 458.

⁷ On October 3rd, 2000, just four days after the second Palestinian intifada began; the Clinton administration approved the sale to Israel of Blackhawk helicopters and spare parts for Apache Longbow helicopters. As Noam Chomsky writes in his introduction to Roane Carey's *The New Intifada: Resisting Israel's Apartheid* (Verso: London, 2001), on October 3rd, 2000 "[t]he defense correspondent of Israel's most prestigious newspaper reported the signing of an agreement with the Clinton administration for 'the largest purchase of military helicopters by the Israeli Air Force in a decade,' along with spare parts for Apache attack helicopters for which an agreement had been signed in mid-September" (6). What is crucially important about the sale is that the press right at that time was reporting Israel's use of U.S. helicopters to attack civilian targets, killing or wounding dozens of people, and that the Pentagon informed (foreign) journalists that the new shipments had no conditions on use. In October of 2000, Chomsky joined a delegation of journalists and other political activists in Boston, attempting to get mainstream newspapers—such as the *Boston Globe*—to report the unprecedented helicopter sale to Israel for civilian population control. These efforts, regrettably, were to no avail.

⁸ From Kanafani's obituary, printed in the *Daily Star*, Beirut's English-language newspaper. Obituary information cited in Barbara Harlow's "The Palestinian Intellectual and the Liberation of the Academy," in Michael Sprinker's (ed.) *Edward Said: A Critical Reader*. Blackwell: Oxford, 1992, n.p.

⁹ Ghassan Kanafani. *Men in the Sun and Other Palestinian Stories*, Hilary Kirkpatrick (trans.), Lynne Rainer Publishers: Boulder, 1999, p. 74.

¹⁰ Barbara Harlow, *After Lives: Legacies of Revolutionary Writing*. Verso: New York, 1996, p. 51.

¹¹ *The Question of Palestine*, p. 152.

¹² Bruce Robbins, "Homelessness and Worldliness." *Diacritics* (Fall 1983), p. 70.

¹³ *The Question of Palestine*, p. 122.

¹⁴ In his *Intellectuals in Power: A Genealogy of Critical Humanism* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1986), Paul Bovey writes: “Those interested in that role and function of the critical intellectual today should ask the question when they read Said: how can such a redoubtable humanist function as an oppositional critic? And we should not look for the answer in some discussion of ideology or history of ideas. **We should look instead at what is central to all of Said’s work, the function of the will in critical intelligence, which appears not only in his writing but which he attempts to embody in his discursive and nondiscursive practice**” (emphasis mine) p. xiv.

¹⁵ Edward Said, “Intifada and Independence” in Joel Benin’s and Lockhart’s (eds.) *Intifada: The Palestinian Uprising Against Israeli Occupation*. Boston: South End Press, 1989, p. 6.

¹⁶ *The Question of Palestine*, p. 174.

¹⁷ Edward Said, *Culture and Resistance: Conversations with Edward W. Said*. South End Press: Cambridge, 2003 p. 53.

¹⁸ Edward W. Said, “Punishment by Detail.” *Al-Ahram Weekly* 598 (August 8-14 2002). Online at <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2002/598/op2.htm> last accessed 25/05/2005.

¹⁹ Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual*. Vintage Books: New York, 1999, p. 100.

²⁰ See Edward Said’s “The Burden of Interpretation and the Question of Palestine.” *Journal of Palestine Studies*, (September 1986), p. 28-29.

²¹ In a chapter entitled “The Politics of Historical Interpretation” in *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1990) Hayden White writes:

In fact, its [Zionist interpretations of the Holocaust] truth, as a historical interpretation, consists precisely [in] its effectiveness in justifying a wide range of current Israeli political policies that, from the standpoint of those who articulate them, are crucial to the security and indeed the very existence of the Jewish people. Whether one supports these policies or condemns them, they are undeniably a product, at least in part, of a conception of Jewish history that is conceived to be meaningless to Jews insofar as this history was dominated by agencies, processes, and groups who encouraged or permitted policies that led to the “final solution” of “the Jewish Question.” The totalitarian, not to say fascist, aspects of Israeli treatment of the Palestinians on the West Bank may be attributable primarily to a Zionist ideology that is detestable to anti-Zionists, Jews, and non-Jews alike. But who is to say that this ideology is a product of a distorted conception of history in general and of the history of the Jews in the Diaspora specifically? It is, in fact, fully comprehensible as a morally responsible response to the meaninglessness of a certain history, that spectacle of “moral anarchy” that Schiller

perceived in world history and specified as a “sublime object.” The Israeli political response to this spectacle is fully consonant with the aspiration to human freedom and dignity that Schiller took to be the necessary consequence of sustained reflection on it. So far as I can see, the effort of the Palestinian people to mount a politically effective response to Israeli policies entails the production of a similarly effective ideology, complete with an interpretation of their history capable of endowing it with a meaning that it has hitherto lacked (a project to which Edward Said wishes to contribute) (80).

²² Said defines Orientalism as “the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, teaching it, settling it, ruling it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient,” (*Orientalism*. Vintage: New York, 1979, p. 3).

²³ In *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1998), Said writes: “When you hear the prattling of Jerry Falwell or any of his born-again crew, all of them staunch supporters of Israel, you are aghast at the utter madness of what they believe, particularly when you hear about their special treatment during visits to Israel—expert tour guides to show them around; leading Israeli government officials to address them. According to the scenario proposed by these fundamentalist Christians, Russia and Israel—Gog and Magog—will have an apocalyptic final battle, which Russia will win, until Jesus intervenes (but not soon enough to prevent the death of all Jews; Arabs don’t seem to figure in it at all). In the meantime, the true Christians will be suspended over Israel, above the battle, in Raptures, and after the fighting is over Jesus will restore them to Jerusalem, from which they will rule the world” (152-3). In addition, we must make note of Said’s reference to Tom Delay who “came by his ideas concerning Israel by virtue of what he described as his convictions as a ‘Christian Zionist,’ a phrase synonymous not only with support for everything Israel does, but also for the Jewish state’s theological right to go on doing what it does regardless whether or not a few million ‘terrorist’ Palestinians get hurt in the process” (*Al-Ahram*, Aug. 21-27, 2003). See Abdirahman A. Hussein’s *Edward Said: Criticism and Society*. (Verso: London, 2002, p. 224-295).

²⁴ In *Orientalism*, Said writes: “The task for the critical scholar is not to separate one struggle from another, but to connect them, despite the contrast between the overpowering materiality of the former and the apparent otherworldly refinements of the latter,” p. 331-2.

²⁵ Noam Chomsky, *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. South End Press: Cambridge, 1983, p. vii.

Public Consciousness Beyond Theatrical Space: Harold Pinter Interrogates Borders and Boundaries.

By Dilek Inan

For Harold Pinter 'writing is discovery and journey', a journey which led him to become a dissident thinker (Pinter at Cambridge Conference Cambridge, 13 July, 1999). Each decade has confirmed a continuing movement in his work. There was a move from East London (in many of his pre-1970 plays) to North London (his post-1970 plays), from menace to mannerism. The significance of his move from the plays' original working-class milieu towards a world of intellectual and professional middle-class culture made him a cultural icon in the 1970s. As his political development advanced in the 1980s and 1990s, his status as world-renowned playwright, in a theatre that was increasingly looking towards the political arena, was even clearer and he became a 'political' icon, a theorist, and a critic of the social order. For Pinter theatre 'is essentially exploratory. [...] theatre has always been a critical act' (Mel Gussow 123).

In 1975, Howard Brenton dreamed 'of a play acting like a bush-fire, smouldering into public consciousness. Or - like hammering on the pipes being heard all through a tenement.' (Howard Brenton interviewed by Catherine Itzin and Simon Trussler, 20). Brenton's generation - David Edgar, Edward Bond, David Hare - founded the fringe theatre whose dream was to create an 'alternative culture' as resulting from feeling the public nature of the theatre; however, Brenton regretted that the fringe had failed, and no playwright of his generation had 'written well enough yet', had 'actually got into public, actually touched life outside theatre' (Brenton 20). A few years later Pinter's writing overtly political plays was actually a dream come true for Brenton and his generation. As early as 1948, Pinter knew that he 'wanted to get out in the world' (Gussow 142). Indeed, Pinter was the only person who broadcast/televised an anti-war programme for BBC2 on the calamity in the Balkans for which he held NATO responsible; additionally he delivered a speech on the same issue, 'The Nato Action in Serbia' (Speech delivered by Pinter at the Confederation of Analytical Psychologists 25 June, 1999). Not only Brenton, but John Arden, too, was looking for a playwright who would write the 'serious social play'; and in the early 1960s he found Pinter's agenda frustratingly hard to define. Arden thought that in *The Caretaker*,

the elder brother's account of his brain-operation is highly detailed and circumstantial. But is

it true? If it is true, why isn't Mr Pinter writing that serious social play to denounce the cruelty prevalent in mental hospitals? And if it *isn't* true, why does it take the crucial place in the text - the climax of Act Two? (John Arden 118)

Eventually in his later stage and screen scripts Pinter criticised current widespread persecution in the institutions of the state: from hospitals (Hothouse - written but discarded before The Caretaker, produced in 1980) to prisons (One for the Road, Mountain Language). Pinter's plays reached beyond the world of the theatre and became part of the starkly politicised 1980s social and cultural scene. Above all, his work established a 'theory of power' and articulated the use/abuse of the political power of language. Pinter's work has obviously met the needs of the contemporary theatre.

Pinter's established persona of the 1950s and 1960s started to become unstable in the 1970s. At that time a new theatrical charter was emerging in Britain of which perhaps Edward Bond was the symbol. While Tom Stoppard was entertaining the nation with his language games, the Royal Court fostered a wave of social realists and social critics as diverse as David Storey and Howard Barker. In 1978, Pinter's Betrayal was seen as a crisis: 'Yet the play is a definite departure for Pinter. Gone are the carefully formed innuendoes, the sinister ambiguities, the impending disasters' (Linda Ben-Zvi 127). Additionally, his mature plays of the 1980s and 90s received hostile criticism, especially when One for the Road in 1980 represented a greater break with his previous work. The critics failed to see that his plays represented his political involvement (both internationally and as an opponent of Thatcherism) and his interest in wider social issues. Critics wrote a great deal about Pinter's alleged creative constipation: 'Why Doesn't He Write More' (Patricia Bosworth 3), 'Plot there is none' (John Bush Jones 296). He wrote fewer plays but instead he created several adaptations for the screen; and it is wrong to dismiss this as a second-class activity. He was participating actively in questions of human rights, censorship, and the United States' foreign policy in Central America. In 1980, he founded the June 20 Group for intellectual sceptics to discuss the plight of Thatcher's Britain. During that time, Betrayal (1978) and One for the Road (1984) were his only full-length plays. The previously 'non-political' Pinter now openly admitted the importance of the social forces that govern our lives. At the British Council Conference, Pinter admitted that he knew his early plays were political, but he actually lied that they were not. His creative work was 'about' tyranny abroad, but also about injustices at home and the ways Britain seemed to be changing morally.

Pinter concentrated heavily on cinema after No Man's Land; he experimented and surveyed different subjects and explored notions of self-consciousness. He looked at other people's works to enrich ways to reflect his main concerns and re-explore his own roots. But critics and academics marked this period as Pinter's end as a writer, a setback in his career: he was a second Stanley who had nothing to say (In The Birthday Party, Stanley is deprived of his individuality and of his ability to speak). Nevertheless, films gave an overview that supported and reflected his political concerns. His film-scripts fitted in very well with what Pinter was trying to achieve, for films are more public work than plays. And also Pinter insisted that the film adaptations were 'acts of the imagination on [his] part' (Gussow 188). The film work and the absence of a full-length play in the fifteen-year period between Betrayal and Moonlight were regarded as symptoms of writer's block. In fact, however, this period was penetrating and acute; as we shall see later

on in the article, it was the period in which Pinter, the withdrawn artist of the 1960s and 1970s, revolutionised his privacy and remodelled his use of theatre into a more public activity; when Pinter the playwright became a critic of Western democracies, and when his new political works functioned as agents of history.

Despite the assumptions of mainstream Pinter criticism, the period between *Betrayal* (1978) and *Moonlight* (1993) marked a revolution in Pinter's career. This was also the time when he transformed his image, which had been framed by the idea of the 'Pinteresque'. The 'Pinteresque' is often interpreted as pauses, enigmas and menace. The word, which implies the use of silences, vague dialogues, memory games and menacing outsiders, has passed into everyday language. Pinter does not approve of the image. He believes that 'Harold Pinter' sits on his back, and he is 'someone else's creation' (Gussow 25). Pinter has succeeded in dissolving that image with his political plays. Critics who could not fit Pinter's political plays into the 'Pinteresque' image dismissed them; they preferred to label this period as a core of 'writer's block' because of their own inability to accept Pinter's political arguments and because of their incapacity and reluctance to see Pinter from outside the 'Pinteresque' image. And yet when Pinter seemed to abandon politics in *Moonlight* (1993), critics were back to influence their readers to join in a tired scepticism. Ghilardi-Santacatterina and Sierz argued that Pinter is 'a victim of his own image' (Maria Ghilardi-Santacatterina and Aleks Sierz 112). Contrarily, he is both intuitive and intellectual, and more intentional than is generally recognised.

The different genres, and the miscellaneous writings for different media, prove Pinter's expertise in 'various voices'. His output explores the depth of the human condition in the space of the twentieth century; it is a set of sketches portraying 'Western Civilisation' - the developed capitalist world - in decline. He has perhaps become the only leading English playwright to imagine the world from the viewpoint of colonised peoples rather than from a Western perspective and has shown the power to understand and share the other's vision of the world. He is at one with the theorists of Post-colonial discourse. He has updated the term 'imperialism' to establish that it 'remains an active and vibrant force in the world today, through the vehicle of financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank; imperialism is in a position to dictate policy to smaller states which rely on their credit' (Pinter, *Nato Action in Serbia*).

Discussing the reception of his new agenda, Pinter satirically talked in 1985 with his publisher Nicholas Hern about becoming 'an exhibitionist, self-important, pompous. [...] Before you know where you are you're having make-up put on, your eyelashes are being tinted.' Critics regarded Pinter's politically engaging plays as a revolutionary new direction. However, Pinter pointed out that the critics had regarded his earlier work as 'rubbish' too - 'absurd rubbish' (Nicholas Hern 19). For example John McGrath had condemned Pinter for an indulgence in absurdity, mystery and enigma - 'the significant failure to say anything significant' (84). But in a real sense, from the beginning, his texts had been defining an inescapable sense of pessimism and alienation in the contemporary world, and though the perspective had altered, the vision had not. For example, his unpublished early prose work written in 1949, *The Queen of all Fairies*, introduced his embryonically present political attitudes. This is an autobiographical piece in which Pinter writes about his family, his friends and the Jewish population in Hackney:

The Fascists did not come into it, though, forcibly, one night I remember a cry in the sudden hustling - 'They've sorted out Harold.' Jimmy flinging out his arms and charging. A nightmare of coshes and stupid faces. And me almost ruined, busted in the crutch. [...] 'Why don't you join the Communists, or the 43 group?' I was asked. I had to laugh. It was all such dross. Causes, banners and speeches. If they squashed me, then that was that. I would be free till then. The effect of the whole business was to give me 'pernicious aggravation in the cobbles.' I didn't give the monkey's toss. (The Queen of All Fairies)

Towards the end of The Queen of All Fairies, Pinter explained what happened to his friends:

Moishe became a soldier in Germany. [...] Ron disappeared, bearing his cross to the stock-exchange. Henry loved and was loved. Jimmy took to the Café Torino in Old Compton Street, read Sartre and La Fargue.

As for himself he wrote:

I, as a conchie [conscientious objector], did not go to prison, but counted myself a king of infinite space, while as an actor, I trod the boards. [...] We see them coming, the barbarians. (Queen of All Fairies, cited in Susan Hollis Merritt 29).

In 1999 Pinter's participation in a Cambridge Conference, organised by the British Council, made the fact clear once more that he had always been critical of the operations of the state machinery, and the ideological underpinnings of the authoritarian state as another example of ideology's ability to mystify/abstract its own operations. As he read and acted scenes from a selection of his plays, and especially when he delivered Stanley's line, 'They carved me up' with wholehearted malevolence, he deliberately stressed the political power of language. Pinter has continuously been a conscientious objector in the widest sense, even in his 'comedies of menace', the 'absurd' and 'mysterious' early work. His plays are constantly being generalised as filled with 'mystery'. But this was a conscious strategy, set out in his early novel, The Dwarfs, where Len says:

Mysteries are always new mysteries, I've decided that. So, you see, I am alive and not a storehouse of dead advice and formulas of how to live. And won't be. But I have to be silent, like the guilty. (The Dwarfs 94).

For many years, Pinter was determined not to fall into the trap of offering 'dead advice.' Increasingly, however, he became convinced that it was his duty to name 'the guilty.' Pinter broke his 'silence' with One for the Road; and the 'directness' of his political views was obvious from then on.

Despite the clear political statements, he was still concerned with time, memory, sexuality, loss, separation and solitude. However, the major difference in the political texts is the depiction of the *destruction* of memory and sexuality. While the earlier plays were about the opposite/gendered linguistic acts of the

isolated man and woman, in the political plays individual freedom is suppressed by established authority.

Pinter has announced himself as ‘the king of infinite space’, and this paper explores Pinter’s satirical ‘celebration’ of space, and how he awakens public consciousness in Pinter’s One for the Road and Mountain Language. For many scholars, space in Pinter’s work has involved distinct and limited interpretations of ‘the room.’ However, his earliest play The Room formulates at the start Pinter’s idea of the room as symbolic space: it is not an ordinary room but a ‘psychic space, a speck of consciousness cursed with a vivid awareness of its own significance and insecurity in a world ruled by forces outside itself’ (Katherine Worth 32) Thus this study sets out to decode the strong sense of an environment *beyond* the room: the social space which is described through communication, speech and memory.

The 1980s plays explore a political no-man’s-land. Precisely, New World Order, One for the Road, Mountain Language and Party Time are all about political schizophrenia and social repression in the contemporary world. The plays re-present a male-constructed theatrical space - a no man’s land - politically taken over and hostile to all those, male or female, who will not integrate themselves into a regime which strangely empowers yet denies their own individuality. The unconquerable psychic spaces of the earlier plays now become brutally breached, and memory and sexuality are destroyed. The political plays also show the characters’ private fantasy worlds as a massive and historically important objective reality. Space is unspecified, deliberately unlocalised; it is global, because Pinter did not want to reduce the plays’ meaning to certain countries, but rather he interrogated borders and boundaries in an alarming, vast, incomprehensible world. On the other hand, his plays make the actuality of this no-man’s-land British and bourgeois.

1980s plays extended Pinter’s poetic perceptions into an objective analysis of the urban phenomenon, portraying cities working as modulators. This is the decade when his ‘metaphorical’ political engagement is at its greatest. He wrote about the 1980s social and cultural scene as he discovered and explored the workings of police power, official secrecy, and the insidious state censorship. Through rational understanding, Pinter conducted himself as an ‘investigator.’ His political dramas frame the relationship between fictional and empirical reality as Pinter clarifies and reworks his earlier themes of oppression and the individual, and the subversive function of language. He writes of the inhuman character of a great city poisoned by misery, contempt and oppression. The lyrical interiors and serene landscapes of the memory plays are taken over by a political anti-pastoral, a pastoral subjugated and colonised by the metropolis. The plays depict an evolution of the pastoral from retreat to indictment, where a brutally corrupt society is matched by its landscapes.

Pinter transfers menace from private relationships to expressively political ones; but his preoccupation with language as an instrument of distortion has never decreased and proffers the use/abuse of language as the quintessence of oppression. He refers to the dregs of society, to the masses who do not conform to the state, to those faced with the pain of death, imprisonment, and social degradation. Some of the plays, like One for the Road and Mountain Language, target a change, like Peter Handke’s *Kaspar*’s transformation from inarticulate clown to model speaker. In Handke’s influential play about language and socialisation,

Kaspar, the hero seems a broken man. Kaspar gets more and more mixed up - his language is suddenly deranged - until complete schizophrenia sets in. The state of schizophrenia caused by language in Handke is replaced by a state of 'paralysis' in Pinter, as seen in the victims of *The Birthday Party*, *One for the Road*, *Mountain Language*, *Party Time*, and *The New World Order*. It is this paralysis that Pinter sets out to oppose. This also applies to the promised transformation that Stanley will undergo at Monty's: 'This was a model of conduct, building a person into society's course of conduct by language, by giving him words [...] he is reconstructed by voices, by language models' (Peter Handke 60).

The depersonalised system, the source of power, which is rigid, resistant, and strictly hierarchical, is represented by the voice of spokesmen, what Derrida calls the 'mouthpieces' in 'The Theorem and the Theatre' (*Of Grammatology*): 'Like the alphabetic signifier, like the letter, the mouthpiece himself is not inspired or animated by any particular language. He signifies nothing. He hardly lives, he lends his voice.' (Jacques Derrida 305). Nicolas in *One for the Road* is exactly such a voice, a 'mouthpiece' of 'the man who runs this country' (who never appears and may not even exist); the Sergeant and the Officer in *Mountain Language* claim to be repeating and enacting the dictates of some mythologised 'military decree.' In all of these plays the longing for individual freedom is walled in by a social institution that is an over-determined and a closed system.

Pinter's movement into political drama was not easy. *Other Places*, which he wrote in 1980, was followed by a three-year period in which he did not write a play; he said he was 'getting more and more imbedded in international issues.' (Billington 286) After *Other Places*, Pinter told Mel Gussow that he 'felt obliged to explore other territory' (Gussow 149): the world of national/international public events; and at this stage he still thought this was inimical to dramatic experience. But, with *Precisely*, Pinter started to explore the 'other territory' and discover a new voice for himself and his theatre.

Pinter has stated that 'each of the plays dealt with the individual at the mercy of a certain authoritarian system.' (Ronald Knowles 184). Pinter said 'These plays, all of them, are to do not with ambiguities of power, but actual power.' (Gussow 152).

The political plays employ a linguistic geography that refers to a universal social repression in the contemporary world. *One for the Road* takes place in the urban world, and *Party Time* is set in a fashionable bourgeois house in a metropolis, *Mountain Language*, as its title suggests, takes place in the country. But the plays represent the colonisation of the country by the city; and now, the city is controlled by a brutal elite. They also present the multiple ways in which women are abused by men. Teddy and Ruth; Duff and Beth; Deeley and Kate; Robert, Jerry and Emma: the male was master in none of Pinter's earlier texts; they were dominated by the emotional complexities of territorial conflict between men and women. His political dramas concentrate on a struggle between the individual and the political (super)structure. As a result, these plays involve a radical change in the nature of space: once impregnable spaces become brutally conquered. The central themes of the subtlety of memory and sexuality are destroyed in the political plays, where masculinity trumpets the triumph of the will. The brutes have escaped from the Room.

Power and Fear: Total Institution as Theatrical Space

I do not have an ideology in my plays. I just write; I'm a very instinctive writer. I don't have a calculated aim or ambition; I simply find myself writing something which then follows its own path. And that path tends to include acts of violence of one kind or another, because it is the world in which I live. And so do you. (Aragay 60).

Pinter's observations and explorations in an alarming world convinced him of the duty to depict and criticise authoritarian forces and oppressive institutions through his art: 'The facts that One for the Road refers to are facts that I wish the audience to know about, to recognise. Whereas I didn't have the same objective at all in the early days' (Hern 11). More than merely polemical, the cycle it initiated forms complex reflections of the dark side of the European imagination, a sharp critique of bourgeois civilisation. In particular, he reflects on the way established systems of society project images onto individuals. Moreover, the political plays now show the fantasy world of 'abroad,' 'other places' as a massive and historically important objective reality. They explore a cultural notion of the 'other,' the need of it, but also the terror of it.

One for the Road is about Pinter's concerns with authoritarianism, unjust imprisonment, the abuse of human rights, and religious intolerance. The play exposes various kinds of institutional cruelty and injustice through language; a diseased language that causes nausea both for the abused and the abuser. Pinter's preoccupation with language as a tool of distortion has never decreased. In the play, the use/abuse of language is at the core of oppression. Nicolas's language paralyzes Victor. But the torturer too becomes more and more mixed up; he estranges and deranges language to create terror to the point where he stands on the borders of madness himself:

What do you think this is? It's my finger. This is my big finger. And this is my little finger. This is my big finger and this is my little finger. I wave my big finger in front of your eyes. Like this. And now I do the same with my little finger. I can also use both...at the same time. Like this. I can do absolutely anything I like. Do you think I'm mad? My mother did. *He laughs.* (223).

Nicolas's free-associating words create a fierce picture of the psychology of arbitrary torture, his verbal attacks enact the disturbing relationship between power and fear.

The play portrays authorised cruelty directly and physically, through brutality, murder and rape. As Pinter argues in his essay 'Eroding the Language of Freedom,' a governing power must be assessed 'not by what it says it is, or by what it says it intends, but by what it does. Because language is discredited and because spirit and moral intelligence are fatally undermined, the government possesses carte blanche to do what it likes. Its officers can bug, break in, tap, burgle, lie, slander, bully and terrorise with impunity' (Pinter Various Voices 173-74). More recently, Pinter told his interviewers about the 'police action', which he believed was 'a very strong brutal element in this society' (Gottlieb 25). One for the Road analyses and

describes the State through ‘what it does’:

I hear you have a lovely house. Lots of books. Someone told me some of my boys kicked it around a bit. Pissed on the rugs, that sort of thing. I wish they wouldn't do that. ... But you know what it's like - they have such responsibilities - and they feel them - they are constantly present - day and night - (228).

Denying any fundamental separation between Brecht's theatre and Artaud's, One for the Road sets art to provoke ‘tension’ and ‘fear’ in the audience: in Pinter's words, ‘[f]ear not only of being in the position of the given victim, but a fear also born of recognition of themselves as interrogator’ (Hern 17). Nicolas uses his menacing and obscene language to threaten Victor. By waving his fingers, a simple act, which gives him great joy, Nicolas enjoys his absolute power and believes he is acting for his country, legitimately and properly; he wants to be loved and respected. The play creates anxiety for the actors as well. Pinter said that the dictum of the play was so real and direct that it was a ‘difficult’ play for the actors; they found the experience ‘too oppressive [...] they found themselves in danger of being taken over by the characters. Because there's no escape once you're in there’ (Hern 17).

Yet Pinter's verbal violence does not reject beauty. Even Nicolas's ghastly lines bear smoothly flowing, poetic, energetic and potent language. His brutality is matched by fantasies of landscapes, too: ‘I do love other things, apart from death. So many things. Nature. Trees, things like that. A nice blue sky. Blossom.’ (One for the Road 231). His speech is disconcertingly dominated by metaphoric, ironic and poetic images and he tells Victor, ‘Let's not beat about the bush. Anything but that. *D'accord?* You're a civilised man. So am I.’ (223) He links his own dreadful territory to an energetic cricket field:

I chat away, friendly, insouciant, I open the batting, as it were, in a light hearted, even carefree manner, while another waits in the wings, silent, introspective, coiled like a puma. (225).

Once again, this involved Pinter reworking a favourite metaphor with new ferocity. The traumatic scene Nicholas depicts is a metaphoric, yet a literal picture of ‘the system’, which applies ‘silent’ operations of violence to its victims. Pinter himself said in 1998 that cricket is actually a ‘very violent game’, however ‘friendly’ it may seem - ‘It's a very physical game, a battle is going on there’ (The South Bank Show) - much as Peter Hall described the inner dynamics of Pinter's mid-period dramas:

My vocabulary is all the time about hostility and battles and weaponry, but that is the way Pinter's characters operate, as if they were all stalking round a jungle, trying to kill each other, but trying to disguise from one another the fact that they are bent on murder (Peter Hall 22).

Disguising the fact he too is ‘bent on murder,’ Nicolas makes a rhetoric of death: ‘Death. As has been noted by the most respected authorities, it is beautiful. The purest, most harmonious thing there is. Sexual intercourse is nothing when compared to it’ (One for the Road 229). Some of his speeches heighten the seductive verbal beauty of violence, employing a terrorising language beneath a civilised mask:

I've heard so much about you. I'm terribly pleased to meet you. Well, I'm not sure pleased is the right word. One has to be scrupulous about language. Intrigued. I'm intrigued. Firstly because I've heard so much about you. Secondly because if you don't respect me you're unique. (227).

Indeed Nicolas's 'scrupulous' style simply shows the way established institutions crush individuals who fail to conform, and how institutional power destroys individual resistance.

Roland Barthes discusses the violence of language in his essay 'Writing the Event'. He suggests that '[v]iolence implies a language of violence, i.e. of a system' (153). Though Nicolas does not actually participate in the acts of violence detailed in the play - Nicky's murder, Victor's torture, Gila's repeated rape - his imposition of violence through language defines the dynamics of power and becomes as operative as the offstage physical cruelty. Pinter said 'I'm quite violent, myself. I have violent feelings and...I feel quite strongly about things. On the other hand, however, I'm quite reticent' (Hern 19). Although Pinter is quite direct and open in this play, much of its power stems from the impression that he does not say all he knows.

Pinter described The Birthday Party and One for the Road alike as 'the destruction of an individual, the independent voice of an individual' (Gussow 69). He shows that the absolutist state can only ensure its monopoly of power if it controls both 'the discursive and repressive apparatus' (Mark Silverstein 432). For Pinter the system represents a source of power that resists change. It is strictly hierarchical, and is here portrayed through the voice of Nicolas - the 'mouthpiece' of 'the man who runs this country.' When Victor, an intellectual/academic, is suspected of not fitting in with the system, he is by definition guilty of rejecting the 'guiding light.' He is faced with the pain of death, imprisonment, and social degradation. His son is killed because he spat at his country's soldiers, and his wife is raped in prison. Space has become degrading. Here is a place of physical and mental torture - with 'a first-class brothel upstairs, on the sixth floor, chandeliers' (One for the Road 246). Pinter depicts a system which deprives the individuals of their 'animal' rights.

Pinter's general determination to avoid sentimentality and direct the violence back at the Establishment is striking. As an agent of a 'predictable, formal, long-established pattern,' Nicolas is a distracted character; he is thrilled and moved by his job, which is to keep the world clean for democracy by punishing and removing those, who, in Pinter's words, are not 'like everyone else,' who do not 'go along the normal path' (Susan Hollis Merritt 20). Nicolas describes 'death' as 'beautiful' and 'the purest, most harmonious thing there is.' He is obsessed by the eyes of those brought to him: '[t]hey're so vulnerable. The soul shines through them' (One for the Road 224). Through Nicolas's chilling articulation of the 'responsibility,' 'respectability,' 'religion,' and 'honesty,' Pinter refers to a false sense of dignity which is deployed to cover up murderous activity' (Gussow 130). Surprisingly however, he denied that his play would have any success as propaganda - its bleak tone does not allow any images of the victim gaining relief or revenge over the victimiser, because Pinter believed that

[r]eason is not going to do anything. Me writing One for the Road, documentaries, articles,

lucid analyses, Averell Harriman writing in the New York Times, voices raised here and there, people walking down the road and demonstrating. Finally it's hopeless. [...] Because the modes of thinking of those in power are worn out, threadbare, atrophied. Their minds are a brickwall (Hern 20).

The official status imposes a collective, shared identity, a 'commonwealth of interest' whose only aim is to 'keep the world clean for God':

The man who runs this country announced to the country: We are all patriots, we are as one, we all share a common heritage. Except you apparently. *Pause*. I feel a link, you see, a bond. I share a commonwealth of interest. I am not alone. I am not alone! (One for the Road 232).

This whole system aims at the one-dimensional man which Pinter developed in The Birthday Party. It does not want trouble, it eliminates or homogenises he who causes 'despair': 'Despair, old fruit, is a cancer. It should be castrated. Indeed I've often found that that works. Chop the balls off and despair goes out the window. You're left with a happy man. Or a happy woman' (One for the Road 233).

Mountain Language: Colonising the Country through the Capital's Language.

Like One for the Road, Mountain Language shows the horrors and dangers of life in totalitarian or seemingly democratic but essentially authoritarian countries. In his meditation on the 'civilised' West, Pinter's analysis very much corresponded to the Post-colonial theorists' determination to expose the realities under the universalistic discourse of democracy, power and knowledge. While Post-colonial discourse creates a space in which a theatre produces only a utopian suggestion, Pinter shows that one can work towards that utopian suggestion. Pinter criticises a concept of imperialism, led by the USA and parts of Europe masquerading as democracy. Through different means, he tried to support Third World experiments of 'collective theatre,' 'a theatre of the oppressed', by bringing history to the fore through drama; their struggle for a cultural identity. Pinter's 1980s plays were a sharp critique of the First World as an armed power which sees in democracy a real threat. The Kenyan writer Ngugi wa Thiong'o commented in 1986 that '[i]mperialism is total: it has economic, political, military, cultural and psychological consequences for the people of the world today. It could even lead to holocaust' (Ngugi wa Thiong'o 2). He discussed the effect of a 'cultural bomb' that aims to 'annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves,' a cultural bomb that makes them see their 'past as one wasteland of non-achievement' (Thiong'o 3). Pinter's political plays, and especially Mountain Language strongly allied themselves to this global discourse of protest.

For some Post-colonial theorists, 'language' is a dialect backed up by an army. For example, Chakravorty Spivak disputes the institutionally established forms of knowledge, and argues that there is no universalistic

discourse without military support. Similarly, Amin discusses the notion of democracy which is in fact *policed democracy*, and while Ngugi defines colonialist control through military conquest and political dictatorship, he sees more dangerous effects practised through the vehicle of language: 'The bullet was the means of physical subjugation. Language was the means of spiritual subjugation' (Thiong'o 9). This idea lies at the core of Mountain Language.

In Mountain Language, Pinter writes about a culture of total repression - presenting a people who have lost their dignity. A minority culture in a rural area is colonised and maltreated by the capital. The capital's language disables the minority's dialect. The play is set in a military prison whose location is never specified. Officers abuse women waiting to visit their husbands/sons/fathers in prison and order: '[y]ou may only speak the language of the capital. That is the only language permitted in this place. You will be badly punished if you attempt to speak your mountain language in this place' (255). Pinter said that the play is 'about suppression of language and the loss of freedom of expression' (Gussow 68). Mountain Language exemplifies the systematic suppression of a minority's language. The capital's language has to be bowed to, otherwise the victims are faced with humiliation and corporal punishment.

Written with the economy and eloquence of poetry, Mountain Language vocalises the Post-colonial debate artistically. Here, literally, language is colonised by an army. Of course, language has always been a crucial issue in Pinter's plays - his characters exist, fantasise, remember, dominate via the medium of words - however Mountain Language is a production of a counter-discourse, in which to speak is to tyrannise. Here, Pinter supports the same objective as Thiong'o, who writes that:

Economic and political control can never be complete or effective without mental control. To control a people's culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relationship to others. For colonialism this involved two aspects of the same process: the destruction or the deliberate undervaluing of a people's culture, [...] and the conscious elevation of the language of the coloniser. The domination of a people's language by the languages of the colonising nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonised (Thiong'o 16).

Mountain Language, like Brian Friel's Translations, is about the political admission that linguistic dominance is a form of imperialism. Roland Barthes, in his essay, 'The War of Languages', theorises the relationship between language and power:

In contemporary societies, the simplest division of languages bears on their relation to Power. There are languages which are articulated, which develop, and which are marked in the light (or the shadow) of Power, of its many state, institutional, ideological machineries; I shall call these *enocratic* languages or discourses. And facing them, there are languages which are elaborated, which feel their way, and which are themselves outside of Power and/or against Power; I shall call these *acromatic* languages or discourses (Barthes 107).

In the light of Barthes's division of languages, we can see a commitment in Mountain Language to

formulate the distinction between a powerful capital/encratic language which is constructed around ideology, and the minority's acratic language, which is outside Power. The language of the capital is empowered to produce state-controlled information and to destroy alternatives.

As the play's title suggests, the governmental/military manipulation of information erodes the language and the dignity of the mountain people. The Officer and the Sergeant talk with the voice of the military establishment. Their words establish definitions. They try to terrify the women and make them feel insecure via a language they do not understand. The Sergeant says:

Your husbands, your sons, your fathers, these men you have been waiting to see, are shit-houses. They are enemies of the State. They are shithouses. (Mountain Language 255).

The Officer continues to humiliate the women and exterminate their language and individuality, to take them further from their selves and incorporate them into the capital's self: As Jeanne Colleran points out: 'The language described as dead becomes dead' (Jeanne Colleran 61).

Now hear this. You are mountain people. You hear me? Your language is dead. It is forbidden. It is not permitted to speak your mountain language to your men. It is not permitted. Do you understand? You may not speak it. It is outlawed. You may only speak the language of the capital. That is the only language permitted in this place. You will be badly punished if you attempt to speak your mountain language in this place. This is a military decree. It is the law. Your language is forbidden. It is dead. No one is allowed to speak your language. Your language no longer exists. Any questions? (Mountain Language 255-56).

Mountain Language is much more than a study of the traumatic effects of torture applied by authority, even though this is a serious part of Pinter's intention. This time despite the aura of constant violence, there is no use of onstage violence. Instead, the abuser uses obscene language - and Pinter believes that 'those old Anglo-Saxon words are still very strong' - the Sergeant has a stick which he does not have to use, he 'uses the words instead' (Anna Ford 4).

Mountain Language portrays an authoritarian state whose major aim is to create a patriarchal, one-dimensional society. It presents human beings at the mercy of the cruellest, most incomprehensible, illogical social order, which does not allow variety or resistance, and whose only aim is to control thought and language. The central authority punishes and assimilates the intellectuals and the ethnic minority alike, because they are equally non-conformist. The prison is divided into two sections to identify the rural prisoners robbed of their natural linguistic rights, and the prisoners from the city - the intellectuals. Thus even amongst the oppressed, the system imposes a clear-cut distinction between the city/capital and the mountain people. Failure to conform to their segregation is treated as a crime in itself: when the Young Woman, Sara Johnson, says she does not speak the mountain language, and the Officer sees on her papers that her husband 'doesn't come from the mountains. He's in the wrong batch' (Mountain Language 257), he and his Sergeant 'slowly circle her. The Sergeant puts his hand on her bottom' and asks her 'what

language do you speak with your arse?’ Pinter talks about the human capacity to endure here: ‘And she has to bear this. [...] She ignores it - doesn’t scream or faint or do anything, just ignores it. I admire her very much. Seeing this act of control on her part, they discuss her arse, as it were, in those terms, merely to offend’(Ford 4). Pinter argues that the aim of the militarised state is to diminish both those whom it classifies as minority and those who consciously decline to conform. Again, the way that his plays of the 1980s treat the intelligentsia as a significant class marks a major development from The Birthday Party or The Homecoming where they are treated as impotent, powerless and pretentious fantasists. The change reflects Pinter’s growing belief that the failure of the post-war educated middle classes to contribute to the moral and intellectual growth of Britain, especially in the Thatcher period, was a profound problem that needed to be redressed.

Following ‘The Prison Wall,’ Pinter takes his audience into the ‘Visitor’s Room,’ where the old woman, whose hand was bitten by the prison dog in the first scene, is visiting her son. Now the Guard hits her because she cannot speak the language of the capital. As she speaks to her son in the only language she knows, the Guard ‘jabs her with a stick,’ shouting at her that it is ‘forbidden.’ Then the forbidden conversation is heard in the half light as a voice-over: these two languages are in fact, to our ears, identical.

The play moves, through short, sharp, brutal scenes into the darkness in which we overhear the lovers’ discourse. In the third scene, ‘Voice in the Darkness,’ the Young Woman (a ‘fucking intellectual’) visits her husband (the ‘hooded man’), where the lovers try to defeat the state by living positively in defiance of its imperatives. Colleran argues that their resistance is achieved by means of ‘nondiscursive, nonrepresentational juxtaposition, it is more than anything else *tonal* rather than verbal or visual’(Colleran 61). However, here Pinter stresses the universality of speech. As opposed to the mimetic spaces of the prison wall and visitors’ room, this key scene evokes diegetic spaces, recalling the lyrical pastorals of the memory plays but giving them new meaning: this is the only scene where two characters use Pinter’s idiosyncratically simple, poetic language:

YOUNG WOMAN’S VOICE You smile. When my eyes open I see you above me and smile.

MAN’S VOICE We are out on a lake.

YOUNG WOMAN’S VOICE It is spring. MAN’S VOICE I hold you. I warm you.

YOUNG WOMAN’S VOICE When my eyes open I see you above me and smile.

(Mountain Language 263).

The lovers’ speech verbalises an urgent beauty. Their poetry offers and shelters a model of a possible idyllic counter-society. In a play where all the characters feel threatened, the only protection is found in pastoral language. However, the idea of nature as protection exists only briefly in darkness; the hooded man is destroyed offstage and dragged off by the Guard. As Lefebvre argues, it ‘is becoming impossible to escape the notion that nature is being murdered by ‘anti-nature’ - by abstraction, by signs and images, by discourse’ (Lefebvre 71). The official language overpowers and exterminates the lovers’ lyrical whisper.

Pinter delivers the punch-line of the play via poetry - the remnant of the pastoral tradition linking nature with faith and emotion. The pastoral here is colonised by an authoritarian metropolis but survives in the imagination of two victimised characters as - in Raymond Williams's phrase - 'an idealisation, based on a temporary situation and on a deep desire for stability, served to evade the actual and bitter contradictions of the time' (Williams 60). The tone of the voice-overs offers 'a moment of transcendence, as if a small bud were pushing through the rest of the muck' (Perloff 15). Even the awfullest destruction cannot conquer the human soul. Applying the vision of the memory plays with new urgency, here Pinter reinterprets the pastoral in terms of his ideological values - to quote Terry Gifford:

The pastoral can be a mode of political critique of present society, or it can be a dramatic form of unresolved dialogue about the tensions in that society, or it can be a retreat from politics into an apparently aesthetic landscape that is devoid of conflict and tension (Gifford 11).

The exploitation of 'mountain people' demands that their language and landscape are forbidden and remain only as a utopian realm. As against the fantasy-reality of the memory plays, the pastoral here formulates a relationship between fictional and empirical truth. His plays of the early 1970s were lyrical, and the characters used their imagination freely to create lyrical discourse; Mountain Language forbids speech itself. This political anti-pastoral calls for a poetry that will return to speak to contemporary concerns.

The final scene takes the audience back to the Visitors' Room. Recalling Vaclav Havel's satire, The Memorandum, the regulations governing language change suddenly. The mountain language can be spoken. Casually, the Guard tells the Prisoner who sits trembling with a bloody face that the mountain language now has official recognition: 'Oh, I forgot to tell you. They've changed the rules. She can speak. She can speak in her own language. Until further notice' (Mountain Language 265). But the old woman remains still and silent all through the scene. She has lost her ability to speak. The Prisoner pleads with his mother to talk until he himself falls on his knees and begins to gasp and shake violently. The Sergeant studies the Prisoner shaking on the floor and tells the Guard: 'Look at this. You go out of your way to give them a helping hand and they fuck it up' (267). In John Lutterbie's opinion the mother's silence acts as an act of resistance, opposing Authority in 'a space defining the interface of opposites' (Lutterbie 468). On the other hand, the mother's silence, the Prisoner's collapse, and the Sergeant's mockery suggest the final futility of resistance according to Terry Eagleton: 'Pinter's celebrated silence had become the muteness of a whole people' (Eagleton 20).

Mountain Language, like its predecessor The Birthday Party, is about the suppression of local differences in favour of a centralised official culture. Stanley, too, is finally unable to speak. He makes a last effort to communicate but no longer has 'access to his tongue' (James Campbell 18). When Goldberg and McCann reduce him to silence, the form of mental murder they commit is similar to the eroding of mountain language: 'You're dead, no juice in you, you're nothing but an odour' (The Birthday Party 33). But in early Pinter it was possible to regard such horror stories as symbolic fantasies. Mountain Language cannot be seen as anything but an accusation. It derives from his campaigning against ethnic and human rights abuses in States supported by the USA and NATO, but its application to the British scene was also

inescapable. Discussing Clause 28, which Pinter said, ‘singles out the homosexual section for censorship and repression,’ he stated that something ‘that could be described as uncommon or slightly out of the norm is regarded as an alien force, something to be suppressed and disciplined’ (Gussow 69).

The suppression expressed in Mountain Language is applied internally by state institutions and globally by forces which are sometimes subtle (cf. Precisely), sometimes savage, and Pinter indicts a universal system of oppression. Many countries, in their history, have suppressed minority languages. Friel’s Translations reminded British and Irish audiences of the abolition of Gaelic in the nineteenth century and it was instantly translated into many other languages with a history of linguistic oppression - and indeed a Welsh version of Translations recalled the English attempt to prohibit the Welsh language in the last century. Pinter’s play is set in a contemporary political prison and a brutalised countryside, whose locations are not identified. Although Pinter carefully undermines the political and geographical reference, and in spite of the fact that the play is set in an unspecified totalitarian state, there are numerous English allusions: the manner and diction are consistently English like, the names (Charley and Sara Johnson, Joe Dokes), the references to Babycham, ‘Lady Duck Muck.’ David Pryce-Jones, however, argued that the British connotations fail because Pinter’s prison state has no connection with the British system (David Pryce-Jones 1228). But most importantly, Mountain Language, like One for the Road, explores a rhetoric of nationalism. Both plays account for nationalism as an ideological configuration. The Power in both plays aims at a unity and control of national consciousness. Like Pinter, Lefebvre suggested in his Production of Space that ‘[n]ationhood implies *violence* - the violence of a military space, be it feudal, bourgeois, imperialist, or some other variety’ (Lefebvre 112). And Mountain Language is an urban nightmare with uniforms and hooded hostages - working for national unity while destroying the ‘other’, the minority, the female, the rural.

Reworking earlier works in which the ‘masculine’ enjoys a powerful status while the ‘feminine’ is associated with powerlessness, space in Mountain Language, both territorial and linguistic, is masculinised by the authoritarian and official speech of the ‘military decree.’ However, in the previous plays, territorial and linguistic space was crucial for the conflict between male and female possession: now the ultimate owner is the military power. In Mountain Language individuals have no rights and no command of the spaces they inhabit. Where The Birthday Party showed the individual stripped from his surrogate Mother and reduced to speechlessness, here an entire social minority, the mountain people, are banned from the use of their mother tongue.

The military are granted complete power over space and language: to dominate and define. Chinua Achebe, questioning a similar hostility between central authority and his own minority nation asked in 1975 whether it was ‘right that a man should abandon his mother tongue for someone else’s? It looks like a dreadful betrayal and produces a guilty feeling’ (Chinua Achebe 18). In this sense, the play is a reworking of one of Pinter’s recurrent themes - betrayal. Self-betrayal transforms into forced betrayal. The mountain people, the weakest and the most vulnerable members of society, are not allowed to shape or discuss their own lives in their own language.

Pinter liberates himself from the 'room': 'There's a room in Mountain Language, but there is also a corridor. What I was talking about was freeing myself' (Gussow 78). And the usual rhythm of pauses and silences evolves into an explicitly political discourse. Pinter denied this both in One for the Road and Mountain Language, repeating that his only aim in writing was to explore the images that came into his mind. But by 1988 he was finding some of these images appalling - '[s]o they shock me into life, and into the act of writing' (Ford 4). He believed that Mountain Language, with its poetic economy, '*simply does something*' (Sue Summers 19).

Russell Celyn Jones writes that Pinter's drama is 'framed chaos' ('Political Zeal of a Literary Revolutionary' (7). It is a romanticised framing of twentieth century chaos that, in the hands of a poet-playwright, has found an impressive voice and a cultivated visuality. As opposed to other literary figures of our age such as Eliot and Beckett, who wrote of the banality of corruption, Pinter romanticises the very same corruption and pursues and formulates the poetics of terror in our space and time, holding up many contemporary issues (rationalism, nationalism, democracy, masculinity) to irony, criticism and mockery, simultaneously celebrating and disturbing them.

Bibliography

Achebe, Chinua. 'The African Writer and the English Language' Morning Yet on Creation Day London: Heinemann, 1975.

Aragay, Mireia. 'Writing, Politics and Ashes to Ashes: an interview with Harold Pinter'. Pinter Review. The University of Tampa Press: 1995-96, 4-15

Arden, John. 'Pinter's "Realism"' Harold Pinter: The Birthday Party, The Caretaker, The Homecoming: A Casebook. Ed. Michael Scott. London: Macmillan, 1986. 117-18

Barthes, Roland. 'Writing the Event'. Trans. Richard Howard. The Rustle of Language. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. 149-54

_____. 'The War of Languages'. Trans. Richard Howard. The Rustle of Language Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. 106-10

Ben-Zvi, Linda. 'Harold Pinter's Betrayal: The Patterns of Banality', Modern Drama 23(1980-81): 227-37

Billington, Michael. The Life and Work of Harold Pinter London: Faber and Faber, 1996

Bosworth, Patricia. 'Why Doesn't He Write More', New York Times 27 October 1968, sec. V, 3.

- Brenton, Howard. 'Petrol Bombs Through the Proscenium Arch', Theatre Quarterly 5 (1975): 4-20
- Campbell, James. 'The Slow Unbaffling of the Pinterwatchers' Times Literary Supplement 25 March, 1994. 18.
- Colleran, Jeanne. 'Disjuncture as Theatrical and Postmodern Practice in Griselda Gambaro's The Camp and Harold Pinter's Mountain Language' in Pinter at Sixty. Indiana University Press: 1993. 49-63
- Derrida, Jacques. Of Grammatology. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Eagleton, Terry. 'Out of the Closet: a review of Mountain Language and Party Time'. Times Literary Supplement. 15 November, 1991. 20
- Ford, Anna. 'Radical Departures'. Listener. 120 (1988): 4-6
- Ghilardi-Santacatterina, Maria and Aleks Sierz. 'Pinter and the Pinteresque: An Author Trapped by his Own Image', Drama on Drama. Ed. Nicole Boireau. Macmillan Press: London, 1997. 108-20
- Gifford, Terry. Pastoral London: Routledge, 1999
- Gottlieb, Vera and Colin Chambers eds. Theatre in a Cool Climate Oxford: Amber Lane Press: 1999
- Gussow, Mel. Conversations with Pinter. London: Nick Hern Books, 1994
- Hall, Peter. 'Directing Pinter'. Harold Pinter: You Never Heard Such Silence. Ed. Alan Bold. London: Vision Press, 1984. 19-28
- Handke, Peter. 'Nauseated by Language'. Drama Review. 15(1970): 57-61
- Hern, Nicolas. 'A Play and Its Politics'. One for the Road London: Methuen, 1985. 7-23
- Jones, John Bush. 'Stasis as a Structure in Pinter's No Man's Land'. Modern Drama 19(1976): 291-304
- Knowles, Ronald. Understanding Harold Pinter Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995. Originally a television interview with John Tusa, 'Harold Pinter's Plays and Politics'. BBC 2 Saturday Review. 28 September, 1985
- Lefebvre, Henri. Trans. Donald Nicholson Smith. The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991
- Lutterbie, John. 'Subjects of Silence'. Theatre Journal. 40.4(December 1988): 468-81

- McGrath, John. A Good Night Out: Popular Theatre: Audience, Class and Form. London: Methuen, 1981
- Merritt, Susan Hollis. 'The Harold Pinter Archive in the British Library', Pinter Review: Annual Essays 1994. 14-55
- Perloff, Carey. 'Pinter in Rehearsal: From The Birthday Party to Mountain Language'. Pinter at Sixty. Ed. Katherine H. Burkman, Kundert Gibbs. Indiana: Indiana UP, 1993. 3-17
- Pinter at Cambridge Conference. A British Council Conference, held in Cambridge on 13 July, 1999
- Pinter, Harold. The Queen of All Fairies. The Pinter Archive. Loan no: 110, Box no: 60. (This is an 8 pp autobiographical prose piece, written in 1949).
- _____. 'The Nato Action in Serbia'. Speech delivered to the Confederation of Analytical Psychologists. London. 25 June, 1999.
- _____. "One for the Road", Plays: Four London: Faber and Faber, 1998
- _____. "Mountain Language" Plays: Four London: Faber and Faber, 1998
- _____. 'Eroding the Language of Freedom'. Various Voices: Prose, Poetry, Politics 1948-1998 London: Faber and Faber, 1998
- Pryce-Jones, David. 'Expressions of Independence: a review of Mountain Language. Times Literary Supplement. 4 November, 1988. 1228.
- Silverstein, Marc. 'One for the Road, Mountain Language, and the Impasse of Politics' Modern Drama 34.3(September, 1991): 422-40
- The South Bank Show. 29 November, 1998, broadcast for ITV. Presenter Melvin Bragg.
- Summers, Sue. 'A Conscientious Objector'. Independent 18 October, 1988. 19
- Thiong'o, Ngugi wa. Decolonising the Mind London: James Currey Ltd, 1986
- Williams, Raymond. The City and the Country London: Chatto & Windus, 1973
- Worth, Katherine. 'Pinter's Scenic Imagery', Pinter Review: Annual Essays 1:1(1987): 31-39

Mao's Dialectical Materialism as an Individualism: Theory and Practice.

By Kane X. Faucher

Over the many years since his passing, Mao Tse Tung has been accused of several things, but it is a rather oblique discourse indeed that will consider Mao's dialectical materialism as a form of a reification of the liberal humanist subject; in fact, it would appear that such a claim is corrupt at the outset for those familiar with the intricate operations and nuances of dialectical materialism as it is grounded in Marx and in other post-Hegelian schools. But in consideration of Mao himself, as it has also pertained to other Marxist interpreters, we can make such critical distinctions between the *ought* of the theoretical constituents of dialectical materialism and the actuality of its practice. It is by no mysterious convention that, among the plenum of Marxist interpreters who utilize dialectical materialism as the vital organ in inscribing policy in very specialized scenarios over and beyond the Marxist ideals, we usually append the use of the hyphen in regard to Marx and a subsequent interpreter; hence, why we can speak of a Marxist-Leninism or a Marxist-Leninist-Maoism. And so we suspend this question of liberal humanism as-it- appears in Mao's dialectical materialism, a question we may pose *quid juris* as we move through the erratic drumbeats and asynchronic rhythms of how this figures in the actual historical manifold of events. We will begin with an opening, plenary discussion of Mao's dialectical materialism—in no way exhaustive or without its own host of aporias—before tending to the sphere of historical praxis.

Dialectical materialism is a philosophical doctrine of the real; that is, there is no recourse to transcendental or metaphysical valuations of truth, no dependent grounding of the actual in abstract concept. It is a doctrine that places matter at the forefront of the mind's activities, as that which occurs both temporally and logically prior to the sentience of the subject. Its first most germinal formulation occurs in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* when he details the relation between the master and slave dialectic as an analogue of the subject-object relation. It is at that moment of Geist that the slave, who had hitherto been in abject service to the master's desires, realizes his own self-consciousness in that it is he who devises the strategies for procuring the goods for the master's consumption, that it is his thinking and labour reflected in the production of consumptive goods.¹ Borrowing again from Hegel, the dialectical formulation is made possible by the organic dynamism of things, i.e., the interconnectiveness of matter. The complexities of

this formulation cannot be captured in such capsule form, and so we proceed to Mao's interpretation/deviation model of dialectical materialism, subsequent to one last definition.²

Liberal humanism is an umbrella term that has under its domain all the ideals Western democracy holds as sacred (even if only touted for a "patriotic" response). Roughly put, liberal humanism believes in the individual subject, a subject that has rights intrinsic to its being such as the right to property, the right to choose one's path in life, the right to security, etc. Originally defined during the *Ausklarung* with figures such as Rousseau, Montesquieu, and Locke, it found fuller development in Mill and more recently with John Rawls.³ This theory undertakes to resolve all human problems in the socius through the management of its welfare, dignity, and well-being. However, what is suspect—among so many other propositions in the theory—is its foundational character: from where do these "intrinsic rights" come from? What in nature guarantees them? But it is not our purpose here to do anything more than to illustrate how it is at odds with the seemingly converse materialism. Liberal humanism privileges the mind (as Reason) before matter, which is seen as subservient to the aims of the subject. In opposition to this, dialectical materialism removes the privilege surrounding the notions of property and mind, but maintains a sense of rights—but rights as guaranteed by the laws of nature. Both share a telos of a possible utopia at the full realization of their theories.

Mao the theoretician...Mao was familiar with these popular theoretical strains, and was perspicuous enough to notice the conflict between idealism and materialism. In a sense, Mao echoes Whitehead's remark that one is either a Platonist or an Aristotelian: "All philosophical currents and schools are manifestations of these two fundamental schools."⁴ Recall that Plato's theory of the forms presupposes a mental idealism, whereas Aristotle's categories grant more privilege to the matter of the universe. But curiously enough, the same symptoms plague both Marxist materialism and Mao's practices in such a way that bespeak of liberal humanism; that is, the privileging of a state-centralized authority that "watchdogs" the populace. Regard how crucially essential "Mao Tse-Tung's Thought" permeated the society insofar as we witness a singular example of privileged reasoning over matters of brute fact (which later becomes "matter" by the production of books that carry the message of this thought, as a monoculture emerges... very much akin to a medieval scenario—also mono-bibliocentric—that privileges the "one book" as being the Bible). The internalization strategy of this "Thought" is in itself somewhat suspicious in that this "Thought" must regulate all activity in the socius. This is an altogether familiar "paternalist" strategy that is inherited from other political models other than Marxist-Leninism.

Like Marx, Mao was not a Marxist all of the time. Evidence of this is apparent in his "One Hundred Flowers" campaign of 1955. This campaign—though only six weeks in duration before a reversion took place! -- was ostensibly an attempt to encourage free thought and discourse, even if the aim was to refute it. In fact, this was a combative gesture: Lu Ting-Yi, Propaganda Department Secretary, issued the challenge to scholars to create and to criticize.⁵ It was a "prove us wrong, we dare you" scenario that did not threaten punishment as a response to such a challenge. According to Mao, this would strengthen his own party position, for this free exercise in thinking would reach its terminus, be confronted by its own fallacies, and the people would return to the established ideological fold, thereby finally laying to rest these

dissenting opinions. Moreover, the campaign had two reflexive qualities: 1) it would allow the people to “sow their wild oats” so to speak, and speak without fear of persecution, which by proxy would rejuvenate the established ideological apparatus of its perceived oppressive function, and 2) those who were “astray” would be given the opportunity to become disenchanted with their own dissenting views and would return—with healthy struggle—back to the ideological platform. More importantly, this campaign improved the condition of the intellectual class. After Chou En-Lai’s “The Question of Intellectuals” was given on January 14th of that year, intellectuals were privy to salary increases, better research access, and given more available materials.⁶ My sources have not indicated whether or not this practice was widespread, or more localized around Peking, for it would be my assertion that areas more removed from Mao’s sphere of influence would no doubt be still enforcing the same standards as set down in Mao’s agenda before the campaign.

What is particularly and distinctly a liberal humanist phenomenon in this political move, beyond granting this reprieve to the intellectual class, is the notion of varied opinions on all matters political and sensitive. One will find as an essential quality in J.S. Mill’s *On Liberty*, especially in concerns to education, that the well-being of the society depends on there being contradiction, for without oblique or challenging perspectives, a society’s intellectual capabilities stagnate, and people will follow the rules without understanding what the rules mean, thereby transforming the populace into functionary automata. It was perhaps Mao’s intention to avoid ruling over a populace who merely functioned, and so he devised a program that would re-invigorate the intellectual fortitude of the People. Why would anyone refuse to govern over a society that merely obeyed without question? We must suspect that Mao was very proud of his ideas, and that for people to merely follow them without meditating on their meaning would 1) make them susceptible if they could be persuaded by an opposing position, and 2) would diminish the import of meaning that Mao inserted in his writings. In sum, it would be tantamount to having undergone an enormous expenditure of time and energy into a novel only to receive the blind praise of a publisher who merely accepts the work because of the name. On unsubstantiated grounds, I would assert that Mao wanted the people to come to his thought after careful deliberation and critical discrimination; he wanted a loyal class, and the only loyalty worth having was the type that truly “felt” the “Thought.” Spurred by the events of the Hungarian uprising in the mid-fifties, the CCP did not want to underestimate the opposition or give license to uprising in China, which would no doubt become a possibility if the relaxation of thought-suppression continued. Rather, Mao quickly abandoned his “Unity-Criticism-Unity” model that would allow the “weeds” in current thought to emerge and be uprooted, thereby bringing a return to unity in thought. We could criticize the short-lived campaign as being teleologically motivated toward homogeneity, a potential trap to rout out the dissenters of the more bourgeois persuasion, or as a devious plan to eventually increase party membership. And indeed this campaign has been subjected to these full frontal attacks, but one must always counterpose this with the terror of the Su Fan and the liquidation of counter-revolutionary thought. For good or ill, people were being granted the opportunity to criticize the state without fear of deadly reproach. Mao was not—in this period—overtly hostile to dissenting opinions, but rather played the paternal role of diminishing the import of the “counter-revolutionary” strain of thinking as backward as opposed to advanced, but also recognizing the necessity of “backward” thought. According to Mao, reminiscent again of Mill, societal progress is best affected by the constant emergence of contradictory views that the

established order must contend with.⁷

As a corollary of this phenomenon, education was stressed, and it was—almost by definition—a right. Even if the purpose of the education was to further disseminate propaganda, to indoctrinate the students to become loyal Maoists, the point is that the education was there at all in a very substantive way, as opposed to the dynastic rule where only the rich could afford to take the provincial exams. Moreover, the education was diverse, meeting the demands of the quickly emergent modernization of China; that is, in response to burgeoning industries, one could receive a formal education in trades that reflected the demands of the society. The pursuit of knowledge, no matter what form it took (though vocational training was valued more highly), was the prime goal—despite its monolithic character.⁸

Some of these education trends are worth noting. Enrolment in higher education increased from 155 036 in 1948 to 434 600 in 1958. In terms of China's population, this does not seem to be a considerable percentage, but it is still a threefold increase. During this same period, arts education went down drastically from 11.6% to 5.4% whereas engineering soared from 25 579 to 177 600. The reason for this may be twofold: a) stress on practical vocational skills and China's industrial demands (public works, etc) that widened the employment base in this area and b) the dramatic economic reforms between 1949 and 1952 caused a boom in mining and manufacture, the reconstruction of railways, and a host of civic projects—all of which entailed the need for engineers. Political science, a pernicious subject that was perhaps perceived as a discipline that would foster opposing thought by exposure to different political models, went from 37 780 to 9300.⁹ There was, in the perception of the state, little need to devote study to political science, for the political information was widely available to everyone.

Another important qualification for liberal humanism is the notion of property rights. Under the Maoist regime, property was more “equitably” distributed during the Agrarian Reform Law that effectively vanquished the landlord class. And although Mao believed in a national property, especially against the threat of a re-armed Japan (prompting an agreement in 1950 between China and the USSR to guard against Japanese or American hostilities), he failed to recognize the sanctity of private property per se, and there are numerous (and horrific) accounts of this, most notably during the purges of the Cultural Revolution, and the Great leap Forward which saw the forced herding of people into communes. It is perhaps on the notion of property that Mao is at his most Marxist.

But in terms of nationalism, the notion of citizenry (itself a liberal humanist concept) was employed by the CCP. The Common Programme, issued in September of 1949 by the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, granted the rights of citizenry to those who formally qualified as the People, giving them the rights of People (zhurenweng) to dictate over the exploiting classes and groups that constituted the remainder.¹⁰ Dictatorship aside, the notion of citizenry—albeit in a nascent and exclusive form—is still imbued, like the liberal humanist model, with various inalienable qualifications. Rather than the right to vote, etc., the citizen's rights are established according to the CCP's qualifications. These rights are “recognized” by the state and granted in like manner. This parallels the liberal humanist model which also depicts the state as recognizing the rights of its citizenry; that is, both the Maoist and liberal humanist

methods are instances of state paternalism.

We can criticize Mao for adhering to a rank individualism, having himself portrayed in an almost demi-god fashion, a cult figure for the adoration of the masses. This in itself is a very powerful proof in illustrating Mao's paternalist features. Also, himself something of a poet in addition to his more political role, seems to suggest that he does place some value in the arts, in expression, and not merely a unilateral fixation on all things "material." Art itself is a form of transcendental behaviour in that it does not lend itself to the real. And when he was not writing poetry explicitly, his political works convey a deep poetic sensibility, imbued with such beautiful and memorable phrases such as the wonderfully figural "paper tiger." In fact, one could perhaps engage in a literary analysis of Mao's writings to find there the tremendous effect and influence the dynastic period in literature had on Mao, thereby showing a direct conflict between this sensibility and his Cultural Revolution to purge "all things old." He was, incontrovertibly, a kind of metaphysical poet, also enamoured with Qing period romanticism in poetry. Moreover, Mao had impeccable calligraphy skills, and for those in the know about Chinese writing, calligraphy is not only a respected art form, but it conveys something intrinsic about the soul of the person who employs it. This, again, presents a contradiction (not to mention an anachronistic cultural belief), for Mao's dialectical materialism demands that we abandon all recourse to transcendentals—this includes the soul. In all fairness, similar charges can be directed to Marx and Lenin, both competent and artful writers in their political prose (and Marx himself enjoyed writing love poetry for his lifelong beloved).

Despite how one seeks to locate a form of liberal humanism in the actions and policies of Mao, this cannot be construed in any fashion as a means of either salvaging him through an apologia or, among that contingent of Western pro-Maoists, to see in him a flawless figure of effective and beneficial ideological conviction. By the same token, we cannot rest complicit with that opposite contingent of Cold War relics who have made their careers vilifying Mao in their works as a further distorting caricature of China presented to the West. All said, Mao was no saintly figure, and he did occasionally lapse into various contradictory instances in order to buttress his political hold upon the country, and far too numerous are the real conditions of suffering at the hands of his dictates. One need only consider the broad testimony of those considered dissenters and enemies of the State who indeed suffered or were executed due to Mao's nefarious purges, the livelihoods of innocent people that were effectively trampled in the somewhat inaptly named "cultural revolution." However, although one cannot completely absolve or vilify Mao as a political and cultural figure, he remains an enigmatic one at best, one whose ideas and works merit continued study, albeit with a sensitive eye to those cruel conditions he occasionally produced via his ideological and personal comportment to the governance of China.

In this ongoing effort to make this link between Mao and liberal humanism, we have only been able to indicate a few cursory and isolated examples—the rest is awash in an enigma, or would prove to be a pedantic exercise of grasping at straws. The abovementioned examples are perhaps the most notable and least contentious examples of Mao's nascent liberal humanism. But we must conclude as we have begun... knowing that Marx wasn't always a Marxist (which sounds rather paradoxical), it should be no different that Mao was not always consistent with his proclaimed principles in dialectical materialism. But it does

not suffice to say that he was a closet humanist either. Mao, like most political figures, was a motley of political views without a center, a panache of ideological weaves that erupted in strange ways. Perhaps it is this that will mark out the future seduction and scholarship of Mao as a historical figure: not to apprentice to how he was a dialectical materialist through and through, but when and where he *wasn't*. This will perhaps prove the more challenging and exciting task indeed.

Notes

¹ G.W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A.V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p.111-118. It must be said that this translation is by far the most reputable and in accord with the original German. This section on lordship and bondage had such a degree of pathos to Marx that it could almost be said without controversy that this one section most influenced Marx's writings on the relation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

² The interested reader is directed to the massive literature produced in this area, including Marx and Engels as the platform of the theory; Adorno, Benjamin, Marcuse, and Horkheimer of the Frankfurt School, Freud Lacan, and Guattari for the developments of dialectical materialism in psychoanalysis; Sartre, Marcel, Wahl, and Queneau for the earlier reception of the dialectic in France; Habermas of the New Frankfurt School, and; Derrida, Deleuze, Baudrillard, and Nancy for the post-marxist (post-structuralist, deconstruction, postmodernist) view in France.

³ Cf. Rousseau's *Social Contract*, Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws*, Locke's *Treatise on Government*, Mill's *On Liberty*, and Rawls' *Political Liberalism*. These are just a few highlighted "big name" theorists in this milieu.

⁴ Mao Tse-Tung, "Dialectical Materialism" in *The Political Thought of Mao Tse-Tung*, ed. Stuart R. Schram (New York: Praeger, 1974), p.180.

⁵ And indeed this program of criticism as destruction, which in turn is necessary for the constructivist activity of Reason, has been with Mao Tse-Tung thought from the beginning. Perhaps one of the later examples of the restating of this tenet can be found in the "Circular of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" which is a direct attack on P'eng Chen who (according to this document) did not consult the Group of Five before submitting an outline report which surreptitiously critiqued Wu Han. On another note, we witness the importance of the relationship between destruction and construction for the teleological purposes of fostering Reason: an inherently liberal humanist by way of fin de siecle view.

⁶ Rene Goldman, "The Rectification Campaign at Peking University: May-June 1957" in China Under Mao: Politics Takes Command, ed. Roderick MacFarquhar (Cambridge: MIT, 1966), p.255.

⁷ Mao Tse-Tung, Selected Works of Mao-Tse-Tung, vol. V (Peking: Foreign languages Press, 1977), pp. 172-5.

⁸ C.T. Hu, “Communist Education: Theory and Practice” in Mao: Politics Takes Command, p.243. The claim of the education being monolithic is Hu’s assessment based on a double criteria of the trends in education and the sustained indoctrination effect in schools. I, however, feel it to be a bit of a hyperbole, though I employ his word here.

⁹ Immanuel C. Y. Hsu, “Higher Education in Communist China, 1949-61” in Mao: Politics Takes Command, pp. 290-3. What Hsu does not indicate, especially in terms of the diminishing enrolment in arts and political science, is whether or not this was the result of a decrease in faculty or vice versa.

¹⁰ Bill Brugger, China: Liberation and Transformation, (New Jersey: Barnes & Noble, 1981), p.52.

Changing the universe...

By Irene Marques

Kernels of light
I imagine
When I look downside
Toward the South Pole

Menthol lipstick
With brown or dark caramel scents
I imagine the flowers that your lips grow
And that I might even feel in my solitary wanderings in the dark dusk

Kernels of light
I envisage in my long wintry nights
I, who sit alone in the North Pole
Waiting for the moon to become round and round and round again
Because when the season is ready
And the winter mature I will no longer stop in the nights of my lonely siestas

Will no longer stop there
And will run and gallop toward you
In the South Pole

Will run and steal you from all you have
Yes, because I cannot heal or wait or repent any longer
Yes, because I have been alone dancing in the stubborn whirl of the northern wind
Alone for many lives and seasons that have brought me back to the circle of this life
To the season of this stagnant sun

Yes, the commandos of colonels will no longer be sufficient
Nor the cooper shields of fierce transitional soldiers that I have been battling against all my lives
Incarnation after reincarnation after des-incantation
Repeating the circle of blood and sore wounds that cannot be controlled

I have been there and there
I have been to your house and to mine

And to that one over the flamingo horizon and even far and beyond only to come back here and be imprisoned in the laws of disintegration

I have been sleeping and awakening in fast cavalcades of deadly malignant horses
Who in their mistaken magnificence have cavalcaded me to the end of the near world
Only to bring me back to this precise point of commencing solitude

I have been there and there

Over to your house and to mine

Beyond the centre or the cascade of the river down the luminous channel

Tried the flying kite and the childish swing put across the two thin and scented eucalyptus trees by my father's incantatory garden

Or sometimes across the two large and rough oak trunks that you planted in the public plaza in the beginning of the sparkling haze

When one molecule said 'YES' to another molecule and love was first made between two creatures

Have been there and there

And back to here

On top of the shedding snake's skin to enter your finite world and become someone, something, some-way, somewhere

I have

I have

And now it is the time to enter no—thing

The one that might BE

King Kong vs. Rambo: A Cautionary Tale (again)

By John McGowan-Hartmann

But wait! Consider what's at stake

When e'er we venture to remake

-paraphrased from Sir Walter Scott, *Marmion*, Canto vi. Stanza 17

In perhaps the earliest attempt to capitalise on Peter Jackson's planned remake of the 1933 classic *King Kong*, Paramount released in 2002 a DVD-format version of the previous feature remake; producer Dino De Laurentiis' 1976 blockbuster starring Jeff Bridges, Jessica Lange and a man in a monkey suit. I recently revisited this film as part of my own preparations for Jackson's effort (due out for Christmas 2005), and found the experience of watching the 1976 version at once bizarrely stupefying for a thriller, let alone a monster movie, as the cast stumble their way through interminable self-exploratory dialogue (Lange's and Bridges' characters even stop for a chatty drink in a deserted NY bar as Kong rampages through the city), and grossly insulting, as the "King" of the title displays all of the technical virtuosity of television's Barney the purple dinosaur. Since its theatrical, and now DVD release, the 1976 film has received mixed reviews, such as a lambasting from Christopher Null, who calls it "frankly one of the worst films ever made, a useless and unwanted recreation of the past," (Null, 2003) and strange if faint praise from Pauline Kael, who while she agrees that the "film doesn't have the magical primeval imagery of the first version; it doesn't have the Gustav Doré fable atmosphere," she nevertheless argues that "the movie is sparked mainly...by the impudent new conception of the screaming-in-fear blonde, and Jessica Lange's fast yet dreamy comic style" (Kael, 1992, 372-3). Kael's opinion is (as always) well-considered, but frankly, that was thirty years ago. Any appeal held by Lange's emoting, the monkey suit or the film overall has gone the way of the dinosaurs—masterfully animated for the original by Kong's creator, Willis O'Brien—that De Laurentiis forgot to include. Scarcely anyone remembers that he tried again in 1986 with the even more awful *King Kong Lives*. Of the 1976 film, Jackson himself has been quoted as referring to it as "Crap! Unadulterated crap! Worse crap, even, than those Japanese imitation *Kongs*! The Japanese, at least, had their own tradition of crap to honour" (Turner, 2002, 17).

Remaking a popular film is always a dubious endeavour, and is even more challenging when the original work is included on virtually everyone's list of greatest movies ever made. Gus Van Sandt did it with *Psycho*, and audiences and critics alike just scratched their heads and wondered why. The 1933 *King Kong* is credited, among other things, with twice saving RKO studios from insolvency, in the aftermath of its

initial release and again with a 1938 re-issue (Turner, 2002, 78). Even after the De Laurentiis' debacle, the original *King Kong* was reunited with lost footage in the 1980s, earning heavy grosses in the home video format. We're still waiting for a "special edition" DVD, but it can't be far off. Along with economic success, there is undeniably immense universal appeal in the original; Kong, in fact, may be among the most recognisable film stars in history.

Both despite and because of the ubiquitous iconography of the original, what really makes things interesting for Jackson is the obvious qualification of the De Laurentiis film as one of the worst remakes ever attempted. That's not just a lot to live up to, it's a lot to live down. It's a serious challenge, made ever the more intimidating by what's at stake with regard to its success; as he builds his New York sets in a New Zealand paddock Jackson, his studio and his production company have a whole nation pulling not just for them, but for a film industry that is increasingly helping to define New Zealand as a country.

In a November 2003 report, New Zealand's Ministry for Arts, Culture and Heritage announced a NZ\$10,000,000 increase in baseline funding for the New Zealand Film Commission, representing a nearly 100% boost to a primary source of funding for local filmmakers (Jackson has on many occasions thanked the Film Commission for assistance he received early in his career)(Development, 2005a). New Zealand features such as *Whale Rider* and *Perfect Strangers* have proved the viability of this industry, and a corresponding report from the Ministry of Economic Development Growth and Innovation notes that the Creative Industries sector, which includes film production, "grew faster than the economy as a whole between 1997 and 2001" (Development, 2005b, n.p). In the same period, the Ministry reports that creative industries exports grew by 435 percent. All of this is without the special consideration due to Jackson's massive *Lord of the Rings* trilogy (the first film was released in 2001), which has to date grossed nearly three trillion U.S. dollars world-wide, employed thousands of New Zealanders from pre- and post-production duties, down to extras for the huge battle scenes, and spawned a new facet of the national tourist industry, welcoming visitors to Hobbiton and other Tolkienesque locales. *LOTR* has in addition re-introduced the film industry and its audiences to the wide-open cinematic splendour of the New Zealand landscape, giving us an astonishingly varied and visually rich conception of Middle Earth. Even Bollywood has expressed interest in utilising such scenery for new Indian spectacles(Enterprise, 2004, n.p). In a small island nation of only four million people, movies are fast becoming a very, very big thing.

Government subsidies for national film industries have, of course, been around since the first decade of the twentieth century, and countries like Germany and Canada currently invest heavily in local production. The situation in New Zealand, however— when one considers the size and character of the nation and the monumental commercial success and development its cinema is generating on an international level—may represent something unique. Pacing the Hollywood juggernaut, cinematic New Zealand is becoming the little country that could. Now, with some of Hollywood's money but with Kiwi energy and creativity, we get to see if they can successfully resurrect the screen's original giant.

Meanwhile, at least one part of the U.S. film industry is contemplating a very different sort of resurrection, of a very different cinematic icon. Quoted on Ananova.com in January 2005, Sylvester Stallone once again

reports that work is progressing on a script for a fourth instalment of the *Rambo* franchise (Joyner, 2005). Comparison of this albeit unconfirmed possibility with Jackson's *King Kong* remake invites some fascinating questions about what cinematic icons and their resurrections indicate in terms of cinema and culture. Such questions are particularly interesting with regard to what is at stake, what it is that filmmakers and even nations gamble with, in and around any attempt to revive a cinematic moment.

The *Rambo* series, beginning with *First Blood* in 1982 and last seen in the Afghanistan setting of *Rambo III* in 1988, cannot of course be credited with the singular economic support of a studio ascribed to the original *King Kong*, despite huge commercial success worldwide. Neither can a potential *Rambo* return be expected to have an economic significance to the U.S. film industry that parallels what Jackson's *King Kong* means to New Zealand. Rather, the significance of the *Rambo* films has long been taken to be one of cultural—and especially political—ideology, some details of which are incisively explored by Susan Jeffords in her 1994 *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era*.

Using *Rambo* as a centrepiece for her argument, Jeffords finds that in terms of the Hollywood action film, the *Rambo* series “can be used to illustrate how the hard-body imagery evolved during the eight years that Ronald Reagan was in office” (Jeffords, 1994, 11). She ties the screen presence of the “hard-bodied” *Rambo* to the American political climate of the times, citing what John Orman has called Reagan's “macho presidential style,” which incorporates traits of being “[d]ecisive, never wavering or uncertain,” “[s]trong and aggressive, not weak or passive,” and a “‘real’ man, never ‘feminine’.” According to Jeffords, the “macho” presidential image and its cultural counterpart in the muscular *Rambo* is both reflective of and instrumental to what was the Reagan administration's increasingly aggressive stand on foreign policy and its massive military build up internationally (Jeffords, 1994. 11-17).

The evolution of the *Rambo* images is indeed profound, from a homeless drifter fending off sheriff's deputies and weekend warriors in *First Blood*, to a one-man killing machine defeating the Soviet army in Afghanistan in *Rambo III*—explicitly symbolic, as Jeffords notes, of the tough, uncompromising, “hard” American body crushing the “evil” Soviet “empire” as defined by Reagan (Jeffords, 1994. 11-17). The political stance—and hence the significance—of the films is ultimately just as uncompromising with regard to the characterisation of America; if *King Kong* is about to become the new face of the little nation that could, *Rambo* provided in the 1980s the primary cinematic characterisation of the superpower that by God will. And as Richard Crenna's colonel Trautman tells us about *Rambo*, in perhaps the franchise's most enduring line, “God would be merciful. He won't.”

Times, of course, have changed. While Jeffords suspected in 1994 that the Clinton/Gore era would bring subtle differences to the “hard-bodied image” as a dominant element in Hollywood narrative film, Americans and the world are in 2005 witness to a new era of “macho presidential style.” The U.S. has a whole “axis of evil” to contend with, and a foreign policy stance that, as the new Secretary of State has explained, is anything but conservative. And here, rumour has it, comes *Rambo*.

Sylvester Stallone will be 59 in July, and one must wonder if *Rambo IV* will be a Schwarzenegger-like

final grasp at hard-bodied-ness, a la *Terminator 3*, or a more compromising approach to updating the character. On what front, one also wonders, will Rambo fight this time? There are so many to choose from, including the mess he (the U.S.) left in Afghanistan. And are Americans or global audiences still willing to swallow the one-man army routine? Maybe he can get a sidekick. The point, however, is clear: while many in the U.S. may politically be holding onto the myth of the “hard-bodied” hero—the “macho President”—and his fight for American “democratic” superiority, the cultural resurrection of Rambo in our twenty-first century is, if anything, a gamble—not just with money, or cinema, but with national self-image. The *Rambo* films are a version of that image, which Hollywood shipped overseas to the tune of big worldwide box office returns. A decade and two U.S. administrations later, in the face of the Iraq war and the increasingly implied threat behind the George W. Bush administration’s vows to “bring democracy” wherever a disadvantageous lack of it can be found, the ideology of a “macho” foreign policy is for some of us, in America or its western allies, becoming a lot to live down—just like Rambo, the icon of American strength *sans* diplomacy, or mercy.

For, if *King Kong* (as I have argued elsewhere) represents a paean to the great dark unknown, that cultural quantity of the mysterious and inaccessible, immortalised by Joseph Conrad and lost (at least in a geographic sense) to the onrush of twentieth century modernity, *Rambo* is representative of an era that seems all too resurrectable. You can’t find *King Kong*’s Skull Island on a map or with a satellite, but somehow the world of Rambo, the killing machine with a pure and democratic heart, is not yet consigned to the mists of time. Kong dies the loneliest death in cinema; Rambo, it seems, just keeps coming back for more.

Meanwhile, work on *King Kong* progresses, under more international scrutiny than can be calculated, via both traditional and new media sources such as a daily video production diary on www.kongisking.net. We’re waiting, but not for a message; after all, any political content to the original film (virtually every kind of content has been ascribed to it at one time or another) is unlikely to cost Mr. Jackson any sleep at night—as quoted in a *Wired* magazine article from last year, he just wants to “recapture what I loved about the film when I saw it when I was nine” (Jackson, 129). At his WingNut studios in Wellington, they aren’t concerned with right- or left-wing posturing; they’re making movies because they can, with a natural joy that seems the antithesis of the “hard-bodied” American action hero. The national importance of the new *King Kong* will come not, as with a new *Rambo* in America, from what the film says *about* New Zealand, but by what it does—or doesn’t do—*for* New Zealand. Perhaps Stallone will get his fourth instalment, but Rambo vs. King Kong? In terms of a remake reflecting well on a nation, my money’s on the little country that could, with one final word to Jackson and his team: watch out for us die-hard *King Kong* fanatics. God might be merciful. We won’t.

Works Cited

Development, N. Z. M. o. E. (2005a), “Boost for New Zealand Screen Production.” New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development. World wide web: http://www.med.govt.nz/irdev/econ_dev/

[growth-innovation/screen/media/minister-20031110-clark-tizard.html](#) (last accessed 25/05/2005).

Development, N. Z. M. o. E. (2005b), "Creative Industries: Why are they Significant?" New Zealand Ministry of Economic Development. World wide web: http://www.med.govt.nz/irdev/econ_dev/growth-innovation/progress-2003/goals/goals-03.html (last accessed 25/05/2005).

Enterprise, N. Z. T. a. (2004), "Kuran (NZ) Ltd: Bringing 'Bollywood' to New Zealand." New Zealand Trade and Enterprise. World wide web: <http://www.nzte.govt.nz/section/13745/10734.aspx> (last accessed 25/05/2005).

"Interview with Peter Jackson," (2004) *Wired*, April, pp. 128-9.

Jeffords, S. (1994) *Hard Bodies: Hollywood Masculinity in the Reagan Era*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ.

Joyner, J. (2005), Joyner, James, ed. *Outside the Beltway*. World wide web: <http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/archives/8872> (last accessed 25/05/2005).

Kael, P. (1992) *In Movie Love: Complete Reviews* Boyars, New York.

Null, C. (2003), "Review: *King Kong* (1976). filmcritic.com. World wide web: <http://www.filmcritic.com/misc/emporium.nsf/0/1bb0e1f457a03d8e88256cca001a25bc?> (last accessed 25/05/2005).

Turner, G. (2002) *Spawn of Skull Island*, Luminary Press, Baltimore.

Andy Warhol: When Junkies Ruled the World.

By Michael Angelo Tata

So when the doorbell rang the night before, it was Liza in a hat pulled down so nobody would recognize her, and she said to Halston, “Give me every drug you’ve got.” So he gave her a bottle of coke, a few sticks of marijuana, a Valium, four Quaaludes, and they were all wrapped in a tiny box, and then a little figure in a white hat came up on the stoop and kissed Halston, and it was Marty Scorsese, he’d been hiding around the corner, and then he and Liza went off to have their affair on all the drugs (*Diaries*, Tuesday, January 3, 1978).

Privileged Intake

Of all the creatures who populate and punctuate Warhol’s worlds—drag queens, hustlers, movie stars, First Wives—the drug user and abuser retains a particular access to glamour. Existing along a continuum ranging from the occasional substance dilettante to the hard-core, raging junkie, the consumer of drugs preoccupies Warhol throughout the 60s, 70s and 80s. Their actions and habits fascinate him, his screens become the sacred place where their rituals are projected and packaged. While individual substance abusers fade from the limelight, as in the disappearance of Ondine shortly after the commercial success of *The Chelsea Girls*, the loss of status suffered by Brigid Polk in the 70s and 80s, or the fatal overdose of exemplary drug fiend Edie Sedgwick, the actual glamour of drugs remains, never giving up its allure.¹ Drugs survive the druggie, who exists merely as a vector for the ingestion of the controlled substance. Ever a delinquent, the druggie cannot be controlled, macrophaging what has been legislated to be outside the bounds of proper consumption somewhere beyond the law’s glare—in a rented room at the Chelsea Hotel, inside a taxi cab, or in a bathroom at Studio 54, among other clandestine locales.² Even Warhol’s own art openings attract the drug crowd: “The bathroom was crowded, I guess people were coking up” (this after the Dia Center for the Arts’ *Shadows* opening; *Diaries*, Thursday, January 25, 1979). Worlds collide, as the art and club spheres take on the qualities of one another (one attends a Warhol opening to coke up, then zooms over to Palladium in the hopes of being Polaroided by Warhol and becoming an art object). Functioning as a sign of the subterranean, drugs authenticate Warhol as cool, giving his art and persona a special infusion of chic. In *Crack Wars: Literature Addiction Mania*, Avital Ronell sums up the urgency of the drug question pointedly: “[t]here is no culture without a drug culture, even if this is to

be sublimated to pharmaceuticals” (96). Yet beyond the textual problem of what relation an intoxicated underground bears to a sober aboveground, drug intake poses an even more basic problem: “[d]rugs make us ask what it means to consume anything, anything at all. This is a philosophical question, to the extent that philosophy has always diagnosed health, that is, being-itself or the state of nonalienation, by means of its medico-ontological scanners” (63). Cultural production itself qualifies as an act of inebriation, or *Rausch*. Narcovoyeur, Warhol grasps the symbiosis of drugs and art, providing illustrious instances of drugs’ magical unworkings (*désœuvrements*).³

Throughout the sum of Warhol’s reports, various consciousness-altering chemicals achieve respective levels of notoriety and fashionability. Each receives its metaphorical fifteen minutes: chemicals, too, can be stars, as “The Tingle” indicates (“lemons” are the olfactory scent of choice for 1975, according to Brigid). Developments in the synthesis and intake of psychotropic chemicals cause a history to crystallize: the intravenous meth and heroin craze of the 60s gives way to the nasal cocaine mania of the 70s and 80s; new psychiatric drugs, like Quaaludes, or Valium, make their mark; methods of drug consumption change over time, marking the emergence of new lifestyles and the erasure of older ones.⁴ Always tracking the adventures of the drug user, Warhol passes from the frenzied early nucleus of amphetamine addicts or A-heads in his *a*, a novel to the cooler, more secretive coke heads of the Studio 54 set in the *Diaries*, ending his infatuation with the heroin-inspired antics of painter Jean-Michel Basquiat, also relayed in the *Diaries*. As a historical document, Warhol’s novel *a* records the early optimism surrounding amphetamine use among the Mole People, professional amphetamine junkies with the roachlike tendency to congregate in nests. In *Factory Made: Warhol and the Sixties*, Steven Watson describes these subterranean creatures: “One such outcast family, the one most closely connected to the Factory, was referred to as the A-Men, or the Mole People. The first name not only paid homage to their drug of choice but also punned on the Catholic background that many of them shared. The second name, the Mole People, had several associations. ‘We called them Mole People because they only seemed to come out at night,’ said Danny Fields. ‘Their skins were light, and they were very intense.’ It was also a campy put-down—as if they were creatures from the B-horror movie *The Mole People*, released in 1956” (167-168).⁵ Warhol’s *a* documents the habits, attitudes and locutions of this outsider enclave:

(O) Six or eleven. Do you want to

take ’em right now? Oh, you

mean your orange juice?

Stick ’em in the grapefruit juice.

(D) I’ve just four left.

(O) Let me take those little orange

ones.

Don't you want just four or you

want five? They're actually ten.

Five'll be . . . the MINute we

get to Rita's they can be replenished.

She has, she has this little

tiny marble picture (6).⁶

Less euphoric, the *Diaries*, compiled eight years later, invoke a different intensity. In them, cocaine use is reported by Warhol, yet without the sense of delight and wonder present in *a* (perhaps the Controlled Substance Act of 1970 has taken its toll, or perhaps Warhol, no longer taking diet pills, is more of a drug outsider). Ironically, the *Diaries* begin with cocaine renunciation: "Victor Hugo picked me up and we went to the U.N. Plaza for Mrs. Kaiser's dinner for Halston (cab \$3). But then we realized we'd forgotten Bianca so we had to go back to pick her up at the Pierre. Victor gave her some coke but she didn't want it" (Monday, December 13, 1976). As such, Warhol's documentation of drug cultures from the "poke" posse of the Chelsea Hotel in the 60s to the cocaine blizzards at Studio 54 in the 70s and 80s to Jean-Michel Basquiat's rides aboard the white horse in the 80s, constitutes a sociological enterprise committed both to tracking the history of chemicals (old and new substances assume places in a chronology) and to examining one chemical at different points in history (for example, the heroin use of Edie Sedgwick is juxtaposed with the heroin use of Jean Michel Basquiat). The end product of Warhol's meticulous attention to the special class of ingestion represented by drug intake is a body of work in which art and filth interpenetrate one another with no hope of extrication (there simply is no way to remove the speed-freakiness from the voice of Brigid in "The Tingle," or to imagine a cinematic shooting free of shooting up).

Underlying Warhol's preoccupation with drugs is his very genuine passion for documenting the process of ingestion itself; in fact, drugs themselves become no more than a privileged case of ingestion, that paradigm of consumption by which the consumer suffers the delusion of transport. For Ronell, drugs invoke the biological paradigm of esophageal processing: "Where does the experience of eating begin? What of the remains? Are drugs in some way linked to the management of remains? How has the body been drawn into the disposal systems of our technological age?" (63). "Paracomestible" drugs surround and substitute for eating (the skin becomes a port of entry, the nose becomes a mouth).⁷ At times, the magical scene of intoxication takes place at the outer limit of attention, as when a worn-out Gerard Malanga sniffs amyl nitrate at the end of *Vinyl*, though more often than not it takes center stage - as in the amphetamine pokes of Brigid Polk and Ondine in *The Chelsea Girls*, or in descriptions of Liza Minnelli's and Halston's cocaine escapades in the *Diaries*. Wherever such moments occur, someone clearly takes off for another zone of

consciousness, and Warhol is present to make note of the change effected. As such, drugs tie to questions of sublimity, art's prime mode of transport: like the sublime, drugs scramble consciousness, threatening it with annihilation in the form of ego loss. Creating what is for Ronell a "supplementary interiority," drugs, themselves straddling the border between singular and plural, magnify individuality, permitting it to flower in a charmed elsewhere which is still "here." Those who peddle drugs become as famous as those who pop, snort or shoot them: star dealers service a star clientele. Drug dealers become film stars, as when the Sugar Plum Fairy takes a role in 1965's *My Hustler*, or when Brigid Berlin deals drugs on camera during her scene in *The Chelsea Girls* ("I'm peddling my wares on my bicycle..."). Whether we are in the Chelsea Hotel, Studio 54 or Jean-Michel Basquiat's studio, the spectre of privileged (and outlawed) consumption hovers above us, tempting us with the glamour of the *demimonde*, a vogue rooted in closeness to the abject. Couched in secrecy, proximity to scenes of drug intake authenticates Warhol as anthropologist and bad boy. Near drugs, yet somehow impervious to them, Warhol instantly becomes radically chic, a fate not allotted to other contemporary Pop artists. Illegal drugs bestow glamour upon those brave enough to partake of them—and those savvy enough to share their habitats without succumbing to the pitfalls of substance abuse. Those aspiring celebrities courageous enough to flaunt their habits enrapture Warhol with their fragrance, and come down to posterity as a class of exemplary drifters. The Duchess, Edie Sedgwick, Rotten Rita, the Sugar Plum Fairy, Halston, Liza, Victor Hugo, Basquiat: as epistemological object, the druggie is priceless.

Encouraging others to consume what he does not, Warhol becomes a point of gravitation for those fringe-dwellers and stars obsessed with placing their sensoria on purée fulfilling his earlier fantasies of problem-exchange: "When I think of my high school days, all I can remember, really, are the long walks to school, through the Czech ghetto with the babushkas and overalls on the clotheslines, in McKeesport, Pennsylvania. I wasn't amazingly popular, but I had some nice friends. I wasn't very close to anyone, although I guess I wanted to be, because when I would see the kids telling one another their problems, I felt left out" (*Philosophy*, 22). With drugs, Warhol finds a continual source of problems—but no problem himself. Trucking in "narcodollars," Warhol transports the psychological fixation on the intoxicating paracomestible substance into the realm of aesthetics.⁸ Living out a childhood dream of being a problem receptacle, Warhol is able to do so primarily by allying himself with one wild child after another. For though Warhol does self-admittedly take diet pills during the 60s, his use of this substance is sanctioned by both medical and legal communities, and does not rival the more cavalier use made of it by the A-heads. Warhol never becomes an addict. His high does not place him in biological or jurisprudential jeopardy: "Andy knew what he was doing with drugs. He was also very careful to take only what was legal, for as he started to gain notoriety, he knew that he would be a prime target for the police. At the beginning of 1963 he got a prescription for Obetrol, a diet pill that produced a sense of infinitely expanding time without inducing the teeth-grinding verbosity or the awful crash of Dexedrine and many of the other amphetamine pills so easily attainable in the sixties" (Bockris, 132). Even when he does consume a mood-altering substance, the report is couched in the language of contingency: "There was a Halloween party at Studio 54, Stevie kept giving me more drinks and then somebody shoved a Quaalude in my mouth and I was going to shove it to the side but it got stuck and then I drank vodka and it went down and that was a big mistake" (*Diaries*, Monday, October 31, 1977). At one point, Warhol jokingly entertains the notion of becoming

a drug dealer himself: “Everybody gave me Quaaludes and I always accept them because they’re so expensive and I can sell them” (Sunday, April 1, 1979). A consummate lover of money, Warhol can’t help but gasp at the economics of drug ingestion—hence his affection for the junkie debutante epitomized by Brigid Berlin or Edie Sedgwick. Ever at the fringe of the illicit and the improper, Warhol deliberately positions himself at the scene of drug intake where as voyeur he can participate without participating (like his 1985 sculpture at New York City nightclub Area, he is there by not being there).⁹

In Ronell’s analysis, substance addiction in fact echoes the primordial longings of Being, which finds itself located in a thrown “there” that mysteriously becomes desirable (through addiction, Being rearticulates its ontological anomie). Rooted in what Martin Heidegger, in *Being and Time*, terms “the thrownness of Dasein,” drug addiction is a secondary development representing an earlier fluctuation within Being (just as, for Freud, secondary repression grows out of primary repression). Lost in the hallucinatory object, Dasein, or “Being-there,” fails to locate itself in an ever receding time and space (spaciotemporally excessive, it is “on the run,” “ahead of itself”) (41). Anxious, Dasein diverts its attention from care, or *Sorge*, concentrating it instead in the addictive substrate of the world, diminishing its anxiousness through a loss of consciousness. What results is a narcotic drive in league with Thanatos: “In anxiety, Dasein is taken back fully to its sheer uncanniness, and hit with vertigo...But this rush gives Dasein its thrownness as something possible, and as something that can be repeated. However, it gives Dasein repeatability as something that can be taken up in a resolution (*Entschluss*) in Beingtoward-death” (44). Recording the work of this narcotic thrust, Warhol captures the behavior and mores of Mole People, coke fiends and smackheads, beings unto an imminent death. Moreover, if space has been a primary concern for Warhol, then, through the intervention of the druggie, time reveals itself to Warhol as similarly troublesome. A fourth dimension of objects, time follows them like a shadow, revealing a temporal flux in which all consciousness is steeped without hope of extrication. Things are products of a specific temporal order; hence *POPism* and the *Diaries* make note of trends, fads and styles, social data spotlighting the immersion of taste in time.¹⁰ From a phenomenological point of view, what Edmund Husserl termed an internal time-consciousness reveals its workings: somehow, the mind finds a way to represent time as time. The junkie’s contribution to phenomenological analysis comes with the shake-up he effects upon the ITC. Speeding it up, slowing it down, poking a hole in it, the junkie plays with time-consciousness as a way of subverting capitalist time. For Debord, the time of capitalist production becomes one commodity among others: “The time of production, time-as-commodity, is an infinite accumulation of equivalent intervals. It is irreversible time made abstract: each segment must demonstrate by the clock its purely quantitative equality with all other segments. This time represents nothing in its effective reality aside from its *exchangeability*” (Thesis #147). Pseudo-cyclical spectacular time carves out a space for relaxation by reserving some temporal blocks for rejuvenation and play: “In its most advanced sectors, a highly concentrated capitalism has begun selling ‘fully equipped’ blocks of time, each of which is a complete commodity combining a variety of other commodities. This is the logic behind the appearance, within an expanding economy of ‘services’ and leisure activities, of the ‘all-inclusive’ purchase of spectacular forms of housing, of collective pseudo-travel, of participation in cultural consumption and even of sociability itself, in the form of ‘exciting conversations,’ ‘meetings with celebrities’ and suchlike” (Thesis #152). For the junkie, work and play know an alternate relation: (1) his work doesn’t matter, since it is illegal; (2) he works only to play, foraging for drugs on the

charmed space of the street; (3) ultimately, all is play, including even perception itself.

Sabotaging spectacular time, the junkie erects a competing temporal order—for this reason the character of the drug user intrigues workaholic Warhol, whose triumph is to incorporate the druggie’s clock into his literary and cinematic ventures. Following *lumpenproletariat* time—that is, the time of the unproductive, or the counterproductive—the junkie knows only the twisted time of disorientation and ITC implosion. Taking in psychotropic pills, powders and liquids, the drug consumer facilitates poetic reflections on the meaning of time itself. The “sense of expanding time” referred to by Bockris—an intensity experienced first-hand by Andy in the 60s—is the era’s greatest illusion. The euphoric text of *a* demonstrates this sense of expansion. Filled with stutters, run-ons and fractured sentences, it testifies to the amphetamine rush and the work it affects on consciousness. When the Duchess exclaims “A poke, a pole is the, is the biggest, is the most beautiful up there is, is the most, well not intravenously because I was on it for two years, I was on metaamphetamine,” her text veers frantically as she struggles to cram it all into one strain (208). Under these conditions, all that can result is *anacoluthon*, the explosion of one thought into super-numerary cosmic tributaries, each finding its own path, yet never converging. As drugs are administered, perceptions stray. Time no longer rests transparent, but thickens into an opaque quiddity which demands further processing. Treating time as spectacular commodity in keeping with Debord’s remarks, Warhol takes as his object the skewed time of the junkie. Isolating those special cases in which the ITC has been altered by chemical ingestion, Warhol continues the drug narrative tradition begun two centuries earlier by Thomas De Quincey, whose 1821 *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* set the trend for drug narration in motion and marked Romanticism’s preoccupation with chemically-induced liminal states. Like De Quincey, he documents the phenomenal changes effected by psychotropic drugs, giving the drug addict a literary legacy of which he is the impetus and star.¹¹

Miraculation¹²

Drugs represent Warhol’s Romanticism better than any other object or category of experience; placing him close to death, they articulate Warhol’s liaison with the obscene and as such refer to other unsavory inclinations, such as his interest in pornography (as demonstrated by films like *Blow Job* (1963), *Couch* (1964), *Vinyl* (1965), *Bike Boy* (1967) or *Trash* (1970), the cocks he Polaroids, or his 1977 Torso series).¹³ For with drugs comes the potential for overdose, the chance that death might follow ingestion, that privileged intake might produce an untimely exit. Yet if one is able to skirt the dangers afforded by overdose, there is, as in the special case of speed, the mania for performance, the overwhelming desire to act—the perfect counterpoint to the performative and biological zero of overdose. As described by Deleuze and Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus*, drugs perform the important function of turning the junkie into a body without organs—that is, as one in whom all differentials dry up and all that remains is a uniform, undifferentiated field preceding and giving birth to organic difference:

The body without organs is an egg; it is crisscrossed with axes and thresholds, with latitudes

and longitudes and geodesic lines, traversed by *gradients* marking the transitions and becomings, the destinations of the subject developing along these particular vectors. Nothing here is representative; rather, it is all life and lived experience: the actual, lived emotion of having breasts does not resemble breasts, it does not represent them, any more than a predestined zone in the egg resembles the organ that it is going to be stimulated to produce within itself. Nothing but bands of intensity, potentials, thresholds, and gradients. A harrowing, emotionally overwhelming experience, which brings the schizo as close as possible to matter, to a burning, living center of matter (19).

Deterritorialized, the body without organs, or *le CSO*, comes into existence as a sign of ego-loss; the undifferentiated, egglike body also becomes a site of *miraculation*, or magical production coincident with the schizoid experience of being strung out: “An attraction-machine now takes the place, or may take the place, of a repulsion-machine: a miraculating machine succeeding the paranoiac machine” (11).¹⁴ Outside itself, and hence outside normal coordinates of space and time, the junkie-CSO knows no impossibility: all that it dreams achieves instant reality. There is no outside, no exterior, either temporally or spatially: the present moment expands infinitely forward and backward into an actualized future and a present past, while the body’s matter regresses to a magical state of pluripotency. A miracle itself, the organless body knows only immediacy and euphoria.

Warhol “Girlettes” - Jackie Curtis, Holly Woodlawn and Candy Darling, among others, all become miraculating machines, conduits for the magical, metaleptic process of glamour production, as demonstrated by Woodlawn’s reports of Curtis’ drive to be a star in her *A Low Life in High Heels*: “‘If you don’t dress right, Curtis, you’ll never get on TV,’ warned Jackie’s mother. ‘But I do dress right,’ defended Curtis. ‘People try to copy me, they really do.’ ‘Oh, Curtis, please,’ the mother said. ‘What are you going to do with your life?’ ‘Listen, Ma,’ Curtis barked. ‘What are you going to say when I win the Oscar?’ ‘Nothing’” (77).¹⁵ As miraculating machine, the body of Jackie Curtis transcends its existence as mere “ambulatory archive” of female poses, since through the chemical pep of speed it becomes an actual female body, at least from its vantage point as CSO.¹⁶ Documenting the process of miraculation, and thereby miraculating his own dreams of fame and glamour, Warhol directs his gaze toward those individuals in whom drugs produce the schizoid state necessary for both ego dissolution and aggrandizement—hence the attention he gives to a tripped-out Eric Emerson in *The Chelsea Girls*, preserving his delusional monologue for posterity as social relic and miracle:

And Eric’s reel is the most retarded of them all, though also the most ecstatic. He undulates, by himself, while colored lights play over a body—his own—that he finds supremely desirable, sufficient unto the day: “Do you ever groove on your own body?” he asks, rhetorically. He speaks for himself and to himself, but he is also speaking to Andy the filmmaker, and may be speaking *for* Andy, especially when he says, “Sometimes I hate to be touched.” Eric is saturated with sensation but also seems afloat in a sensory deprivation tank: “I can’t see a thing, except me—that’s all there is to see, as far as I’m concerned” (Koestenbaum, 124).

Existing at that strange vantage point from which ego becomes all and nothing, Emerson dramatizes the schizoid's transcendence of the law of contradiction itself. Set against a reel in which various colors are projected onto cast members, Eric's trip highlights the fact that, for Warhol, everybody is a screen, except the body without organs, which resists outside projection through its own manic maneuvering. Giving way only to its own projections, the CSO uses its surface to project personal fantasies of magical production much in the way that, for the Freud of *The Ego and the Id*, the ego represents a corporeal projection in its own right.¹⁷ Warhol's unwavering attention to miraculating machines like Eric Emerson or Jackie Curtis of course underscores his own skewed relationship to celebrity, the twist being that documenting the trips, hallucinations and psychotic episodes of his coterie bring him fame proper, while burdening the drug users in his vicinity with the dubious psychoanalytic celebrity reserved for the case study. Taking their place beside Little Hans, the Wolf Man, Dora and the Rat Man, Eric Emerson, Jackie Curtis and others become perpetual oddities and objects of curiosity. Famous for being "off," they present their schizoid pleasures to the public, whose appetite for freaks ensures their place in history.

Yet in terms of *The Chelsea Girls*, the best example of miraculation comes not with Eric's disembodied conversation with himself, but with Ondine's transformation into Pope Ondine. While at first it appears that papal ascendancy might be purely performative for Ondine, *né* Bob Olivo, a nasty battle with penitent Rona Page ensures that another schizoid delusion has been taken literally: Ondine *is* the Pope, and don't forget it! Reassuring us that there are no roles in *Chelsea Girls*, that what you see is what you get (the business acronym would be WYSIWYG), Ondine throws the tantrum to end all tantrums when he feels that his performance has been read as virtual, not actual. While in Reel 2, shown coincidentally with a reel of Nico trimming her bangs in the presence of Eric Emerson and her son Ari, we witness Ondine's succor of Ingrid Superstar as he observes her confession and dispenses expert advice (Reel 1), in Reel 11, shown coincidentally with a reel of Nico crying (Reel 12), we see Ondine run amok with crazed anger at a disbelieving parishioner who has dared question his authority and authenticity. Out of the loop, she has forgotten that the characters in the film are not acting, that the point of *Chelsea Girls* is to present reality, not to simulate it. When Rona Page, supposedly "in character," yet fast leaping out of it, makes the *faux pas* of intimating that Ondine is not the real Pope, all hell breaks loose. Throwing Coca-Cola violently in her face, Ondine defends his Popedom with the nastiness and vehemence appropriate to one whose mortality has been threatened: "Who are you supposed to be? Little Miss Wonder?" Berating her as a "bitch," "cunt" and "whore," Ondine beats her mercilessly, obviously breaking character and forcing her to do the same. Performing no small miracle, Warhol has created a social chain reaction producing the real from the simulated; erupting onto the screen, reality puts its grit and grime on display. Stephen Koch describes the scene in more vivid detail:

"Well, let me tell you something, my dear little Miss Phony. You're a phony. You're a disgusting phony. May god forgive you." And Ondine slaps her again, more violently, then leaps up in a paroxysmic rage. With his open hands he begins to strike the cowering bewildered girl around the head and shoulders. "You Goddamned phony, get the hell off this set. Get out..." "Stop it," she says. "Stop it. Don't touch me." She is unable to move, but her voice is, as last, authentic. Ondine rages on. "How dare you call me a phony? Little Miss Phony, you

disgusting fool,” he begins to strike her again. She leaps up and runs (95-96).

As Deleuze and Guattari point out, the schizoid knows no representation or simulation: for this boundary creature, all attains the status of reality. Living at “that unbearable point where the mind touches matter and lives its every intensity, consumes it,” the miraculating machine actualizes every conceivable possibility (Deleuze and Guattari, 20). From its vantage point, nothing is phony, and any assertion of the world as phony will produce the requisite outburst—an overflow or *bornage* rooted in self-preservation. In light of Deleuze’s and Guattari’s plans for an anti-Oedipal, de-territorialized project, the rabidity of Ondine’s outburst alludes to far more than postmodern debates surrounding any crisis in authenticity or collapse of the legitimizing metanarrative. Rather, Ondine acts out because, from his sped-up perspective, he truly is the Pope and must be respected as such.

Another drug fiend commanding respect both in *The Chelsea Girls* and in Factory life in the 1960s is Brigid Polk, Pop’s famous Duchess. Like Ondine, she too occupies a major role in the film, catapulting Warhol into the limelight with her camera-friendly junkie behavior. Most importantly, unlike so many of Warhol’s beloved addicts, she will not miraculate, displaying little interest in generating glamour or in attaining the insane levels of notoriety craved by so many members of the Warhol entourage—hence her dislike of so many Warhol ingénues and protocelebs, as when, in *Chelsea Girls*, she relays to Ingrid Superstar, “I hate movies. The Underground is not my scene.” In *Chelsea Girls*, and in her off-screen life, the Duchess refuses the role of miraculating machine, focusing instead on pushing pills, poking girls with needles and holding court for Ingrid Superstar (and others). No transformation is effected by what passes into her system—no psychological trick convinces her that she has become another entity, or that she will, through the magic of chemical alteration, metamorphose into a larger-than-life fashion creature. Though referred to as “Duchess” by Ingrid Superstar in the film, the nickname makes perfect sense, since Brigid truly is “royal” in her own right: publishing tycoons for the Hearst empire, her parents are loaded, and she qualifies both as heiress and debutante (as well as, to use the later language of the Area crowd in the 80s, celebutante).¹⁸ Thus while Ondine’s claim of Popedom is clearly the product of magical thinking, Brigid’s acceptance of the Duchess role finds its basis in socioeconomic fact. Her other nickname with the Warhol crowd, Brigid Polk, also demonstrates a refusal of miraculation, referring not to some mysterious transformatory process, but rather to a simple act: the amphetamine poke. If her first sobriquet, “Duchess” functions as a riff on her riches, then the second, “Brigid Polk,” uses the coyness of the homonym to indicate her identification with skin-popping.¹⁹ For Brigid does not merely receive pokes, but, along with Pope Ondine, gives them: she too is a center of generosity, a bearer of gifts.²⁰ Yet unlike Ondine, the injections she bequeaths upon the faithful in her entourage do not cause her to glamourize her role. Antithesis to Ondine’s extravagance, Brigid’s pragmatism does not entail a papal transformation. While he assumes the role of spiritual guru, she selects the more grounded persona of “poker.” For Brigid, pokes are not miraculous, nor do they precipitate mystical events: pokes are pokes.

As pragmatic entity, the Duchess comes across as no more than a shrewd businesswoman. When compared with the film’s other stars, such as a blathering Eric Emerson, an abusive Mary Woronov or a pussy-whipped Gerard Malanga, she appears under the guise of the Reality Principle.²¹ As we watch the Duchess

in action, we learn the ins and outs of drug dealing, including a new vocabulary and onomastics. “I’m gonna call Dropout now,” she announces, then, slightly later, “I moved my stash out of the air conditioner and Dropout took it.” Speaking street-jive, the Duchess, street creature herself, leads her audience through the workings of a subaltern, criminal order. Like Hanoi Hannah in the film’s Reels 5 and 6, Brigid dominates those around her, who have no choice but to obey her every word: neither she nor Hannah take no for an answer, subjugating all within reach.²² “Getting all the bubbles out,” the Duchess prepares a poke for Ingrid, who nervously interrogates, “What are you gonna do with me?” Yet the Duchess is not solely a supplier of ups: downs are hers to give as well. “Want a downer?,” she asks Ingrid just after administering intravenous meth, implying the existence of a chemical rollercoaster available to all. “I need a pill. Where’s my down bag?” she inquires, making it clear that ups and downs are stored separately, that each inhabits its own niche, and that the Duchess has access to both worlds—an access she is more than willing to share. Silver, the color so dear to Warhol, takes on a new tenor here, as Brigid connects it specifically with the storage of amphetamines in aluminum foil: “...one little silver packet under my pillow,” she coos. When Brigid points to some aluminum foil and makes the assertion “This is where it all started,” she both assumes ownership of the Factory look while rooting that look in the drug experience.²³ Unlike other cast members, only Brigid pulls Warhol directly into the fray. Warhol figures negatively into her life as poke-giver: “This is why I don’t go around the Factory—Andy’s paranoid about me and my drugs.” Claiming his *argentomania* and underscoring his hypocrisy with regard to substance abuse, she forces Warhol to appear. When Ingrid asks Brigid, “You really like to destroy people, don’t you?,” the question could be directed to Andy himself, pointing to Brigid’s existence as Warhol double (and making sense of the special form of disdain and love Warhol reserves for her alone). Rattling off a catalogue of pills and their respective colors, the Duchess seems to offer a cornucopia of sensation. Codeine, Morphine, Demerol: the contents of her Down Bag promise a panoply of colors and a variety of cerebral states, while also alluding to the experience of pain. When she claims “I only have ten more for the night,” it becomes apparent that the Duchess will soon be out foraging for more pills, riding her famous bicycle through the West Village. Implying a continuum, the druggie’s pills come one after the other without interruption like so many Campbell’s Soup cans. A paradigmatic example of serial reproduction, pills and aluminum packets multiply promiscuously, comprising a mathematically infinite series.

While *The Chelsea Girls* reveals the Duchess as non-miraculating, the best description of her pragmatism comes at the conclusion of Mary Woronov’s *Swimming Underground*, when the Duchess’ body-image is at stake (in fact, its stability precipitates Woronov’s exit from the Underground).²⁴ Furious at the Duchess for arranging to have best friend and roommate Jane strung out on heroin through a mutual acquaintance named Crocodile (or the Cockadial, as Jane calls him), Woronov seeks to destroy Brigid: “The minute he [Woronov’s dealer] was gone I went to his refrigerator, which was stuffed with little aluminum packets. I got down on my knees and whispered, ‘Please, God, you fucking monster, take whatever you want, but give me one last fuckin’ crack at the Duchess. Just let me see her again, I’m begging you, you prick’” (219). Discovering from Ingrid that Brigid and Andy are lunching at Rockefeller Plaza, Woronov devours the refrigerator’s amphetamine contents and marches across town to raise a ruckus. What she encounters stuns her: though morbidly obese, the Duchess demonstrates more physical grace than even a svelte vixen like International Velvet or any of Warhol’s other “Big Babies” could have hoped to muster.²⁵ Space is

no mystery to Brigid, who hasn't the slightest difficulty cutting through it while balanced precariously on blades:

They were easy to spot; it was after lunch and no one else was there. Andy sat ringside at a table with a pink tablecloth, applauding and laughing over his seafood salad, while the Duchess skated by him, as graceful as a little killer whale. I couldn't believe it. She wasn't just good, she was show class, skating beautifully—backwards, figures, dives, leaps—her great form balanced effortlessly and swooping past me in perfect circles. I couldn't hate her, she was too good; instead I felt condemned, the victim of my own brutal search, when the oddest thing happened. I vanished. I was screaming like an enraged Lucifer but nobody heard, and while Andy ignored me and the Duchess stared straight through me, I was dragged by the attendant out of the icy white ring of heaven (220).

Rooted firmly in her own body, the Duchess knows only the miracle of existence, the incredible thickness of reality. Unlike Ondine, she has no need of taking off for an outer space of alternate identities; as Duchess, she finds her end internally, and thus surprises with sudden bursts of grace and *savoir faire*. Brigid Polk knows her body intimately, and so she is able to use her body-image to perform complicated physical tricks—a shocker, when one considers that Warhol junkie-stars generally end up possessing the least amount of influence over their physical destinies. Never falling prey to the dual traps of miraculation or overdose, the Duchess skates by both pitfalls. Outside Ondine's heaven and Edie Sedgwick's sleep, Brigid Berlin comes off as the strangest of Warhol's junkies—strange by virtue of her incredible ability to survive and to retain grace in a vortex of instability and volatility.²⁶

Narcosis

If uppers like speed and cocaine cause their user to condense into a single performative point, then opiates like heroin and downers like barbiturates and sleeping pills lead their consumers to the existential edge separating life from death. Thus Jean-Michel Basquiat continually falls asleep throughout the *Diaries*: opiates produce narcolepsy, poisoning him at the brink of life and death. Carrying one away from pure performativity and egomania, heroin inspires sleep, pushing its user in the direction of the vegetative. The hypnagogic state induced by opiates and the collapse following barbiturate ingestion initiate a hallucinatory streaming which is a prelude to mortal end—the disembodiment and disorientation produced by opiate and downer ingestion wed the dream and the dreamer to death, causing the heroin and sleeping pill user to walk the thinnest line possible between existence and nonentity. As such, “sleep” functions as an important trope for Warhol: while one class of junkies never experience slumber, another slips into an unconsciousness from which it might never emerge. Consequently, sleep becomes a Factory in-joke, achieving its maximum resonance when in 1963 Warhol makes poet and boyfriend John Giorno the star of his first full-length silent film *Sleep*.²⁷ According to Warhol in *POPism*, while the film would be read by Factory outsiders as no more than a visual ode to semiconsciousness, it would be more correctly read

by insiders as an elaborate drug joke:

I could never finally figure out if more things happened in the sixties because there was more awake time for them to happen in (since so many people were on amphetamine), or if people started taking amphetamine because there were so many things to do that they needed to have more awake time to do them in. It was probably both...I only slept two or three hours a night from '65 through '67, but I used to see people who hadn't slept for days at a time and they'd say things like "I'm hitting my ninth day and it's glorious!"...

Seeing everybody so up all the time made me think that sleep was becoming pretty obsolete, so I decided I'd better quickly do a movie of a person sleeping ("1960-1963," 33).

Thus although even Warhol allies the film with the world of the speed freak, a more sinister reading of the film places it closer to the heroin and prescription medication user's domain, where sleep is not so much a reference to the obsolescent as a mortal threat. Unlike the amphetamine poke, which expands, projects and rejuvenates, the heroin poke and the digested Demerol slow, arrest and enervate.

Interested in muteness and silence, Warhol quite deliberately casts his gaze in the direction of heroin users Edie Sedgwick and Jean-Michel Basquiat, who for him contrast significantly with upper aficionados like the Duchess, Ondine or Liza Minnelli.²⁸ In a chapter aptly entitled "Stillness," Stephen Koch traces out the implications of Warhol's attachment to the unspeakable: "Such is the allure of Warhol to the critical mind, the intuition that his silence is—or was—connected to something that a good critical work-over would make speak. I'm convinced that Warhol has a theme—indeed, one of his grand Themes—from which all his important work grows. And I think that by now we have descended through enough circles of perception to name it flat out, without orotund hysteria of further hermeneutical flower picking. The theme is death. Death" (133). Placing himself in the creative vicinity of those individuals who push their physical limits in an open courtship of death, Warhol sets up camp on a biological abyss. To approach death is to transcend anxieties of exchange, to defer infinitely the question of acquisition. Seen in this context, the *Giorno of Sleep* is riveting because he has gone beyond exchange, regressing it to its most basic formulation: the lungs' metabolic and automatic swapping of oxygen for carbon dioxide. On the subject of death, Warhol is reticent; *Philosophy's* "Death" chapter promises to be "all about it," yet delivers only the words "I'm so sorry to hear about it. I just thought that things were magic and that it would never happen," and "I don't believe in it, because you're not around to know that it's happened. I can't say anything because I'm not prepared for it" (121-123). Master of vicariousness, Warhol lets others die for him. Even the near-death experience inspires him, as in Billy Name's overdose and Warhol's shooting by Valerie Solanas.²⁹ Death constitutes Warhol's prime limit, the asymptote he bumps up against through the actions of others, some of whom cross the threshold, making his art even hipper through the glamour of their departure. Watching *Giorno sleep*, we experience the catharsis of mortality, witnessing the liminal state represented by somnolence. Whether we haven't slept in a month or have just woken up from a heroin coma, the film speaks to our trip.

Youthquaker Edie Sedgwick represents Warhol's first important overdose. Although by the time death claims her she has left Warhol's orbit and returned to her family's home in Santa Barbara, California, her demise by barbiturate overdose cannot shed its affiliation with Warhol, who is blamed for it by Factory insiders and outsiders alike—this despite the fact that she had severed ties with him of her own accord by the time of her death. Even *Chelsea Girls* star Marie Mencken erupts in anger after Edie overdoses, as her words on an envelope in Time Capsule -17 chillingly proclaim: “You made her take the needle she says...SOB! Bastard—Cock!...Blow your bra(ins) out...See what you have done to our Edie! Creep.”³⁰ Jean Stein's *Edie: An American Biography* presents Warhol's response to Edie's death as surprisingly disconnected. The words of Bruce Williamson reveal Warhol's coldness regarding his most important protégée and double:

Brigid told Andy that Edie had suffocated, and Andy asked *when*, not sounding particularly surprised or shaken. But then, that's Andy. Brigid pointed out to him that Edie hadn't died of drugs, she had suffocated in her sleep. And Andy asked how she could do a thing like that. Brigid didn't know. Then Andy asked whether *he* would inherit all the money. (I took the *he* as a reference to Edie's young husband at the time of Edie's death.) Brigid said that Edie didn't have any money. Then, after a pause, Andy continued with something like, Well, what have *you* been doing? Then Brigid started talking about going to the dentist (Stein, 342).³¹

Even beyond Warhol's obliviousness to Edie's demise, the question of who made whom plagues Warhol. Did Andy make Edie? Did Edie make Andy? Whose fame is primary? Poet René Ricard is especially pointed on Edie's priority in *Edie*: “Edie brought Andy out. She turned him on to the real world. He'd been in the demimonde. He was an *arriviste*. And Edie legitimized him, didn't she? He never went to those parties before she took him. He'd be the first to admit it” (152).³² Whether or not Warhol's engagement of Edie intensified her drug addiction, her death taints his work with death's odor. Staining Warhol, Edie's barbiturate-infused exit serves as a sign of the dangers he and his art skirt—dangers that survive the 60s, continuing into drug scenes of the 70s and 80s. Henry Geldzhaler, curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Twentieth Century Art and one-time Commissioner of Cultural Affairs for the City of New York, connects Warhol's destruction of Edie with his ruination of *My Hustler* star Paul America: “Paul America was a wasted creature after they had finished with him. They finally washed their hands of him and let him float away. He's a poor burned-out thing living in a commune in Indiana and trying to pull himself together” (*Edie*, 176-177). Like Mr. America, Edie, a veritable Miss America (after all, hers is an “American” biography), cannot pull herself together, leaving the Factory a total mess as she wafts away toward an uncertain horizon.

Emulating the workings of Hollywood, Warhol becomes a center of attraction for New York City's lunatic fringe. Seeking out those people living on a neural precipice, Warhol takes in one fragile ego after another, making matters worse by magically transforming them into superstars and making them feel momentarily gratified. Under such circumstances, withdrawing his attention has the deleterious effect of shattering a bloated ego erected upon an insecure foundation. In the case of Edie, her replacement by Ingrid Superstar is the cataclysmic event. Ricard tells a story also relayed by Woronov:

The Warhol people felt Edie was giving them trouble—they were furious with her because she wasn't cooperating. So they went to a Forty-second street bar and found Ingrid von Schefflin. They had noticed: "Doesn't this girl look like an ugly Edie? Let's really teach Edie a lesson. Let's make a movie with her and tell Edie she's the big new star." They cut her hair like Edie's. They made her up like Edie. Her name became Ingrid Superstar...just an invention to make Edie feel horrible (*Edie*, 227).

Excising Edie from *The Chelsea Girls* and replacing her reel with one of Nico crying, Warhol deflates her ego, removing her from the limelight and ending her worldhistoricity. Holly Woodlawn voices the anxiety experienced by Edie and others—an anxiety based upon the radical instability of Factory celebrity: "Finally, I came to realize the ugly truth behind my popularity. These party people weren't interested in me as a person...I was a conversation piece; a curious bauble on display. I felt used by them because I was a good laugh or something to talk about. I felt like a joke and it hurt" (181). Edie feels like the same species of sight gag. Over cocktails at the Russian Tea Room, Edie confesses her fears in the wake of a proposed Edie Retrospective: "Everybody in New York is laughing at me...I'm too embarrassed to leave my apartment. These movies are making a complete fool of me! Everybody knows I just stand around doing nothing and what kind of talent is that?" (Bockris, 173). Frail creatures, Edie and other Warhol stars suffer the fate of being elevated, then dropped. When Andy ponders, "I wonder if Edie will commit suicide. I hope she lets me know so I can film it," his words come as prophetic (Bockris, 178). Flopping out in a swimming pool on her mother's estate, Edie ends her life both miraculating past glamour (she fantasizes about phone conversations with *Vogue* editors) and plunging into a narcotic pit from which there is no return.³³

Unlike Edie, Jean-Michel Basquiat does much more than stand around vapidly—although Warhol does indicate that his fame is built upon the automatic repetition of a pose, as when, in the *Diaries*, he comments: "Bruno just called—at the Christie's auction Jean Michel's painting went for \$20,000. I think he's going to be the Big Black Painter. It was one of his sort of big paintings. I think Jean-Michel's early stuff is sort of better, because then he was just painting, and now he has to think about stuff to paint to sell. And how many screaming Negroes can you do? Well, I guess you can do them forever, but..." (Wednesday, October 31, 1984).³⁴ Through Basquiat, heroin becomes associated with inspiration: "Jean Michel called three or four times, he'd been taking smack. Bruno came by and saw a painting that Jean Michel wasn't finished with yet, and he said, 'I want it, I want it,' and so he gave him money and took it, and I felt funny, because nobody's done that for me in so long" (Wednesday, October 3, 1984).³⁵ Letting heroin lead him, Basquiat makes it a crucial part of the productive process: "Jean-Michel was painting back in the images he'd painted out when he was on smack and he came up with some masterpieces" (Sunday, November 4, 1984). Heroin refers to a history of abuse: "He got a hole in his nose and he couldn't do coke anymore, and he wanted to still be on something, I guess. I guess he wants to be the youngest artist to go" (Wednesday, May 18, 1983). Though Basquiat does not overdose until 1988, his collaboration with Warhol is fueled by his association with heroin; like so many stars intersecting his path, Basquiat is the junkie-of-the moment. Basquiat himself indicates the knowledgeproducing capacity of drugs: "He's not even a drug addict—how can he write a book? About *what?*" asks Basquiat, upon discovering that his father has fancied himself a

writer (Thursday, November 27, 1986). The special knowledge provided by the drug experience entices Warhol, causing him to affiliate himself with one junkie after another. Perhaps they *do* know something, after all!

If Liza is the *Diaries*' coke star, then Basquiat is their junk star. Saturated with smack, Basquiat becomes their indecent "Big Black" insider, even bigger and blacker than Grace Jones, who also functions as subversive center by virtue of her racial and sexual alterity. With Basquiat, Warhol veers away from earlier, more cavalier attitudes toward drug use, since he seems to wish genuinely that Basquiat would clean up his act: "Jean-Michel called, back from the Ivory Coast. He said they sell meat with four million flies on it—they cut off a piece and just sell it with the flies. He sounded normal, like he was off drugs and missing old times, he wants to do prints together" (Tuesday, October 31, 1986). Linking "on drugs" with not wanting to collaborate, Warhol indicates that heroin had played a role in the emergence of more distant "new times." The period following their 1985 joint show at Tony Shafrazi left Basquiat with the feeling that Warhol had used him to sustain a faltering career as painter, the space between them multiplied. When *The New York Times* identified Basquiat as Warhol's "mascot," Basquiat receded. In his Sunday, November 24, 1985 diary entry, a jilted Warhol complains, "Jean-Michel hasn't called me in a month, so I guess it's really over," giving credence to ex-girlfriend Paige Powell's assertion that Warhol is Basquiat's lover.³⁶ In keeping with other famous Warhol addicts, like Sedgwick or the Duchess, amorous overtones permeate their relationship, as when Warhol gives Jean-Michel a Come painting, or when the two swap hair follicles.³⁷ With Basquiat, Warhol speaks the language of love. Warhol even subjects Basquiat to a symbolic golden shower, producing a Piss Painting in his image (*Jean-Michel Basquiat*, 1982). In *Unseen Warhol*, Basquiat's father Gerard describes the painting: "Jean-Michel brought the portrait Andy had painted of him to my house. I said, 'What are all those strange, green dots?' He then told me the story about Andy having people piss on the wet copper paint to get that effect. We laughed about that" (106). Pissing on Basquiat and on his other addicts, Warhol showcases and toys with the drug narrative, whose protagonists influence him for three decades.

Jean-Michel Basquiat is Andy Warhol's last junkie. Closing out a rollicking series beginning with Warhol's earliest amphetamine coterie, Basquiat represents the final installment in the Pop drug narrative. Nodding off, Basquiat's sleeps adumbrate his eventual heroin overdose. Both brilliant and braindead, Basquiat becomes the true genius of the late *Diaries*: "Jean-Michel came over to the office to paint but fell asleep on the floor. He looked like a bum lying there. But I woke him up and he did two masterpieces that were great" (Tuesday, October 2, 1984). Within this context, *Sleep* continues to generate shockwaves. Like John Giorno, Basquiat might slip into REM; unlike him, he might never awaken, as history will eventually prove. Mixing a non-miraculating performativity, having less to do with the energies and talent of either the A-heads or Les Girlettes, with an unpredictable tendency to slip into semiconsciousness at the drop of a hat, Basquiat owns a celebrity which his drug habits do not eclipse, but rather enrich. Literally a product of the street, NYC's most important second-generation Pop artist dies a death commensurable with the myth of the burnout. Along with Edie, he persists as caveat to drug euphoria. For while Liza and Halston have a blast with cocaine, and while even the Factory A-heads whoop up skin- and pill-popping, Jean-Michel and Edie are characters in a darker story. That Warhol should have experienced such close and complicated

relationships with the pair is not a factor of his status as master exploiter. Rather, his affinity with them is the outgrowth of a deep and abiding infatuation with those individuals who actively seek out the limit situation and throw themselves into it without a care in the world. Terrified of death, Warhol preserves his own precious mortality by letting them toy with their own. Such consumption is toxic—yet heavenly.

Bibliography

Bockris, Victor. *The Life and Death of Andy Warhol*. New York: Bantam Books, 1989.

Debord, Guy. *The Society of the Spectacle*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books, 1995.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari, Felix. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

de Quincey, Thomas. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. London: Penguin, 1986.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Ego and the Id*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1962.

Frizelle. "Fatty Acid." *WWD (Women's Wear Daily)*: July 16, 1971. Time Capsule 7.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Haden-Guest, Anthony. *The Last Party: Studio 54, Disco, and the Culture of the Night*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1997.

Husserl, Edmund. *Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness*. Trans. James S. Churchill. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969.

Koch, Stephen. *Stargazer: The Life, World and Films of Andy Warhol*. New York: Marion Boyars, 1991.

Koestenbaum, Wayne. *Andy Warhol: A Penguin Life*. New York: Viking Press, 2001.

Kramer, Margie. *Andy Warhol Et Al: The FBI File on Andy Warhol*. New York: Unsub Press, 1988.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Paul Kegan. London: Routledge Classics, 2002.

O'Connor, John and Liu, Benjamin. *Unseen Warhol*. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1996.

Ronell, Avital. *Crack Wars: Literature Addiction Mania*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Shreber, Daniel Paul. *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness*. Trans. Ida Macalpine and Richard A. Hunter. New York: New York Review Books, 2000.

“Skinny the Only In Thing? Fat Chance.” *L.A. Times*: July 1, 1971. Time Capsule 7.

Stein, Jean. *Eddie: An American Biography*. New York: Dell, 1982.

Warhol, Andy. *THE Philosophy of Andy Warhol (From A to B and Back Again)*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1975.

_____. *a, a novel*. New York: Grove Press, 1998.

Warhol, Andy and Hackett, Pat. *POPism: The Warhol Sixties*. New York: Harcourt Brace Johanovich, 1980.

_____. *Andy Warhol's Party Book*. New York: Crown Publishing, 1988.

_____. *The Warhol Diaries*. New York: Warner Books, 1989.

Watson, Steven. *Factory Made: Warhol and the Sixties*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2003.

Woodlawn, Holly, with Copeland, Jeff. *A Low Life in High Heels*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Letters

Envelope from Marie Mencken to Andy Warhol. Time Capsule -17.

Filmography

Morrisey, Paul. *Trash*, 1970.

_____. *Heat*, 1972.

_____. *Women in Revolt*, 1972.

Schnabel, Julian. *Basquiat*. Miramax, 1996.

Warhol, Andy. *Kiss*, 1963.

_____. *Sleep*, 1963.

_____. *Blow-Job*, 1963.

_____. *Couch*, 1964.

_____. *Vinyl*, 1965.

_____. *The Chelsea Girls*, 1966.

_____. *Bike Boy*, 1967.

Waters, John. *Female Trouble*. New Line Cinema, 1972.

Weisman, David, and Palmer, David. *Ciao! Manhattan*. Pacific Arts, 1972.

Notes

¹ While Brigid Berlin continues to exert a crucial influence on Warhol's work in the 70s and 80s—for example, *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol*, as detailed by Bob Colacello in the chapter “Paris (and *Philosophy*)”—her street cred. fades as the amphetamine abuse of the early Factory finds itself eclipsed by the cocaine orgies of the disco-era beautiful people. Speed loses its world-historicity as newer drugs take the top spot, and thus Brigid's entertainment value diminishes. Furthermore, Warhol is particularly nasty to her at various points throughout his *Diaries*, especially those passages in which he tracks her weight: “Brigid Polk...called and said she's down to 197. Ever since she saw herself in *Bad*...weighing 300 pounds and went on a diet, she's so boring to talk to—she never *does* anything, she just *lies* there in bed in her room at the George Washington Hotel and waits for the fat to roll off. I told her I'll give her a job—that she could let some roll off around the Factory while she answers phones, but she won't. It's taken her thirty-nine years to lose weight and it'll probably take her another thirty-nine years to get work” (Sunday, November 28, 1976). As the *Diaries* close, Warhol even jokingly prepares to fire her: “Oh, and Brigid *is* at the English fat farm and she's going to be fired when she gets back. I'll give her a pink slip, I'll give her *dogs* pink slips—Fame and Fortune will be fired!” (Tuesday, February 17, 1987).

² Regarding the law and its glare, Warhol's affiliation with various NYC “low-lifes” alerted the FBI, which kept close tabs on the habits of the Warhol entourage. See Margie Kramer's *Andy Warhol Et Al: The FBI*

File on Andy Warhol (New York: Unsub Press, 1988). De-bracketing the secret actions of, for example, the A-heads, Warhol placed their styles of consumption on display, thereby exposing himself and others to danger. See also Anthony Haden-Guest's *The Last Party: Studio 54, Disco, and the Culture of the Night* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1997) for Warhol's response to Steve Rubell's having surrendered information about the cocaine use of Studio 54 patrons to the U.S. government: "The reaction of Steve Rubell's host of friends to the melting away of his money, his drugs, his power, was interesting. It was true that some had actually been upset about the Cocaine Favors List. Diane von Furstenburg, for instance, and Andy Warhol (who usually in his diaries refers to Rubell as 'Stevie' before prison and 'Stephen' after)" (197-198). While Haden-Guest is not entirely accurate with regard to Warhol's shift in attitude toward Rubell, he is correct in his assertion that Rubell's "narking" posed problems for Warhol and his circle.

³ "If the literature of electronic culture can be located in the works of Philip K. Dick or William Gibson, in the imaginings of a cyberpunk projection, or a reserve of virtual reality, then it is probable that electronic culture shares a crucial project with drug culture. This project should be understood in Jean-Luc Nancy's and Blanchot's sense of *désœuvrement*—a project without an end or program, an unworking that nevertheless occurs, and whose contours we can begin to read" (Ronell, 68).

⁴ For Warhol, "chemicals" also refer to neurotransmitters: "The symptom of love is when some of the chemicals inside you go bad. So there must be something in love because your chemicals do tell you something," for example (*Philosophy*, 47), or, "I think I'm missing some chemicals and that's why I have the tendency to be more of a—mama's boy. A—sissy. No, a mama's boy. A 'butterboy.' I think I'm missing some responsibility chemicals and some reproductive chemicals" (*Philosophy*, 111). Like drugs, chemicals are interesting in and of their tropic potency. "Chemicals" relate to "problems": "But when I was eighteen a friend stuffed me into a Kroger's shopping bag and took me to New York. I still wanted to be close with people. I kept living with roommates thinking we could become good friends and share problems, but I'd always find out they were just interested in another person sharing the rent" (*Philosophy*, 22). Both problems and chemicals necessitate exchange, and as such interest Warhol, whom the *quid pro quo* never ceases to entrance.

⁵ According to Watson (New York: Pantheon Books, 2003), the Mole People can be contrasted with two competing drug groups, the Street People (homeless users) and the Pod People (users with pads, or pods). Watson defines "nests" as follows: "Nests: the living quarters for people on amphetamines, often small and housing a few dozen people" (169).

⁶ Throughout this passage, I have preserved the typography of *a* in order to give an accurate picture of its look. The book's basic pattern is double columns of text interspersed with more regular pages. Each page is flanked by an italicized blip; in the instance of the quote provided, the quote is *I go under like a wonderful third time*. It refers to the ecstasy of the Obetrol high: "That's a hundred milligrams, like pure gaiety" (7), muses Ondine.

⁷ “As that which can swallow and throw up—naturally or artificially—the body rigorously engages the dynamics of becoming, surpassing itself without reducing itself to a passageway. These observations in fact model age-old concerns whose subscription to thought has been renewed by the way drugs negotiate the paracomestible substance” (Ronell, 64). Surrounding and substituting for ingestion, drugs achieve paracomestibility through their function as meal replacement, appetite suppressant, absorbed foodstuff.

⁸ “What goes hand in hand with her [Emma Bovary’s] decline is a kind of crash economy, an exorbitant expenditure with no reserve: we call this ‘narcodollars’” (Ronell, 109). Unlike Emma Bovary, Warhol does not spend his own narcodollars, but manages the expenditures of others. In this sense, he qualifies as a sort of stockbroker.

⁹ “Andy Warhol did an elegant piece, which has been inadequately documented, for understandable reasons. It was a sculpture that wasn’t there. He was given an alcove and if he was in the club, he might stand in it for a bit. Otherwise it was an invisible sculpture” (Haden-Guest, 266-267).

¹⁰ See Edmund Husserl’s *The Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969). For Husserl, the problem of time is a problem of the consciousness of time: how is it exactly that the human subject is able to perceive temporal flux as temporal flux in the lived experience of time? “We can only say that this flux is something which we name in conformity with what is constituted, but it is nothing temporally ‘Objective.’ It is absolute subjectivity and has the absolute properties of something to be denoted metaphysically as ‘flux,’ as a point of actuality, primal sourcepoint, that from which springs the ‘now,’ and so on” (100). Husserl’s most fundamental point is that even the now-point involves recollection, retention and protention: time-consciousness is generated by a complicated relation among what is phenomenally given and what the mind can remember (that a melody can be perceived as a whole, despite the fact that each note immediately passes, points to the work of the internal time-consciousness).

¹¹ See Thomas De Quincey’s *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* (London: Penguin Classics, 1986). Obsessed with his own psychic transformations as the drug opium, in the tinctured form laudanum, floods his system, De Quincey makes the drug narrative central to Romanticism, packaging it for other eras and epochs.

¹² For Deleuze and Guattari, miraculation is that process by which the schizoid subject overflows its own bounds and, reversing the process of gastrulation, acquires a lost pluripotency: literally, the schizoid subject can be anything. Reborn as a miracle, the schizo, modeled after Judge Shreber, becomes a divine plaything through whose changes a cosmic presence is made incarnate. See Daniel Paul Shreber’s *Memoirs of My Nervous Illness* (New York: New York Review Books, 2000).

¹³ Holly Woodlawn recounts the day Warhol photographed her cock for inclusion in his cock collection in her *A Low Life in High Heels* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991): “Andy honed in on my crotch, released a soft gasp, and put his hand up to his mouth. ‘It looks so big, Holly. How big is it?’ ‘Andy!’ I

snapped back in embarrassment. ‘Please stop it. I’m a woman.’ ‘Can I take pictures of it?’ ‘What?!’ ‘You don’t have to take off your clothes. I just want to photograph it, Holly, just like it is now.’ ‘Andy, you’re just a dirty old man!’ ‘Come in the back,’ he invited, and led the way as I followed. Sure enough, Andy dragged out the Polaroid and snapped away at my crotch. I didn’t mind, though I made him promise not to tell anyone whose crotch it was” (291).

¹⁴ Deleuze’s and Guattari’s use of the term *miraculation* bears direct reference to Marx’s employment of it in the service of political economy: “Machines and agents cling so closely to capital that their functioning appears to be miraculated by it. Everything seems objectively to be produced by capital as quasi-cause. As Marx observes, *in the beginning* capitalists are necessarily conscious of the opposition between capital and labor, and of the use of capital as a means of extorting surplus labor. But a perverted, bewitched world quickly comes into being, as capital increasingly plays the role of a recording surface that falls back on (*se rabat sur*) all of production” (11). Capital thus switches cause and effect such that all becomes the result of capital, which persists as a full body on whose plenitude all else is dependent.

¹⁵ Woodlawn’s quote is actually taken from Curtis’ unpublished and unfinished autobiography, *A Storm of Kisses*. For other examples of glamour as miraculation, see Woodlawn’s descriptions of Candy Darling’s state of mind: “Candy was still blond as ever! She was aloof and arrogant and would show up on the set with her manager at her side constantly fussing over her. Miss Darling had a severe case of Norma Desmonditis” (187). Woodlawn uses the epithet “Les Girlettes” to describe the trio Woodlawn/Curtis/Darling, as it has been these drags in particular who have dominated Warhol’s screens (Woodlawn stars in *Trash* (1970) and *Women in Revolt* (1972); Curtis and Darling star in *Women in Revolt*). Finally, outside the Warhol *oeuvre*, Divine’s performance as Dawn Davenport in John Waters’ *Female Trouble* (1972) provides an important example of the schizoid’s relation to glamour. Identifying as “the top model in the country,” she turns her obese body and acid-scarred face into works of beauty via the work of insanity.

¹⁶ The full quote reads: “Among other things, drag queens are living testimony to the way women used to want to be, the way some people still want them to be, and the way some women still actually want to be. Drags are ambulatory archives of ideal moviestar womanhood. They perform a documentary service, usually consecrating their lives to keeping the glittering alternative alive for (not-too-close) inspection” (*Philosophy*, 54). My argument is that a drag queen like Jackie Curtis does not primarily perform a documentary service, but rather uses her body as site of miraculation—this process taking place with the presence of uppers, since it is these chemicals which psychologically induce the magical experience of plenitude.

¹⁷ Even though Reel 10, “Color Lights on Cast,” contains a soundtrack, projection instructions are that the reel is to be run in silence, to the effect that the coincident reel, “Eric Says All,” provides the only dialogue. Though silenced, Reel 10 presents some important moments, as when Eric states “I’d do anything to get someone to care. I’d do anything to get someone to listen,” or “I hate comedowns.” Regarding Reel 10, Warhol demonstrated a similar attachment to the psychedelic technique of projection in paintings as well. 1986’s *Camouflage Statue of Liberty*, *Camouflage Joseph Beuys* and *Camouflage Last Supper* and 1988’s

camouflage *Self-Portraits* provide related examples of psychedelic projection, a 60s technique which Warhol would never lose.

¹⁸ For a closer look at the celebutantes and their involvement with NYC nightclubs Area and Tunnel, see “Kamikaze Kids” in *The Last Party* (317-327). Warhol’s influence on this fresh crop of freaks cannot be elided: “James St. James was talking into my tape recorder. We were in a small room in the Chelsea Hotel on Twenty-third street. ‘This is James St. James. I moved here when I saw the *Cars* video by Andy Warhol. It was Dianne Brill who inspired me. I wanted to *be* her,’ he intoned. St. James has frail, fine features. A metal crescent several inches long was piercing his lower lip and chin. Michael Alig, who was alongside him on the bed, interjected, ‘With me, it was an Edie Sedgwick T- shirt. I bought it in a thrift shop in Chicago—’”(317). Haden-Guest, pace Michael Musto, credits Warhol’s death with precipitating the “death of downtown,” a void which the celebutantes and clubkids will rush to fill. Again, party monster Dianne Brill figures as a sign: “Musto notes gloomily that a trimmed-down Dianne Brill had ‘showed up at the Tunnel looking like any other tasteful blonde and escorting her good friend Cheryl Tiegs (this was before her birthday luncheon at Le Cirque)’” (302).

¹⁹ “The Factory A-men were mostly fags (they knew each other from Riis Park in Brooklyn), except for the Duchess, who was a notorious dyke. They were incredibly skinny, except for the Duchess, who was incredibly fat. And they all mainlined, except for the Duchess, who skin-popped” (*POPism*, 62).

²⁰ In Reel 11, Ondine casually rinses a needle in Coca Cola before using it to inject himself. Such behavior points to the film’s value as documentary of drug praxis. The wonderful naïveté of Ondine comes across as shocking, given the current prevalence of the AIDS virus. Like pre-AIDS pornography, *The Chelsea Girls* contains real danger—a danger known only to future generations, yet imperceptible to those budding stars obliviously performing perilous actions on camera.

²¹ I refer to Malanga as “pussy-whipped” on the basis of his response to his mother’s behavior in “The Gerard Malanga Story” (Reel 8). In this *tableau vivant*, Gerard is berated by his mother, played by Marie Mencken, for having chosen Mary Woronov as paramour: “What is she *doing* here? Tell me— who is she?” Throughout the reel, Mary seethes in silence while Marie harangues Gerard, who seems more interested in his manicure and coiffure than in either Mary or Marie. Koestenbaum describes the scene’s hateful nuances in greater detail: “Marie is hard on Gerard, who wears unmanly rebel apparel (striped pants, mesh shirt, beads): she whips the bed, berates him for his ‘filthy towel,’ whips the towel, and scornfully calls it ‘last night’s towel.’ How dare he leave last night’s towel on the bed! ‘I wish I had a daughter!’ she cries. Marie and Mary are doubles, though they don’t address each other, and though Marie’s voluble cruelty, ultimately maternal and solicitous, can’t rival Mary’s silent spite” (“Torture,” 123).

²² Mary Woronov plays the role of Hanoi Hannah. As Hanoi, she keeps Ingrid Superstar confined under a desk as her personal sex slave, initiates various catfights with co-star International Velvet and causes Pepper to suffer a psychological breakdown. Cold, cruel and downright nasty, Woronov is the film’s quint-essential harpie.

²³ By “Factory look,” I refer to the silvered surfaces of the early Factory. Covered in silver foil, the Factory instituted the space-age interior design which made it famous as postmodern locus.

²⁴ For a discussion of the phenomenological construct of the body-image, see Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s *Phenomenology of Perception* (London: Routledge Classics, 2002), as well as Elizabeth Grosz’s *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994). For both Merleau-Ponty and Grosz, the ability of the human organism to navigate successfully space and time points to the phenomenal existence of a body-image, without which there is only uncoordination and chaos. I also read the stability of the Duchess’ body-image metaphorically, transferring it to her intellectual image as well (hence Warhol’s reliance on her in, for example, *Philosophy*).

²⁵ “In ’65 a lot of the girls had the Big Baby look—short little-girl dresses with puffy little sleeves—and they wore them with light-colored tights and those flat little shoes with the straps across them. The tights weren’t really tights, though, because when the girls bent over you could see the tops of their stockings where they were attached to garter belts. It’s hard to believe that young girls were still wearing contraptions like panty girdles, but they were. (Underwear wouldn’t completely disappear until ’66, when girls like International Velvet would walk down the street in the dead of winter with no stockings and no underwear. Granted, they’d have on fur coats—but then they were fur *minicoats!*)” (*POPism*, 115).

²⁶ Pat Ast also demonstrates grace and talent, as relayed by Woodlawn: “Pat Ast was always offering free entertainment on the beach. There she was, her stout legs planted firmly in the sand, her face painted brighter than the neon in Times Square, her dazzling eyes big and alive as she sang arias to the two muscle boys flanking her sides. She swayed back and forth, her fabulous Halston chiffon muu- muu rippling in the brisk sea wind, belting out operas to anyone who’d listen” (266). Ast stars in *Heat*, and is Halston’s assistant. Though other sources describe her obesity as revolting—for example, the July 1, 1971 *L.A. Times* article “Skinny the Only In Thing? Fat Chance” in Time Capsule 7, or *WWD*’s July 16, 1971 article “Fatty Acid” in Time Capsule 7—Woodlawn’s presents Ast in a more positive light. Like Brigid Polk, Pat Ast surprises her skinny counterparts by her relationship to the delicate.

²⁷ Technically, *Kiss* was Warhol’s first silent film, but since it was intended to be viewed in truncated blips before various films at Mekas’ Film-Makers’ Coop, *Kiss* functions more as a series whose elements might be removed and repositioned, while *Sleep* is more of an unbroken totality.

²⁸ Edie’s favorite form of heroin intake is the speedball: “Speedball! Speed and heroin. That was the first time I had a shot in each arm. Closed my eyes. Opened my arms. Closed my fists, and jab, jab. A shot of cocaine and speed, and a shot of heroin. . . . A speedball is from another world. It’s a little bit dangerous. Pure coke, pure speed, and pure sex. Wow! The ultimate in climax” (Stein, 216).

²⁹ Koch relays Billy Name’s overdose in “Stillness” (134). Born Billy Linich, Billy Name became the inspiration behind much of the earliest Factory. Warhol credits him with the Factory’s silver look: “Billy was responsible for the silver at the Factory. He covered the crumbling walls and the pipes in different

grades of silver foil—regular tinfoil in some areas, and a higher grade of Mylar in others. He bought cans of silver paint and sprayed everything with it, right down to the toilet bowl” (“1960- 1963,” 64). His departure marked the end of an era: “One morning when we got to the Factory, the door to the darkroom at the back where Billy had locked himself in for two years was open and he was gone. The room smelled horrible. There were literally thousands of cigarette butts in it and astrology- type charts all over the walls.” His final words are contained in the note he tacks to the wall: “Andy— I am not here anymore but I am fine Love, Billy” (299-300). Significantly, his words end *POPism*.

³⁰ Mary Woronov describes filmmaker, painter and actress Marie Mencken in *Swimming Underground* as being Gerard Malanga’s patron and surrogate mother. Married to the queer filmmaker Willard Maas, she is another of Warhol’s famous zaftig starlets, dominating those around her in the imperious style of Brigid Berlin, Pat Ast and Sylvia Miles. “She looked like my future in forty years; we both had the same big old Slavic cheekbones, and she towered over Willard just like I towered over Gerard. The whole thing was funny and too close for comfort. In spite of the fact that Willard was gay, Gerard said that Marie met him when she was a virgin and never fucked anyone else, and here they were at sixty, drinking and shouting their way through dinner till she passed out” (31). As Woronov’s text indicates, the plot of “The Gerard Malanga Story” relies upon the real-life Malanga/Mencken/Woronov triangle, which it mines and mimes.

³¹ When Tennessee Williams dies, Warhol’s response is similar to his Edie reaction. “How could Tennessee Williams choke on a bottlecap, do you think? How could that happen?” he asks, implying that death involves volition (Thursday, March 3, 1983).

³² In the *Diaries*, Warhol recalls an important fight with Ricard, who remains critical of his work. The drama unfolds at the afterparty of his *Shadows* opening at Dia: “Philippa invited René Ricard—her Dia Foundation just signed him up for benefits as the first poet—so he arrived at 65 Irving and was saying that my work was just ‘decorative.’ That got me really mad, and I’m so embarrassed, everybody saw the real me. I got so red and was telling him off, and then he was screaming things like that John Fairchild, Jr. was my boyfriend—you know how horrible René is—and it was like one of those old Ondine fights, and everybody was stunned to see me so angry and out of control and screaming back at him” (199). Much of Warhol’s anger centers on the fact that Gerard Malanga has just become Ricard’s agent.

³³ David Weisman’s 1972 film *Ciao! Mahnattan* documents Edie’s last moments. It is a masterpiece of *schadenfreude*.

³⁴ “Big” is Warhol’s word for Basquiat, as when he remarks “Jean Michel and I went to the back of the plane and he was smoking joints, and then I realized that he’d left his brand-new Comme des Garçons coat in the hotel room when he’d been rolling, and he called and I called but they’ll never send it. He just knows what looks good on him. He’s 6’—or 6’1” with his hair. He’s really big” (*Diaries*, Wednesday, November 7, 1984). Basquiat’s cock is also huge: “He fell asleep and then he got up and he was up front by the phones with a big hard-on, like a baseball bat in his pants” (Thursday, April 12, 1984).

³⁵ While Jean-Michel's name is hyphenated, the *Diaries* spell it without the hyphen. Consequently, I have retained the use of "Jean-Michel" throughout, "normalizing" *Diary* spellings for the sake of consistency.

³⁶ "And Paige and I are fighting. She keeps making these digs about Jean Michel, she said, 'Are you starting up your gay affair again with Jean-Michel?' and so I got *my* dig in and said, 'Listen, *I* wouldn't go to bed with him because he's so dirty, and I can't believe that anyone would. I mean, *you're* the one who had the affair with a dirty, unwashed person" (Sunday, January 11, 1987). As in other entries, Basquiat is connected with filth.

³⁷ "What happened was I'd given Jean-Michel a Come painting and he had it with him when he and Richard got drunk together, and Jean-Michel didn't have anything to write his phone number on for Richard Gere except this painting of mine, so he wrote it on that and gave the painting to Richard. Then when Richard woke up the next morning he said he saw it and thought it was disgusting and threw it into the fire. I told him it was *my* come but actually it was Victor's" (Sunday, November 13, 1983). Basquiat first gives Warhol his locks on August 31, 1983; Warhol responds by providing Basquiat with one of his wigs on December 19, 1985. Julian Schanbel's *Basquiat* (Miramax, 1996) dramatizes this hair exchange.

Coming Into Being and Flowing Into Exile: History and Trends in Palestinian Film-Making.

By Helga Tawil

Almost two decades ago, Edward Said suggested that the existence of a “center” (or a “meta-narrative”) to describe the Palestinian experience, was not just missing, but would likely fall short:

[w]e have no dominant theory of Palestinian culture, history, society; we cannot rely on one central images (exodus, holocaust, long march); there is no completely coherent discourse adequate to us, and I doubt whether at this point, if someone could fashion such a discourse, we could be adequate for it. Miscellaneous, the spaces here and there in our midst include but do not comprehend the past; they represent building without overall purpose, around an uncharted and only partially surveyed territory. Without a center. Atonal (Said, 1986; 129).

As Said suggests, it is impossible to define Palestine or Palestinians in any coherent, holistic sense, for neither is monolithic or simple. Palestine can signify a biblical geography or the ever-shrinking Territories promised to the Palestinian Authority in the Oslo Accords. Most maps, no matter their date, do not denote Palestine. Similarly ambiguous, Palestinians can signify people living in Jerusalem with an Israeli ID card, or in the refugee camps of Lebanon. A Palestinian could likely be residing in Paris with Canadian citizenship, in the U.S. with an Egyptian *laissez-passer*, or in a rural West Bank village with Jordanian papers. Palestinians can be Muslim or Christian, or, even atheists; their political views can be radically different and opposed – Communist, Islamist, Secularist, One-State Solutionist, Globalist, to name but a few. They can speak Hebrew, or Arabic, or neither at all. Indeed Palestine or Palestinians are more aptly to be understood as hybrids rather than a place or a people easily defined.

On one hand Said’s claim can be read as a call for the need to document Palestinianness. On the other hand, it should also be understood that any such undertaking be done with trepidation, for not only are Palestinians increasingly becoming “hybrids,” but everything to do with Palestine seems to rest on shaky ground. If to define a Palestinian is challenging, imagine then the difficulty in agreeing on what constitutes a “Palestinian film.” The notion of a Palestinian cinema begs the question of how it can be classified

as such in the first place. Is a film ‘Palestinian’ that is directed by a Palestinian person? And what if that person is an exile, a refugee and/or has taken citizenship elsewhere? Or is it a film shot on location in ‘Palestine’, and if so according to which borders? Is a Palestinian film to be determined by where the production company is located, where financing came from, where it was edited, who distributes it, or even who its intended audience is? Can there be such a thing as Palestinian cinema when there is no such thing, in geo-political terms at least, as Palestine? As the controversy over Elia Suleiman’s film, *Divine Intervention*, shows, Palestinian films cannot enter the Oscar-race since the MPAA did not recognize Palestine as a nation-state (see Judith Gabriel, 2002). And yet, there is definitely a growing, creative, body of work that can be called Palestinian film-making; and it can be defined by any of the questions I raise above.

What seems clear from the onset is that we should expect Palestinian films, however we agree to define them, to reflect the contradictions, the hybridity, even the absurdities at the heart of what constitutes Palestinianness. To discuss Palestinian films puts us in the quandary of dealing with the notion of the “national,” the world of Palestinian film – to be understood in a number of ways – is rich, diverse, contradictory and one of the growing forms of cultural expression for a peoples both attempting to build their nation and at the same time being thread apart by diaspora and exile. Palestine, in one sense, can be understood as the ‘nation without a state’ – a political project aimed at defining autonomy of a national group within (and with-out) the existing system of states. It can also represent a ‘state of mind’ – as that of belonging to an oppressed group that sees a specific geographic location as its ‘original’ homeland. As such, this dual existence is reflected in the history and development of Palestinian films. Films are inevitably constructs, fabrications and representations – be they fictional or documentary – but they do intersect to some extent with the historical processes that have shaped ‘Palestine.’ What I intend to do in this paper is to delineate different filmic theories and briefly assess the history of Palestinian film-making vis-à-vis these different theories.

A Brief History

“A country without images or a nation which does not produce images is like a country or a nation which does not produce its own food supply.”

film-maker Moumen Smihi

‘Palestine’ has not known the cinema industry in the proper sense of the word. Being under Jordanian, Egyptian and Israeli rule, Palestinian society has had little possibility to establish a cinema industry. Given the political centrality of Egypt and Syria during the 1950s and 1960s, it should be no surprise that they were the first Arab countries to produce films about Palestine and the Palestinians. *Land of Peace*, an Egyptian film made in 1957, is the first film ever to be made in the Occupied Territories by an Arab. In the 1960’s, Syria, during the time of a strong pan-Arab orientation, became a haven for exiled Palestinians

and pro-Palestinians, as exemplified by the Festival of Young Arab Cinema in Damascus. Its promotion was seen as a support and a supplement to the armed struggle. The dominance of the Palestinian question in Damascus did not only express itself on a verbal level. Between 1969 and 1972 three (out of the five) full-length feature films produced by the Syrian film organization dealt with Palestine. Five years after the 1967 'Six Day War' and the subsequent occupation of the rest of Palestine by Israel, and a year after Black September, the Palestinian question was inevitably in the fore of any political discussion. Although films focused on Palestinian issues, they were more socio-political commentaries on the commitment and responsibility to a pan-Arab unity.

In the case of Palestinian film-making, cinematographic activities developed in connection with armed struggle, started by exiled Palestinians after the defeat of Egypt, Syria and Jordan by Israel in 1967, and the subsequent Israeli occupation. The various Palestinian national resistance movements were among the first to recognize the latent possibilities of the media to support and express national self-assertion and liberation. So it was in 1967 that a Palestinian cinema came into existence, primarily focused on addressing 'public opinion' and introducing the 'facts' of the Palestinian problem – from the Palestinian perspective. But this Palestinian cinema was to be formed in exile, with practically no cinematic development within the Occupied Territories. Between 1967 and 1968 the first Palestinian film unit was founded and annexed to *Fateh*. After Black September in 1971 the group moved to Beirut, where it continued producing documentaries about the situation of the Palestinians until 1975. Other Palestinian political organizations, like the PLFP (Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine), the PDFLP (Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine) and the arts and culture section of the PLO, began to produce films. The films coming out of the Palestinian organizations dealt with the roots of the armed struggle against "the Zionist enemy... [and] highlighted the historical and contemporary dimensions of the Palestinian-Zionist struggle and the Arab-Zionist struggle" (Abdel Fattah, 2000a). Politically and financially conditions were unfavorable. Cut off from Israel and the Occupied Territories, they documented military actions and life in the refugee camps. "But because of the lack of planning and the absence of a clear goal for cinematic production, which depended mainly on individual initiative, it was not properly effective" (*ibid.*).

The Palestinian Cinema Group formed in 1973, which had no allegiance to any of the factions, was created as a nucleus for a Palestinian cinema, but only managed to produce one film – *Scenes of Occupation in Gaza*, which was an edited version of scenes shot by Western news agencies showing the intimidation and suffering of Palestinians. The activities came to a total halt after the Israeli invasion of Beirut in 1982, and a great part of the Palestinian cinema archive disappeared. With the PLO's move to Tunis, its cinema department drastically limited its own production. As Shohat and Stam note of the early history of Palestinian cinema,

Palestinian film production, from the establishment of 'Unity Cinema' in 1967 through the 'Palestinian Cinema Group' in 1973 to 'The Palestinian Cinema Organization,' under the auspices of the PLO, has always been intended as an instrument for the promotion of the Palestinian national cause and the registering of revolutionary events related to the Palestinian resistance. Virtually all production, therefore, has been devoted to news and documentary

films – a situation common in societies struggling for political definition (Shohat & Stam, 290).

The films of the Palestinian *fedayeen* did little to influence world public opinion. These films seldom made into the Territories or outside the boundaries of the nation-state they were produced in, and had very limited viewership. Nevertheless the promotion of the national cause and revolutionary aspects continued well into the 1980's, when most films produced focused on the war and resistance 'martyrs.'

It was during the 1980's that a few independent Palestinian film-makers began to take different 'artistic' and 'political' turns in their films, and began to address Palestinian perspectives beyond the purely nationalistic views of the majority of films. Most of these film-makers were Palestinians in exile, educated in Europe and managed to secure technical knowledge and funding from foreign sources. For in order to finance films, independent Palestinian film-makers to date, have only two options: to rely on foreign producers or be born into a wealthy family. When Arafat returned to Palestine after his exile in 1994 and his Palestinian Authority was granted permission to control its own media, he concentrated on setting up newspapers, radio and television broadcasting stations, not cinematic capabilities, in order to maintain as much control as possible on the 'national' media, and leaving little room for art or oppositional cultural forms.

According to film critic Abdel Fattah, Palestinian cinema (as *in* Palestine) today is in dire conditions as it lacks the necessary technical and artistic resources to make films, it lacks a specific working place and methodology, and also suffers because of the dispersion of Palestinian filmmakers among various revolutionary factions which leads to fragmentation rather than a uniting efforts. Clearly, Abdel Fattah's notion of what the Palestinian cinema should be leaves no room for heterogeneity or difference, and sees it as something to be done under the auspices of one national power and one 'unity.' A conviction, still held today, of a purely nationalistic cinema. Although to him the most serious impasse is that "Palestinian cinematographers have not bothered to ask themselves one simple question: who is the targeted audience? Is it the Palestinian, the Arab or the foreign audience?" (Abdel Fattah, 2000a).

But beyond the financial constraints or a lack of directive as to who the audience is/should be, it most often seems expected of Palestinian film-makers to uphold to the notion that film is one part of the liberation struggle for the nation-state still to come. For example, Abdel Fattah claims of Palestinian cinema that it should be "one of the tools used to restore Palestinian rights and reiterate the identity of their land, history, language, customs and traditions" (*ibid.*). Or as Palestinian film-maker Elia Suleiman put it, "my brand of humor or irony is not at all accepted [by Palestinian audiences]. I have even been accused of treason, of being a Zionist! My approach is considered too critical for a time of national construction that is said to call for unity and even uniformity. They think that Palestinians should all speak with one voice" (Bourlond, 100). There is definitely a fear of destabilization linked to a place, where unity is considered essential. Suleiman's style of self-critical and self-mocking humor requires a certain freedom; and in a place where the daily reality is occupation and military presence, humor and irony aren't very well accepted.

According to Bibas (2001), there seems to be two major trends in Palestinian film-making: those with explicitly political discourses, as first intended by the Palestinian Cinema Organization,¹ to make use of the cinema for the Palestinian revolution; or those that have a more aesthetic language such as the films of Michel Khleifi, which take him back on a search of Palestinian identity by way of folklore and memory. The remainder of Palestinian films look the same: desperate refugees, litanies of complaints about the lost homeland, the brutality of Israeli occupation, and finally (and almost always) the possibility and the dream of return. But Bibas has quite a narrow view of what Palestinian films today consist of. It is still true that the categories of ‘explicit political discourse,’ the refugee/homeland/occupation/return, and the new ‘aesthetic’ films exist. But there are also films such as those by Elia Suleiman, Mona Hattoum, Hany Abu-Assad and Rashid Masharawi – among others – that belong to entirely different categorizations. There has been a diversification and appearance of directors from various ethnic or religious groups², which indicates on the ideological level a disintegration of the common notion of nationhood and unitarian nationalism.

Palestinian films cannot make claim to a huge collection, but their historical trajectory has still touched on various aspects of different film movements. More recent Palestinian films, although small in number, represent a range of styles (aesthetic, political, mode of production, etc.). Given that they began when they did they were firmly embedded in national and third cinema perspectives of film-making, a tradition which continues on until today. But Palestinian films, due to the political nature of Palestinian history, are also evocative of exilic cinema, whereby some film-makers have attempted to veer away from the imposed national image, constructed by political/cultural actors who drone on about what Palestine means or should mean, and who fear that if such an image disappears, then political/artistic inspirations will disappear with it. Some film-makers focus on the pathos of exile. Others even posit that Palestine does not exist: it has no borders, it has all the chaotic elements that leads one to question space, borders, and crossings, even if none of these elements, in itself, is valid. Some even attempt to have the audience participate in the construction of the image and hence in the construction of the (his)story. In short, Palestinian film-makers are asserting a pluralistic sense of ‘Palestinianness’ through various approaches and filmic styles, from the experimental exilic films to the national ones.

National Cinema

Theories of national cinema seem to be concerned with the ‘internal’ aspects, how, if at all, the production, distribution and consumption of films are constitutive of the national collectivity. However, there is also an awareness of the ‘external’ as a shaping force, as cultural, economic, political and ideological forces. Here then we come to a concept of national cinema that is two-fold. On one hand, it looks inward by reflecting on the nation itself, on its past, present and future, its cultural heritage, its traditions, its sense of common identity. On the other hand, it also looks outside its borders, asserting its difference from other national cinemas, proclaiming its sense of otherness or difference. It assumes then that national identity and tradition are already formed and fixed in place; also takes borders for granted as effective in containing political, economic, cultural developments and identity.

In discussion of national cinema, the nation is treated as singular, and the study of national cinema revolves around a country's cinematographic production. The problem of delineating a national cinema is based on a statist paradigm, firmly rooted in the development of a political culture: "film functions as a cultural articulation of a nation... [it] textualizes the nation and subsequently constructs a series of relations around the concepts, first of state and citizen, then of state, citizen and other..." (Schlesinger, 25). What seems clear is that whether consciously or not, social communication thought³ is an expression of the cultural geography of the nation-state. "This is the bedrock on which film studies has been based when it involves a largely derivative sociological argument about nationalism and national identity as a necessary starting point for studies of national cinema" (Schlesinger, 29).

The notion of a national cinema proves a helpful taxonomy to some extent, but more importantly this process of labeling is to some degree tautological, fetishizing the national rather than merely describing it. It erects boundaries between films produced in different nation-states although they may have much in common, thereby obscuring the degree of cultural diversity of cinematic activity. Until the 1980s the idea of national cinema tended to focus only on films produced within the territory, while ideas of the nation-state were conceived primarily in essentialist terms, even if anti-imperialist. Seeing these as expressions of a putative national spirit. Since the theories of Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm, accounts of national cinema have sought to resist the homogenizing fictions of nationalism and recognize their historical variability and contingency, as well as the cultural hybridity of nation-states.

Anderson (1991) stresses that nations are ideological constructions seeking to forge a link between a self-defined cultural group and the state, creating an imagined community passed off as 'natural' that we loosely refer to as the nation. Anderson takes mediated communication to be of central importance in the formation of a nationalist consciousness, defining the nation as the mapping of an imagined community with a secure and shared identity and sense of belonging, to a demarcated geo-political space. The nation is forged and maintained as a bounded public sphere and national identity is the experience of belonging to such a community, being steeped in its traditions, its rituals and characteristics. But the 'imagined community' argument imagines the nation as limited, with finite and meaningful boundaries. The problem is then when describing a national cinema, there is a tendency to focus only on those films that narrate the nation as this finite, limited space, inhabited by a unified community, closed off to identities that aren't national. This produces an image of a strongly bounded communicative community, offering little insight into the contradiction, especially in the Palestinian case, of the decoupling between nation and state, or of the invariable hybrid and 'impure' cultural formations of Palestinians, given that most of them do not live in a closely constituted geographic or mental space. And clearly, mass media and films, are ways in which transnational cultural connections (and fragmentations) are established.

Andrew Higson (2000) argues that national identity and national cinema should be seen as "processes." We ought to define national cinema by looking at a range of features: industrial and business aspects, exhibition and consumption, cultural policies, the favoring of particular genres. Essentially, these kinds of theories attempt to address how national cinema may be taken to affirm a singular national self-identity and simultaneously be part of an international system of differences. Not a single, all-encompassing grand

theory. He suggests “transnational” as a subtler means of describing cultural and economic formations that are rarely contained by national boundaries, not just a fetishizing of the national (Higson, 54). Furthermore, borders (whether physical or metaphorical) are always leaky and there is considerable movement across them, and so cultural formations are invariably hybrid. The cinemas established in specific nation-states are rarely autonomous cultural industries, involving quite a bit of transnational movement. For example, production and activities of film-makers take place across borders, whether as co-productions or taking into account the itinerant nature of film-makers. Cinema is also trans-national on the level of distribution and consumption. Even if one chooses to focus on state policies vis-à-vis cultural production, one cannot omit that a national cinema is unfettered by the problems of the international capitalist economy. Not only do governments operate on a transnational basis, but in the case of Palestine, there is no such thing as policy towards film-making, let alone a national economic base for funding, production and distribution.

Paul Willemen sees the existence of borders, albeit far from a unified homogenous space, as very real; although their meaning and function are changeable, their effectiveness has not diminished. Willemen focuses his attention on the confusion of cultural specificity and nationalism in film studies. As he explains, “the boundaries of cultural specificity in cinema are established by governmental actions implemented through institutions such as censorship and its legislative framework, industrial and financial measures on the economic level, the gearing of training institutions toward employment in national media structures, systems of licensing governed by aspects of corporate law, and so on” (Willemen, 25).

This leads to a number of problems, such as, encouraging confusion between the discourses of nationalism as an object of study or political project, and the issue of national specificity. However the specificity of a cultural formation may be manifested by the presence, but also by the absence of concerns with national identity. The discourse of nationalism and national specificity are however identical, and neither are the construction or the analysis of a specific cultural formation identical with national identity. Willemen, intending to “go further,” suggests “that the construction of national specificity in fact encompasses and governs the articulation of both national identity and nationalist discourses. Nationalist ones forever try to colonize and extend themselves to cover, by repressively homogenizing them, complex but nationally specific formations” (Willemen, 26).

Willemen’s most poignant argument leads to an essential contradiction of what a national cinema entails.

A cinema that seeks to engage with the questions of national specificity from a critical or non- or counterhegemonic position is by definition a minority and a poor cinema, dependent on the existence of a larger multinational or nationalized industrial sector... A cinema addressing national specificity will be anti- or at least nonnationalistic since the more it is complicit with nationalism’s homogenizing project the less it will be able to engage critically with the complex, multidimensional, and multidirectional tensions that characterize and shape a social formation’s cultural configurations. This leads us to the ironic conclusion that a cinema positively yet critically seeking to engage with the multilayeredness of specific socio-cultural formations is necessarily a marginal and a dependent cinema: a cinema dependent for its

existence on the very dominant, export- and multinational-oriented cinema it seeks to criticize and displace (Willemen, 28).

As a case in point, one can look to *Chronicles of a Disappearance*, a film critical of what the national constitutes, vilified for being anti-nationalistic, and having to rely on funding from none other than Israel. It seems then that to be critical is to be understood as anti-nationalistic. But the contradiction can reach beyond the economic/mode of production realm. An unrelenting patriotism/nationalism leads one to one's own self-destruction and that of the nation/national cause. Because of the unwillingness to 'compromise (including being 'critical') – both internally and externally with the Other/enemy – being nationalistic (in the extreme form) hinders the nationalistic causes one is essentially, at the beginning/end, seeking to ensure, protect and/or bring about. The 'means' eventually do not bring about the 'ends' one desires, but instead they further the schism between the actuality of one's personal and national existence and one's desired ends. In the case of film being overly nationalistic and patriotic in one's representation of one's 'nationalness' forces one to maintain a static image/idea of the nation, and therefore forbids one to make any changes which would improve the 'status' of one's nation. Especially in the case of revolutionary films, where what is being celebrated is usually an armed struggle, which seems to only lead to more conflict.

There are a few films that take the national for granted and attempt to portray a sort of unity. Oddly enough two such films were not made by Palestinians, bringing to light the transnational dimension that need be included in such discussion. For example, the first film whose events take place in the occupied territories is Egypt's *Land of Peace* (1957) which vilifies the Israelis, and stresses the importance of an integrated Palestinian-Egyptian action to overcome the enemy. Much as the Israelis had tended to portray the Arabs as the Other/enemy in face of Jewish unity, this film does the opposite – Arab unity versus Jewish enemy. Lebanon's *Kafir Qassem* (1973) demonizes the Israelis, by having a Palestinian in the streets of Tel Aviv, observe the sale of a presumably popular toy: a guillotine cutting off the head of an Arab in a *kuffiyeh*. Although the film is about a 1956 massacre of Palestinians by Israelis the murders are dealt with only in passing, as the main focus of the film is on the daily life of the villagers and the internal conflicts that arise from a variety of ideological points of views ranging from opportunism towards the Israelis to explicit pan-Arabism. The film however is also a call upon other Arabs as the final message is the let-down by Arab neighbors of the Palestinians. It makes clear that the claimed Arab solidarity with the Palestinians is characterized by hypocrisy and weakness. Even some of the more recent films share aspects of a nationalistic cinema, such as Hanna Musleh's *We Are God's Soldiers* (1993), which disregards the variety and plurality of political opinion in the Gaza Strip. Instead the film assumes unity of political support for Islamic movements and avoids discussion of dissention or difference of opinion.

More recent theorists have expanded the definition of the nation to a concept of a nation which involves people in a common sense of identity and works as an inclusive symbol which provides integration and meanings (Robins & Webster, 6). In this sense national identity is more about the experience of belonging, allowing diasporic communities to still share a common sense of belonging, despite – or even because of – their transnational dispersal. Communities are seen as consisting of fragmented and dispersed groups

of people with as many differences as similarities and with little in the sense of real physical contact with each other. Nationhood thus answers to “a felt need for a rooted, bounded, whole and authentic identity” (Robins & Webster, 19). In similar vein, Higson suggests a national cinema should be understood as a product of a “tension between ‘home’ and ‘away’” (Higson, 67).

Third World Cinema

Theorists such as Roy Armes (1987) define Third World Cinema as the ensemble of films produced by Third World countries. The Third World refers to the colonized, neo-colonized or decolonized nations and ‘minorities’ of the world whose economic and political structures have been shaped and deformed within the colonial process. As a political coalition, the Third World broadly united around the enthusiasm generated by anti-colonial struggles such as Algeria’s. The fundamental definition of the Third World however had more to do with structural economic domination than with crude humanistic categories, development categories, racial categories, cultural categories, or geographical categories – such as, respectively, the poor, the non-industrialized, the non-white, the backward, and the East. The Third World was defined passively as having had a certain experience, as having suffered and undergone colonialism, hence flattening heterogeneities, masking contradictions, and ignoring differences (Stam, 282).

Early Third World film theory was premised on nationalism and assumed the nation to be an unproblematic term. “Third-Worldist filmmakers saw themselves as part of a national project, but their concept of the national was itself discursively overdetermined and contradictory... discussions of nationalism took it as axiomatic that the issue was simply one of expelling the foreign to recover the national” (Stam, 289). This unitary notion covers the existence of indigenous nations within the nation, provides no criteria by which to distinguish what is worth retaining in a national tradition, nor does it take into account that all Third World countries are themselves heterogeneous – urban and rural, male and female, religious and secular, and so on. There was also an assumption that Third World filmmakers speak for the oppressed, so that a film about middle-class people in Egypt could not ‘really’ be Third World, bringing to light the problem that the concept of the Third World elides the presence of a Fourth World, consisting of people variously called ‘indigenous,’ ‘tribal,’ or ‘first nations’ – the still-residing descendants of the original inhabitants. So Third World Cinema becomes an anachronistic label, although Shohat and Stam (1997) suggest that it is more useful to distinguish between First and Third World as a geopolitical location, and third-worldists as referring to a discourse and ideological orientation.

However, because of the assumption that Third World intellectuals could only express ‘local’ concerns, or perhaps because their work was so overtly political, this body of work was rarely seen as forming part of the history of ‘universal’ (read Eurocentric) film theory. When not ignored, it was treated with condescension, as a subaltern shadow of the ‘real’ cinema. The incongruity between Third Worldists and Eurocentrism was also, according to Shohat and Stam, a more essential problem. Third Worldists often fashion their idea of the nation-state according to the European model, in effect “reducing Third World

nationalism to a mere echo of European nationalism ignores the international realpolitik that obliged the colonized to adopt a discourse and a practice of the nation-state precisely in order to end colonialism” (Shohat & Stam, 287).

Exemplary of Third World films, although containing aspects of accented and national cinemas, Michel Khleifi’s films rely on the idyllic chronotope – the unity of an ancient complex and folkloric time, with stress on territoriality, ownership of the land, and attachment in agricultural ways. *Wedding in Galilee* (1987) is an allegorical strategy that hinges on the ritual of marriage and wedding-night, events over-determined with meaning due to their implicit uniting of families, histories, in this case exacerbated by the political conflict. The Israeli governor’s invitation to the wedding signifies the breakdown between private and public dimensions, where marriage becomes the pretext for a socio-political x-ray. The film interweaves a number of intra-Palestinian discourses, diverse perspectives, contrasting attitudes about the political situation, and riveted by ideological, sexual and generational tensions. Khleifi interweaves the longer history of Palestinian dispossession with the narratives of the historically evolving roles of women under the occupation. Unlike other pro-Palestinians, he does not separate the internal problems from the external challenges – traditional and generational clashes and political strife. Although the film alludes to gaps and tensions within the Palestinians, it also reflects a common struggle against occupation, along with a common history and cultural identity rooted in the land and its past. The film connects earth, crops, trees, vegetation and food with the Palestinians. At the same time it links violence to the land with the Israelis, who plant mines in the fields. The documentation of culture reinforces a sense of permanence, a refusal to disappear. The monologues of the old man who rambles, in present tense, about the Turks, reinforces the perspective from Palestinians that the Israelis are yet another invasive foreign power. Portraying the Israelis as “visitors” creates a narrative that favors the land’s original inhabitants as Palestinian. The presentation of Palestinian identity is also a national one rather than religious, since the wedding incorporates both Muslim and Christian traditions, and radically opposing Western media’s image of “terrorists.” Also, the film valorizes the linked destinies and dreams of 1948 and 1967 Palestinians in its seamless interplay between scenes shot in the Galilee and in the West Bank. The films’ scenes and sequences are also explicitly allegorical – Palestinians and Israelis together coax a mare out of the mine field, evoking a vision of a dialogical future. The image of the mare expresses the Palestinians’ wish for freedom. Two configurations: militarization and cultivation, but Khleifi adds also cooperation. Exterior fields are male spaces of militarization and eventually masculine reconciliation, whereas the interiors are coded as feminine spaces of culture and female reconciliation. “The film established a parallel between the saving of the mare and the transformation of the female soldier, both of which involved demilitarization as a result of cooperation of the opponents. It posits that the Palestinian national identity is dependent not only on securing land but also on creating a thirdspace of cooperation” (Naficy, 2001; 168-169).

The film however also criticizes the ethics of patriarchal Arab society, in particular the concept of male honor – on one hand represented by the fact that the mayor/father must invite the Israeli soldiers to the wedding, angering the son so much that he is unable to have sex with his new wife. The latter proves to be the more fatal, as the groom’s virility is bound up with the father’s reputation. This notion of manhood can only be proven by means of penetration and deflowering. In the context of the occupation, Khleifi

tries to show how meaningless such a notion of virility is. *Wedding in Galilee* is important for the way that political issues become part of a culture that is changing within its own terms (e.g. the challenges to the patriarch) as well as being threatened from without. Without proposing solutions or creating villains in the Israeli soldiers (who are shown as just doing their job), it dramatizes a social as well as a political crisis. The film also raises questions about gender relations and (in)equalities, by recognizing women's roles in cultural expression, yet maintaining women's culture in a separate realm from the men – inside the home. The wedding is a “thick description” and documentation of Palestinian culture and agriculture. “It forcefully posits that Palestinian Arabs are there on the ground, and that like the Israelis they are capable of making the desert bloom. By so integrally linking the Palestinians to the land and to its cultivation, the film creates an agricultural idyll before occupation and expulsion” (*ibid.*, 167-168). Shohat calls this representation a “painterly, quasi-Orientalist idealization of a pre-industrial village” (Shohat 1988, 46).

Theoretically in the 1980's and 1990's there was growing disenchantment of Third Worldism, which brought with it a rethinking of political, cultural and aesthetic possibilities. “The rhetoric of revolution began to be greeted with a certain skepticism. As a result of external pressures and internal self-questioning, the cinema, too, gave expression to these mutations, as the anti-colonial thrust of earlier films gradually gave way to more diversified themes” (Stam, 282). Film-makers wanted to create a cinema which engendered not only political awareness and aesthetic innovation, but also a spectatorial pleasure which could enable a viable film industry. Around the same time, also came forth theories of Fourth World films, usually ethnographic, which, Stam argues, “theorize their own practice by questioning their own authority, while striving for ‘shared filmmaking,’ ‘participatory filmmaking,’ ‘dialogical anthropology,’ ‘reflexive distance,’ and ‘interactive filmmaking,’ as artists experience a salutary self-doubt about their own capacity to speak ‘for’ the other” (Stam, 284). This also leads to the question of indigenous film-makers who confront, what Faye Ginsburg calls a ‘Faustian dilemma:’ on one hand using new technologies for cultural self-assertion, and on the other spreading a technology which might foster their own dis-integration. But Ginsburg does not see this work as bound in a traditional world, but mediating across boundaries and rupturing time and history. So that the work goes beyond asserting an existing identity to become “a means of cultural invention that refracts and recombines elements from both the dominant and minority societies... [a] new form of collective self-production” (Ginsburg in Stam, 285). Although not as self-reflexive as other ethnographic films, the work of Mai Masri comes to mind here, where she not only reflects on her own goals and identity, but affords refugee children with cameras of their own, allowing them to tell their own stories.

Third Cinema

“...the establishment of cadres capable of using a camera on the battlefield beside the gun”

Palestinian Cinema Manifesto

Third Cinema theory originated in Latin America in the 1960's, inspired by the Cuban Revolution and Brazil's *Cinema Novo*. Manifestos were written arguing for a political practice of cinema, focusing on the 'national,' revealing divisions and stratifications within a national formation, such as class and political antagonisms. The term itself was launched by Argentinean film-makers Solanas and Gettino publishing their ideas in 1968, followed by the publication of "For an Imperfect Cinema" by Espinosa from Cuba in 1969 (see "Cinéma d'auteur ou cinéma d'intervention?", 1978; Solanas & Gettino, 2000; Espinosa, 2000).

There exists a doubtless ambiguity in the term 'third' cinema – a wordplay on the analogy with the term 'third world', that also has to do with the development of a world-wide liberation movement whose moving force is to be found in third world countries. What it suggested was an avant-garde cinema – not in the traditional notion of experimentalism defending the notion of safe artistic space untouched by political consideration. Instead, the third cinema is often equated, although rhetorically in some cases, to the gun. It was about using films as revolutionary tools and radically relocating the practices of viewing and the industrial-economic designation of cinema itself (Solanas & Gettino, 1978; Solanas & Gettino, 2000). Teshome Gabriel calls it a "combative" cinema, whereby film is an "ideological tool" in the "decolonization of culture and total liberation" from First world domination (Gabriel, 2000; 304).

Solanas and Gettino offered a 'virtual geography' of their own, not necessarily to be confused with the geo-political boundaries of First, Second and Third World. Their new conception had as much to do with modes of production, 'consumption' (viewing of films) and aesthetics. Third Cinema is to be understood in contrast to First and Second Cinema, or as a trajectory of filmic development that is both dynamic and dialectical, which Gabriel delineates as "phases" that third world films pass through on their path from "domination" to "liberation" (Gabriel, 2000; 299).

First Cinema is the model imposed by the Hollywood system, where cinema is conceived as pure spectacle, and made for exhibition in large theatres. It is designed to satisfy commercial interests of production companies, and leads to the absorption of forms which necessarily imply a bourgeois world-view in which the capacity to participate in making history is denied to all except the heroic individual, and history is presented as an external force. It imposes models of form, language, and industrial, commercial and technical structures. First cinema is that which expresses imperialist, capitalist, bourgeois ideas, exemplary in the "monopoly capital finances of big spectacle cinema" (Solanas in Willemsen, 9). Second Cinema, also known as *auteur* cinema, produces its own structures and patterns of distribution and exhibition, its own ideologies and critics – films made by the elite who would be politically reformist but incapable of achieving any profound change. The Second cinema was that which expressed the aspirations of the petite bourgeoisie. Third (militant or guerilla) cinema was a collective endeavor which opposed itself to First and Second Cinema; and was the expression of new culture and social change. Third Cinema films were those that directly and explicitly set out to fight the system. It was a politically oriented militant cinema opposing mainstream entertainment and *auteur* cinema. It was the convergence between experimental form and radical left politics. In the words of Solanas and Gettino, "Third cinema is... the cinema that recognizes in the [anti-imperialist] struggle the most gigantic cultural, scientific, and artistic manifestation of our time, the great possibility of constructing a liberated personality with each people as the starting point – in a

word, the decolonization of culture” (Solanas & Gettino, 268). Third Cinema sought to challenge the old race relations paradigm and experimented with new forms of representation, while careful not to fall into Third World essentialism. It questions whether there was an aesthetic paradigm which defines a broad range of oppositional cultural practices. It was made by cultural activists outside the white Euro-American sphere who dealt with questions of domination/independence, center/periphery, and resistance/hegemony. These film-makers looked at the relations between the cultural and political, aligning itself with national culture, as that created by the popular classes. It was essentially presented as a socialist cinema, or in the words of Gabriel, “a cinema of mass participation” (Gabriel, 2000; 301).

The manifestos of the 1960’s and 1970’s valorized an alternative, independent, anti-imperialist cinema more concerned with militancy than with auterist self-expression or consumer satisfaction. Issues of production methods, politics and aesthetics become inextricably intertwined. The hope was to give expression to national themes in a national style. It is a cinema made for political and artistic reasons seeking to achieve the production of social intelligibility, not only a cinema for the people or of expressing opposition to imperialism or bourgeois rule. A critical dialogue, a need for criticism. Experimental cinema engaged in a constant process of research, reserving the right to any device deemed necessary to achieve their goals. These manifestos, although having distinctions amongst each other, called for a cinema that promoted a critical understanding of social dynamics, condemning professional and middle class intellectuals whose expertise had been seen as serving the central authority of society. Secondly, they refuse to prescribe to an aesthetics on how to achieve a revolutionary consciousness. Their objective is not to be thought of as similar to oppositional cinema in the European context of doing whatever was the opposite of dominant cinema. The Third Cinema proponents were hostile to dominant cinemas and also refused to let those cinemas dictate the terms in which they were to be opposed. Thirdly, they advocated a cinema which should not be limited to Latin America or indeed to the Third World, instead a cinema to be applicable everywhere.

The Third World film festivals (Cairo in 1967 and Algiers in 1973) called for a tricontinental revolution in politics and an aesthetic/narrative revolution in film form. Written during a period of intense nationalist struggles, the manifestos emerged from a particular cultural and cinematic context, yet did have common concerns. Just because a country was economically underdeveloped did not mean that its films had to be artistically so. “Cinema had to be not only dialectical but also ‘anthro-pophagic’... and had to de-alienate a spectatorial taste colonized by the commercial-popular aesthetic of Hollywood, by the populist-demagogic aesthetic of the socialist bloc, and by the bourgeois-artistic aesthetic of the European art film. The new cinema, for Rocha, should be ‘technically imperfect, dramatically dissonant, poetically rebellious, and sociologically imprecise’” (Stam, 96). It was to be a cinema for political activism, as opposed to Hollywood’s entertainment, and saw in art the ability of an endless critical process. Manifestos were published in the Arab world, mainly in Morocco and Egypt in 1972. There was even the “First Manifesto for a Palestinian Cinema” in 1972 issued at the Damascus festival, Syria, and a second manifesto issued in 1973 at the Carthage festival in Tunisia. It became a historically analytic yet culturally specific mode of cinematic discourse and film-making. While Third Cinema may have its share of theoretical limitations (i.e., more applicable to the Latin American context than to the general Third World; not taking into

account ethnic or gender divisions), two of its characteristics have a lasting and global value: the insistence on flexibility as research and experimentation, as a cinema forever in need of adaptation according to the dynamics of social struggle, and its attempt to speak a socially pertinent discourse absent in mainstream and authorial cinemas.

Gabriel (1989b) sees Third Cinema as a ‘battle’ between history and popular memory – popular memory being a folkloric account of memories passed through the generations, primarily oral; different and in opposition to false consciousness and the official versions of history. Popular memory considers the past as a political issue, as a theme of struggle, it is “a look back to the future, necessarily dissident and partisan, wedded to constant change” (Gabriel 1989b, 54). Such cinema can often be the auto-biography of the collective, hence multi- generational and trans-individual. It requires multiple points of view, but not just in the process of film-making but also in its reception, whereby film viewers are introduced to the collective autobiography and are urged to interact with it. Such cinema defies notions of passive viewing and celebrates direct participation, entering the spectator’s own autobiography. Gabriel calls it both an ‘activist aesthetics and critical spectatorship’ (*ibid.*, 60); “a sharing of responsibility in the construction of the text, where both the film-maker and the spectators play a double role as performers and creators” (*ibid.*, 62). So to Gabriel, “Third World cinema does not... have an independent existence. It is merely an index of a general cultural and historical trend in which film-makers can find their role and serve as caretakers of popular discourse in cinema” (*ibid.*, 55).

The documentary film *Jerusalem 1948* (1998) attempts to show what has been repressed in official (Israeli) versions of history. The example of the massacre of Deir Yassin is kept alive through collective accounts, delving into the past to reconstruct, redefine and redeem what official versions have overlooked or omitted. Such films are also characterized by open- endedness and keeping a situation unresolved. For example, Gabriel points to *The Duped* (1972) as having closure but of a different nature. Its purpose “is not simply a call for action, but rather an invitation to consider one alternative among many. In this way [it engages and entices] us with historical memories, authenticating the causes of conflict, of failure, and of difference” (Gabriel 1989b, 58). *The Duped* (1972), adapted by Egyptian director Taufik Salih, based on the novel *Men Under the Sun* by Palestinian author Ghassan Kanafani, and financed with Syrian money, is a pan-Arab production *par excellence* (Shafik, 155). Its story deals with the attempt of three Palestinian refugees to enter Kuwait from Iraq, hoping to find jobs in order to support their families still in the refugee camps. A Palestinian truck driver agrees to smuggle them through the desert. The refugees hide in his empty water tank, which is heated by the burning sun, and wait for the truck to pass the border checkpoint. He gets held up at the border, only because the Kuwaiti guards are bored and want him to entertain them. With the delay, the men die in the heat of the blazing tank, the air conditioners having drowned out their cry for help. Salih’s film was one of the first to give pan-Arab slogans a more solid base and to state the common responsibility of the Arab states for the situation of the Palestinians. The three refugees represent three different generations of exile, whereas the truck driver who lost his manhood during the way symbolizes the well-established careless émigré Palestinian. The film approaches the Palestinian question from a rhetorical level, in that the defeat from which Palestinians suffered most seems a result of moral failure. It is not the complicated network of Arab and international political power games that is made responsible,

but stupidity, egocentrism, cowardice, and missing vitality of the Arabs themselves. Other films such as *The Captain* (1997), *48 Hours in Israel* (1998), made by Egyptians, and *Men Under the Sun* (a trio of films based on the Palestinian novel by the same name, 1970) made by a Syrian, urge Palestinians to carry arms, stressing that there is no time for personal problems or oscillation between support and rejection of Palestinian action. They also make the point that the cause must be presented to the international public opinion to properly win support. Many of the early Palestinian films were exemplary of militant and guerilla cinema, unfortunately none of them seemed to have survived the war in Lebanon.

Exilic and Diasporic Films

“I don’t have a homeland. And since exile is the other side of having a homeland, I’m not in exile. On the other hand, at another level – a non-political level – every place is both a homeland and an exile... Exile is a kind of ‘place’ too. For me, Nazareth and New York are both simultaneously exiles and homelands... As far as I’m concerned, exile is a choice...”

“I have traveled and lived in different countries, and this nomadic experience is a privilege. My tie to the land is not exclusive... In my case, land is not an element that creates desire.”

film-maker Elia Suleiman

Exile is inexorably linked to the homeland and to the possibility of return, and is it is essentially associated with nationalism. The interplay between exile and nationalism are dialectical opposites constituting each other. Exile suggests a painful banishment from one’s homeland, and as such “must not be thought of as a generalized condition of alienation and difference... All displaced people do not experience exile equally or uniformly. Exile discourse thrives on detail, specificity, and locality” (Naficy 1999, 4). Although exile is usually solitary, experienced as an acute sense of solitude outside the group (Said, 359), and is very much about the need to reconstitute one’s broken life, to reassemble an identity out of the refractions and discontinuities of exile, it is also necessarily related back to the group. As Edward Said notes, and is an example of, Palestinian national identity has been as much created in exile as it has in more traditional means – many Palestinian ‘nationalists’ (for lack of a better word) have been exiles: for example Arafat in the political realm, Mahmoud Darwish in the literary realm, and Michel Khleifi in the cinematic realm. And so exilic films can also transform individual experience into collective form.

Although it is not an established or cohesive cinema, de-territorialized people and their films share certain features, most of all that they (the film-makers and their films) are at the “interstices of culture and film practice” (Naficy 2001, 4). Although their films may be similar, it is still important to recognize the differences between exile and diaspora. Exile suggests longing for home, dreaming of a return to an organic connection, and so the exile’s life is taken up with compensating for disorienting loss. It is also most often a solitary and lonely experience. According to Said, exiles also express opposition – to the institutions that

dominate modern life, to the place where they are ‘forced’ to live now.

No matter how well they do, exiles are always eccentrics who *feel* their difference (even as they frequently exploit it) as a kind of orphanhood. Anyone who is really homeless regards the habit of seeing estrangement in everything modern as an affectation, a display of modish attitudes. Clutching difference like a weapon to be used with stiffened will, the exile jealously insists on his or her right to refuse to belong (Said, 1990; 363).

This can translate into intransigence, exaggeration, overstatement. And so in a certain sense to be in exile means not to let go of the past and one’s history (collective or individual, imagined or real). While exile and diaspora are related and are often used synonymously, diaspora also shares in common with nomadism. Holding neither the exilic dream of return nor the nomadic celebration of liberty, “diaspora teaches the perpetual postponement of homecoming and the necessity, in the meanwhile, of living among strange lands and peoples” (Peters, 39). And so while diaspora also shares a sense of holding on to history with exile, it does not do so at the expense of adapting (and to some extent adopting) to one’s new place. Furthermore, diaspora often lacks the misery of exile, as it suggests real or imagined relationships among scattered members, whose sense of community is sustained by forms of communication and contact (Peters, 20). And as such diaspora is always collective.

The ‘structures of feelings’ in what Hamid Naficy (2001) calls an ‘accented cinema’ – to refer to films in the diaspora and/or in exile – focus on the undeniable personal and social experiences of exile and diaspora. The prevailing mood may be one of loneliness, melancholy, fear, panic or anomie. Characters may be living between psychological and social formations, hence liminal. They may also be interstitial, located at the intersections of aesthetic systems, languages, nations, and cultures. They may then also be hybrid, appropriating from different cultures. They may interpret all things politically. They recognize the simultaneity of space and time. There is an emphasis on the senses and on textures – sometimes as markers of difference, loss or longing – sound, screen gestures, nature. There may also be a heightened sense of sensuality and emotionality.

The recurring themes of accented films include the search for identity and the quest for ‘wholeness’ of the self; a focus on the family as a unit under pressure; an accounting of personal and/or national past; the ambiguity of what is real and visible; the preoccupation with deterritorialization, exile, displacement and un-belonging; and three types of journeys: the home-seeking journey with a search for home at the center and an account of the events that caused departure; the homelessness journey characterized by wandering, continual displacement and homelessness; and the homecoming journey characterized by the return, or by the desire, impossibility or staging of return.

With the concept of return, the conceptual frames of home and homeland are imbued with special significance. As Naficy distinguishes them, house is the material place in which one lives, home is anyplace, temporary and moveable, it can be built, rebuilt, and carried in memory and by acts of imagination – although in his analysis in his later work, he seems to use the terms inter-changeably. Homeland is the

most absolute, abstract, mythical and fought for (Naficy 1999). In either of these, the place refers not just to a physical entity (although it might), but also to relations to it and social relations within it. “Home is bound to horizons of reach and homeland to exile. In addition, since place is also historically situated, displacement and emplacement have a temporal dimension... For example, the sense of displacement of Palestinians and emplacement of Israelis is strongly tied to the year 1948... Accented films encode, embody, and imagine the home, exile, and transitional sites in certain privileged chronotopes that link the inherited space-time of the homeland to the constructed space-time of the exile and diaspora” (Naficy 2001, 152). Amos Gitai’s *House⁴* (1980) focuses around the irony of Palestinians rebuilding a house for a Jew, which originally belonged to a Palestinian, while at the same time fighting Israel for a homeland. Possession and renovation function as metaphors for the ownership and occupation of the homeland. The film documents three reconstruction projects: “those of a physical house, a house of memory (for the former occupants), and a celluloid house” (*ibid.*, 171). The film was neither aired on Israeli TV, nor had any Israeli funding, as Gitai explained: “the Israeli Television did not want to admit that Palestinians have memories, attachments and rights” (*ibid.*, 171). The completed house is never shown in the film, instead it is a ruin of a house, “a powerful symbol of the multiplicity of histories that have converged at this particular site without congealing them into a single History... a poem that contains many ellipses and fragments of narratives but not a totalizing, coherent story” (*ibid.*, 172). Focusing on the dispute of the physical house as its bearing on the idea of a national home, is common in Palestinian films as well. *Jerusalem: An Occupation Set in Stone?* (1998), begins with the bulldozing of a Palestinian house, shows Palestinians living in shipping crates and abandoned buses on the sites that used to be their house, and interviews Palestinians in front of their old houses that are now lived in by Israelis. But the physical and discursive battles are not only for a house but for the home. This represents the design to deprive Palestinians of homes, as a place for the possibility of a “radical political dimension” (in the words of Bell Hooks, 1990) and a sense of larger belonging. The Palestinians’ vehemence for the house is driven by their understanding of its larger political implications and their struggle for a homeland.

But in the case of Palestinians, transitional places, such as refugee camps, are also part of the idea of place that form identities. In fact there are also three symbolic landscapes in Palestinian exilic literature and film that play a huge role: desert, city and refugee camp (*ibid.*, 166). Furthermore Naficy also distinguishes between open and closed films and spaces. ‘Open’ films favor continuity, introspection and retrospection, as if to suggest that the experience of the here and now are not sufficient or real enough by themselves unless they are projected as loss or mediated by nostalgia or memory. ‘Closed’ films are driven by panic and fear, and a sense of claustrophobia. Films in and about the refugee camps are common, from the decades old documentary styles of the plight of the Palestinians, to more recent films made by ‘outsiders’ such as James Longley’s *Gaza Strip* (2002). Although Mai Masri has spent the majority of her film-making in the refugee camps of Lebanon, the more interesting films are those by Rashid Masharawi and Subhi Zubeidi, themselves refugees from the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, respectively. Both of their films blend documentary, ethnographic and narrative styles, and are produced, filmed and acted in solely by Palestinians, positing a new trend in Palestinian film-making, and a hope perhaps of a birth of an industry *per se*.

Elia Suleiman's films are worth analyzing here as exemplary of exilic cinema, and representative of new trends in Palestinian film-making. Suleiman's *Homage by Assassination* (1990) breaks away from the macro-narratives of national liberation, by re-envisioning the 'nation' as a "heteroglossic multiplicity of trajectories" (Stam & Shohat, 318). Although still anti-colonialist, such an experimental film focuses attention on the diversity of experiences within and across nations. Different than the Third World films that assume a fundamental coherence of national identity, a film like this calls attention to the fault lines of gender, class, ethnicity, religion, partition, migration and exile. The film chronicles Suleiman's claustrophobic reality in New York during the Persian Gulf war, and an attack by Iraqi scud missiles on his hometown of Nazareth; invoking diverse spatialities and temporalities marking exilic experience. The two clocks (New York and Nazareth time) point to the double spatiotemporality lived by the exilic subject. The film-maker is aware of his own simultaneity and his split existence, he is in fact, paralyzed by them. Souvenirs and fetishes of a Palestinian homeland displayed throughout his apartment: a Palestinian flag on a TV monitor, the land as a map on the wall, and 'al awda'5 as his 'return' key on the computer.

The diegetic filmmaker has failed attempts to reach his family in Nazareth: the communications media become the imperfect means by which this dislocated person retains the national imaginary, while struggling for a place in a new country. He "is at the nexus of a technologized communication and epistolary network consisting of computer, copier, fax, telephone, answering machine, radio, and television, all capable of both representing and misrepresenting the Palestinians" (Naficy, 2001;117). The routines of Suleiman's day, which he performs silently, represent activities that Bhabha calls the performative expressions of nationhood – "the performative expression of dailiness by exiled and disenfranchised peoples is a countermeasure to the official pedagogical representation of them, which tends to abstract them by stereotyping, exoticizing, and otherizing" (*ibid.*, 117). His silence may be read as culturally and cinematically oppositional, alienating the spectators by refusing them entry into the text. But such silence is also representative of the loneliness of the exile, which to Naficy also allegorizes the loneliness of interstitial production mode.

Suleiman's *Homage* also shows the impossibility of communication, even with the telephone's possibility of immediate communication – for in his case communication takes place over the answering machine, phone lines are down in Nazareth, and his only 'immediate' form of communication is through the fax machine, which in this case is not simultaneous. His only other form of knowing what is happening is through the television and radio. But what the film succeed in, is rather than evoking a longed-for ancestral home, it affirms the process of recreating identity in the liminal zone of exile (Stam & Shohat, 321). This film, like Suleiman's other works, does fetishize certain aspects of the homeland, but at the same time goes against the tendency of turning nostalgia into a ritualized denial of history.

Within exilic and diasporic films, one can include the cinema of the nomadic. Nomadic cinema may share some of the same aspects as exilic cinema, such as being multi-focal, asynchronous, including fragmented narratives and multiple subjectivities, and having a shifting and critical distance. Of course there is also in common a strong sense of placelessness, displacement and de-territorialization. One can also argue that both cinemas function and are representative of peoples on the margins, or at interstices of society. But

nomadism differs extensively from the exilic first and foremost because it dispenses altogether with the idea of a fixed home or center. Instead home is always mobile, suggesting a kind of doubleness: being at home everywhere, but lacking any fixed ground. Although this may seem similar to the exilic, in the nomadic perspective there is no hope or dream of homeland, there is no sense of forced banishment from (and hence longing for) one's 'original' place. Although they may share their themes of journey, nomadic films tend to represent journeys as an acknowledgement of the encounters with others, with known and unknown forces, and seeing land as something that exists only as mythic wilderness.

As Gabriel (1990) describes it, nomadic cinema is one of celebration rather than tension, it stresses yet minimizes conflict. Its dominant aspects are those of symbolism, metaphor, music and performance of marginalized and de-territorialized people – an expression of a collective memory rather than an official history. Time and space are subjective, flexible, cyclical and simultaneous, an outcome of experience. This seems to go hand in hand with their viewpoint on reality, as both tangible/ seeable and untouchable/ unseeable, and the nomadic perspective on memory and experience as ephemeral. And such expression consolidates the community through ritual and performance and relies on a collective participation. As much as they 'synthesize' their own voices, so they do with the surrounding cultures they pass through. Seeing themselves as belonging to different cultures and different periods of history, they incorporate aspects from different times and places; but they adapt not adopt.

Certainly most Palestinians do not see themselves as nomads, although they may share similar aspects. For them exile is not a choice, nor a privilege, but something that they must now live with. Exiles still somehow search for an identity. For nomads it seems that the quest for any fixed identity is illusory, perhaps even dangerous. Instead their lifestyle is one of drifting liberty, conjuring up images of bohemians, free from any attachment or any responsibility. As such, the nomad is a hero of postmodern thinking, liberating thought from dogmatism, celebrating a mobile diversity of life. Ultimately the concept of "nomadism is the dream of radical liberty, roaming at will, beholden to nothing but the winds and the stars" (Peters, 33). The passing 'through' of cultures is not traumatic but is to be part of the characteristic motion of subjectivity. If exile is the attitude of critical race theorists, multiculturalist, nationalist and ethnic movements, then nomadism is the attitude of poststructuralists, many liberals, cosmopolitans, and postmodernists generally (*ibid.*, 32). Which could then include the possibility of a performance of citizenship. One could see the difference between exile and nomadism as debates about identity, respectively primordial or constructed identity.

Elia Suleiman's *Chronicles of a Disappearance* (1996), although as much exilic as nomadic, shares quite a bit with this mode of cinema, as is perhaps the only Palestinian film to push the limits of Palestinianness. The story is of the return of a film-maker (himself) to Nazareth and Jerusalem. Despite some autobiographical elements, the film is not really autobiographical, nor documentary, nor fiction, as it contains elements of all without specifying which is which. One critic labeled it "part documentary, part psychodrama, part structuralist investigation, and part absurd comedy." The film-maker's return is neither an emotionally fulfilling homecoming to an originary homeland, nor a dystopian vision of total rejection of the old country. The film-maker never speaks which in a sense evokes the performance of his (non)identity. It is

difficult to tell what his role in the film is, perhaps a transient being opening windows into Palestinian and Israeli histories, cultures and identities, much like a nomad then, he passes through different places and acknowledges their differences. His silence can also be understood as a strategy of political resistance, or likewise the difficulty of coming to speech in an exilic situation. His film is an assertion of the absence of a Palestinian identity, but also offers an identity constantly seeking to define itself, in perpetual transition, anti-nationalist.

An ironic split subjectivity is developed, which juxtaposes critically and with humor aspects of the two sides' lives, in line with a post-modern aesthetics and ideology. Naficy classifies the film as a 'border' film in which "home turns out to be the critical distance, the third discursive space, which Suleiman creates and inhabits in the film" (Naficy 2001, 236). The film is also characterized by a decentralization of viewpoint and narration, non-linearity, duality of narrative perspectives and plurality of styles. Using non-linearity in narrative mode makes clear Suleiman's challenge to the linearity of the 'chronicle' of Palestine. As he explains of his choice:

Palestinians have always been ghettoized in a way, geographically and historically. To translate this metaphor requires a nonlinear cinematographic narrative structure... The nonlinear image, which is read through dispersed fragments, is the only way you can make the audience participate in the construction of the image and therefore in the construction of the story, of the discourse (Bourlond, 97).

In trying to create a decentered image of Palestine, Suleiman avoids a centralized, unified image that allows only a single narrative perspective, creating an image that transcends the ideological definition of what it means to be Palestinian – an image far from any stereotype and simultaneously a rejection of the static aspects of space and memory. Suleiman also seems to think of himself as a nomad rather than an exile; once claiming, "when the place you're in is no longer anything but its own representation, without the possibility of other representations, it's time to leave" (*ibid.*, 101).

The Future

While certainly Palestinian films represent a greater array of theoretical placement – from the nationalistic to the exilic – Palestinian film-makers are only slowly inching beyond thinking of film as a political project – whether of embracing national unity or challenging it. Of course this may have to do with the fact that one could equally think of Palestinianness as still having to do with a political project: Palestine is simultaneously a nation coming into being and a nation being lost to exile, and its films represent both these contradictory aspects. As such, this dual existence is reflected in the history and development of Palestinian films.

Palestinian cinema may always have a political role to play, thanks to the subject matter. Everything about

Palestine and Palestinianness is forcibly political, and inevitably manifests itself in cultural products. As such, Palestinian films will remain a description of a people living with constant misery, with political failures, without inalienable rights. Palestinian film-making will continue to be a description of a continuous human tragedy. And so, Palestinian documentation is an explanation of loss, necessarily political. A chagrin for lost earth and lost lives, a lost future.

At the same time however, film-makers such as Hany Abu-Assad (*Rana's Wedding*, 2001 and *Ford Transit*, 2004) and Elia Suleiman point to a birth of a new Palestinian film and new tendencies among film-makers. Less propaganda, less militancy, more experimentation that plays with orality and visuality, with spaces of memory and spaces of borders. As Palestinian film-makers embrace their trans-national experience, their global voice, their hybridity, they will inevitably create an "engaged" cinema. One that not only reflects the social memories, but one that pushes the creative limits of society; a cinema that evokes the curiosity and the will to find solutions to internal and external problems. Then, hopefully Palestinian film can live up to Edward Said's call:

whatever the claim may be that we [Palestinians] make on the world – and certainly on ourselves as people who have become restless in the fixed place to which we have been assigned – in fact our truest reality is expressed in the way we cross over from one place to another. We are migrants and perhaps hybrids in, but not of, any situation in which we find ourselves. This is the deepest continuity of our lives as a nation in exile and constantly on the move (Said, 1986: 164).

Bibliography

Abdel Fattah, Mohamed (2000a). "Arab Memory in the Palestinian Cinema." *IslamOnline*, June 1. Retrieved March 7, 2002 from <http://www.islamonline.net/iol-english/dowalia/art-2000-june-01/art2.asp>

Abdel Fattah, Mohamed (2000b). "Palestine and the Cinema: Palestine from the Perspective of the Arab Cinema." *IslamOnline*, June 8. Retrieved March 7, 2002 from <http://www.islamonline.net/iol-english/dowalia/art-2000-june-08/art2.asp>

Abdel Fattah, Mohamed (2000c). "Towards a Real Palestinian Cinema." *IslamOnline*, August 22. Retrieved March 7, 2002 from <http://www.islamonline.net/IOL-English/dowalia/art-2000-August-22/art1.asp>

Alexander, L. "On the Right to Dream, Love and be Free: Interview with Michel Khleifi" (1996). *Middle East Report* 201, vol.26, No.4. (Fall): 31-33.

Anderson, Benedict (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.

New York: Verso.

Armes, Roy (1987). *Third World Film Making and the West*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bibas, Benjamin (2001). "Cinéma Palestinien: La Troisième Génération." *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Février. p.31.

Bourlond, Anne (2000). "A Cinema of Nowhere: Interview with Elia Suleiman." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 29, no.2, Winter: 95-101.

Devereaux, Leslie & Roger Hillman (Eds.) (1995). *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology, and Photography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Espinosa, Julio García (2000). "For an Imperfect Cinema." In Robert Stam and Toby Miller (Eds.) *Film and Theory: An Anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers: 287-297.

Gabriel, Judith (2002). "Chronicle of Dark Humor: Palestinian Filmmaker Snubbed by Oscar." *Al Jadid*, Vol. 8, No. 41 (Fall). Retrieved April 12, 2005 from <http://www.aljadid.com/features/0841gabriel.html>

Gabriel, Teshome H. (1989a). "Towards a Critical Theory of Third World Films." In Pines, Jim & Paul Willemsen (Eds.) *Questions of Third Cinema*. London: British Film Institute: 30-52.

Gabriel, Teshome H. (1989b). "Third Cinema as Guardian of Popular Memory: Towards a Third Aesthetics." In Pines, Jim & Paul Willemsen (Eds.) *Questions of Third Cinema*. London: British Film Institute: 53-64.

Gabriel, Teshome H. (1990). "Thoughts on Nomadic Aesthetics and Black Independent Cinema: Traces of a Journey." In *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*. Ed. Russell Ferguson. Cambridge: MIT Press: 395-410.

Gabriel, Teshome H. (2000). "Towards a Critical Theory of Third World Films." In Robert Stam and Toby Miller (Eds.) *Film and Theory: An Anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers: p.298-316.

Gertz, Nurith (2004). "The Stone at the Top of the Mountain: The Films of Rashid Masharawi." *Journal of Palestine Studies* Vol. XXXIV, No. 1 (Autumn): 23-36.

Ginsburg, Faye (1995). "Mediating Culture: Indigenous Media, Ethnographic Film, and the Production of Identity." In Devereaux, Leslie & Roger Hillman (Eds.) *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology, and Photography*. Berkeley: University of California Press: 256-291.

Higson, Andrew (2000). "The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema." In Mette Hjort & Scott

- Mackenzie (Eds.) *Cinema and Nation*. New York: Routledge: 63-74.
- Hjort, Mette & Scott Mackenzie (Eds.) (2000). *Cinema and Nation*. New York: Routledge.
- Hooks, Bell (1990). *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Naficy, Hamid & Teshome H. Gabriel (Eds.) (1993). *Otherness and the Media: The Ethnography of the Imagined and the Imaged*. Langhorne, PA: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Naficy, Hamid (2001). *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Naficy, Hamid (Ed.) (1999). *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media and the Politics of Place*. New York: Routledge.
- Peters, John Durham (1999). "Exile, Nomadism, and Diaspora: The Stakes of Mobility in the Western Canon." In Naficy, Hamid (Ed.). *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media and the Politics of Place*. New York: Routledge: 17-41.
- Pines, Jim & Paul Willemen (Eds.) (1989). *Questions of Third Cinema*. London: British Film Institute.
- Said, Edward (1986). *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, Edward (1990). "Reflections of Exile." In *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*. Ed. Russell Ferguson. Cambridge: MIT Press: 357-366.
- Schlesinger, Philip (2000). "The Sociological Scope of 'National Cinema'." In Mette Hjort & Scott Mackenzie (Eds.) *Cinema and Nation*. New York: Routledge: 19-31.
- Shafik, Viola (1998). *Arab Cinema: History and Cultural Identity*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Shohat, Ella (1987). *Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Shohat, Ella (1992). "Notes on the Postcolonial." *Social Text*, No. 31/32 (Spring): 99-113.
- Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam (1997). *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. New York: Routledge.
- Solanas, Fernando and Octavio Gettino (2000). "Towards a Third Cinema" In Robert Stam and Toby

Miller (Eds.) *Film and Theory: An Anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers: 265-286.

Solanas, Fernando and Octavio Gettino (1978) "Cinéma d'auteur ou cinéma d'intervention?" Table Ronde avec Fernando Solanas et al. *CinémAction* Vol. I, Paris: n.p.

Stam, Robert (2000). *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Willemsen, Paul (1995). "The National." In Leslie Devereaux and Roger Hillman (Eds), *Fields of Vision: Essays in Film Studies, Visual Anthropology, and Photography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

The Importance of the Pedagogy Process.

By Stephanie Watson

As I prepare a syllabus for the students enrolled in Freshman Composition, I include five types of essays, which I expect any high school graduate to have an idea of how to write. The first of these five essays is a simple remembering essay with the only guideline being that they write three to four pages describing a memory that is important to them. I encourage their writing in first person, making the essay a personal narrative, but also making this essay much easier for the students to write. Imagine my disappointment when after the first essay was completed and turned in I found the majority of the grades to be low Cs, high Ds because the students in my class have no idea how to organize, form, or proof an essay. High school English classes are obviously teaching something other than essay writing.

Walk into any high school English classroom in the state of Texas, and you will find students reading classic literature. Homer's *The Odyssey*, Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, or perhaps *King Lear*; Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*, and Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath*, are among a few of the novels that high school English educators select for their students to read, study, and test over. On top of teaching students the classics, high school teachers have to focus upon preparing their students to pass the required standardized tests that our state government deems so important, so they concentrate on teaching young men and women how to simply pass a test. This means that they focus on teaching not how to write a good solid organized essay, but on how to write a personal narrative of two pages without focusing on having them use any type of writing process. Yet once the students leave their high school environment they find themselves ill prepared to enter a Freshman Composition classroom, which focuses solely on the writing process. This is due to a majority of high schools teaching not the pedagogy process, but teaching them to write to a test. The writing *process* is important; teachers of eleventh and twelfth graders should be focusing more on writing, incorporating it with reading great literature. This process is easily taught to high school students and can be integrated into a classroom, not only continuing the literature reading, but also adding the writing process into the curriculum.

The pedagogy or writing process can be defined any number of ways, by any number of theorists. A common set of teaching methods used for college student instruction includes a three-step process of prewriting, drafting, and post-writing. The prewriting phase is used to show students brainstorming techniques, which can assist in their discovery process when trying to determine topics to write about. Students may find "a question or problem may not be welldefined, but sense something unknown or disagree with

other's views" (Ramage 485) thus wish to investigate and find the answers. As instructors we want to "include activities that motivate students to write, generate ideas for writing, and focus the attention of students on objective of the writing" (Norton 287). Techniques such as drawing, listing and categorizing, and semantic mapping can be introduced as methods to stimulate, prompt, and inspire writing. "Where prewriting experiences allow students to explore, imagine, consider initial structure, and think about [the] details that go into their writing," (294) moving from the prewriting step to the actual writing process, also known as drafting, will demand some additional considerations that as teachers we must introduce to our students before the pen touches the paper.

The drafting phase of the pedagogy process may include creating outlines, focusing on a specific point to be made, considering the audience who will be reading the final paper, and the linguistic choices to be made. "The objective of [the actual drafting] phase is the fairly rapid writing of ideas generated, developed, and redefined during the prewriting phase" (301). This phase "often leads writers to discover new ideas, to complicate or refocus the problem, and to sometimes change directions" (Ramage 490). While all of these changes may occur during the drafting phase, students may have the tendency to become unorganized in their writing, and many experts believe an outline will keep writers on task. Author Ayn Rand believes that "most writing problems – the psychological barriers, setbacks, discouragements – come from the absence of a proper outline . . . thus [the writing] falls apart structurally" (Norton 295). Encouraging students to write with some type of organization is beneficial and will be seen in the finished product.

The final stage in the pedagogy process over the years, revision, "has been a neglected part of the writing process" (Dean 9). Experts believe the reason for the neglect might be that revision is hard to teach. "Revision isn't easily reduced to a model as with prewriting clusters, Venn diagrams, or freewriting" (Campo 257). Revision tends to happen after the first drafting process, is also where major portions of writing are still completed, and most certainly is a recursive step, for drafting and revision tend to go hand in hand. Most experienced writers will write, revise, write, and revise slowly "going through the first draft, adding, deleting, reordering, or completely rewriting passages" (Ramage 498). Each student should be taught proper revision processes, such as, peer review and editing workshops. Students must be shown how to revise properly, with instructors informing the students what, when, and how they should be searching for possible mistakes and probable places for revision.

Many theorists disagree with a three-step process in teaching writing. Patricia Bizzell believes that "there is no one composing process that works for all writers and all situations" (109). She believes that each person who writes "employs several processes for different types of writing and that writing is a repetitive process that cannot be divided into isolated stages of pre-writing, drafting, and revising" (109). Bizzell actually defines composition herself as "all the processes out of which a piece of written work emerges" (122). She has employed several methods to the process of writing from a product-centered pedagogy, to cognitive composing developments. She states that many researchers interpret results based on their own personal pedagogical assumptions, whether it is on classroom size or teaching methods (125).

Experts Gordon Rohman and Raymond Wlecke suggest that journal keeping and mediation should be

taught as a part of the first of the three stage composing process of prewriting, writing, and editing (Connors 6). This pedagogy seems limited to being linear because it tends to “move through the composing process without backtracking or omitting any stage” (Bizzell 113). However, the Rohman-Wlecke teaching model has several key stages missing, for example, what if a student has no organizational skills and needs an outline to maintain a sense of order. Does outlining fall under the “writing” stage of the Rohman-Wlecke process? “. . . [R]ather than grammar drills, [prewriting activities] could become the actual content of the writing course” (Connors 5) when using this three-stage method. While prewriting is a great way to initiate students to the writing process, it fails to teach many of the rules that should be learned when it comes to formal essay writing. Whereas journal writing is a great exercise for brainstorming ideas to use in essays, it does nothing to help the student prepare a cohesive, mechanically correct final essay. Journal writing is an informal act that allows a student to write without the pressure of making sure every “I” is dotted and “T” is crossed. This fun activity allows students to write down what is going on in their head.

Linda Flower and John R. Hayes use the writing process as a way to see what is going on inside a writer’s head, and ask their writers to talk aloud while in the thought process. Their model divides the composing process into three main parts, a task environment, a writing process, and a writer’s long-term memory. These are then subdivided into even more sections. This composing process is recursive and not linear, so the writer can switch back and forth from one writing subprocess to another at any time while composing (Bizzell 116). The process tends to have a lack of organization and is not a beneficial way to teach students the beginnings of how to write. Organization is important to helping a new writer see the writing process we teach. Nancy Sommers makes the argument that the “whole composing process is a process of revision in which the writer does not simply polish her style, but more important, develops her ideas” (117). This leaves the teacher to understanding that even the more abysmal of first drafts has hope due to the continual revising process. The recursive organizing and revising process is functionally sound, students understand this method fairly well, and above all, they respond favorably to any critiquing of their work.

Student response techniques that appraise student writing obviously help define criteria for evaluating students’ writing. Richard W. Beach describes in his essay “Evaluating Students’ Response Strategies in Writing about Literature” that the various response strategies are important to “recognize that the quality of students’ responses [do] depend on the quality of the assignments and social context in which the students are responding” (Cooper 195). These techniques include: engaging, recalling, inferring, understanding the text as a cultural world, connecting, and interpreting or judging. Beach states that these strategies “serve as a framework or taxonomy for organizing instruction and evaluation” that they are “designed to encourage students to go beyond simply retelling and interpreting texts” (196). Instructors can have students write journal entries on their own interpretations of a text and comment in a “conversational mode, posing questions and giving reactions in an attempt to provoke further thinking about the responses to the novel” (198). This method of instruction sounds similar to the reader response theory, which was a “reaction against the New Criticism, or formalistic approach, which dominated literary criticism for roughly a half-century” (Guerin 355). Beach explains that this method, which expresses an “engagement or aesthetic response,” (Cooper 195) is an excellent way to integrate writing and reading together. Whether it is called reading response theory or student response strategies, these methods and

approaches of interpretation and response should still be considered valuable teaching tools, especially in the high school environment. They should be used today in our classrooms because it makes students comfortable interpreting and writing about literature.

Teaching the method of reader response criticism in writing is frowned upon by most academia. Many say that reader response theory is subjective and relative, and most teachers are more comfortable giving students a solid basis or meaning behind a text rather than allowing the students to interpret for themselves their own meanings by using their own experiences. This “truncated, familiar descriptions of their engagement” (195) is also considered self-indulgent, yet students tend to bring in their own experiences of life into the classroom, so why should we fear their using these experiences in their writing? Each strategic criterion that Beach describes does in fact help students to learn not only about the text through their own familiarity, but also teaches them to be comfortable when writing. In preparation for college composition, high school educators might consider teaching the reader response essay, teaching students the writing process, thus preparing students for the writing expected of them as they enter the college environment.

To begin to understand exactly how the pedagogy process could be implemented using the reader response theory, I sought out a high school instructor that would be willing to allow me to experiment with her class. I was welcomed into Mrs. Chumley’s twelfth grade class at Asumud High School* and explained what I would attempt, which was to change the process in which they had been previously taught to write. I explained that I would look through their prior essays, which had been graded, and I would give a second grade based on my own Freshman Composition class grading standards. These prior essays were what I would call persuasive arguments. Out of the twenty-five students, after I had given each essay a second grade, this class has a total of three B’s, ten C’s, eight D’s, and four F’s. The largest problem I found with these essays was their lack of organization, no thesis sentence, no conclusion, no transitions, and failure to maintain cohesiveness to both the topic sentence of their respective paragraphs and the thesis.

Then I gave Mrs. Chumley instructions to a pedagogy process, which included prewriting, drafting, and post writing steps. These steps were to be implemented on their next essay, which I suggested be a three page reading response essay. They were to summarize any of the literature they had read up to the present and then write a personal response.

The prewriting steps I suggested were to have the student’s journal write on their response to the literature they choose. They could write in any manner, and they were not to worry about grammar or punctuation. One such journal entry was as follows:

I really liked reading *To Kill a Mockingbird*. I get how Scout feels about her brother and Dill since my brothers and their friends do not like me to hang out with them at all. Scout really wanted to play with Dill and Jem but I think it was stupid of them not to let her. She was really mad when they went swimming and left her out. My dumb brothers are always leaving me out and when I want to ride the four wheelers with them they just ignore me or tell me to go away because I am a girl. Jem always tells Scout she acts more and more like a girl all the time.

This student felt that she could relate to a character in Harper Lee's novel and wrote her own feelings that were parallel. This prewriting step helped Mrs. Chumley and myself see what kind of idea the student might have for a paper.

The next step I requested the students complete was an outline. While I understand the dislike for the five-paragraph format, these students had no idea how to organize any of their ideas in preparation to write a first draft. Mrs. Chumley and I introduced a format, which does not necessarily demand five paragraphs, but it does explain an organizational method that the students could understand and use for their own work. Using the same student's idea on *To Kill a Mockingbird*, her outline looked like this:

I. Introduction

Summarize Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*

Thesis: Harper Lee wrote Scout very realistic; I can understand how Scout felt when Jem ignored her and called her a girl because my own brothers tell me all the time that I am a girl and cannot do the same stuff that they can do.

II. Response – How do I feel about my brother's treating me this way and how does this compare to how Jem treated Scout?

III. Conclusion

While this was a rough outline for the student to work with, it gave her a sense of organization before she began the drafting process.

To teach the actual drafting process, I had Mrs. Chumley begin by explaining that a summary should accurately and objectively represent the key ideas. "Summaries cite the author and title, accurately represent the main ideas, quote directly key phrases or sentences, and describe main features of the text" (Reid 153). When summarizing, the student must understand they are to be objective and need to accurately represent the main ideas. The summary should appear first and be about one-third of the entire paper. The thesis sentence of the essay should be the transition from the summary into the response. The response needs to "focus on [the student's] ideas and reactions" (Reid 153). A student can analyze the text, the organization of the text or story, agree or disagree with the author, or interpret the author's ideas. Supporting the response with evidence is also important. Students cannot make a claim such as, "I really didn't like *To Kill a Mockingbird* because it was dumb." They have to understand that any base claim made must be supported with textual evidence. The best way to have student's practice evidentiary writing is to have them use examples from their own experiences.

First drafts in Mrs. Chumley's class were to be 200 words, basically a summary and a clear thesis sentence. The students brought these rough drafts into the classroom, and we began the first step in the revision

process. While many experts and instructors believe that peer review is worthless, I feel it is beneficial to students if they are taught what to look for in their peer's papers. Mrs. Chumley and I discussed several ideas on what the students should look for in each other's papers and for this first draft we instructed the students to pair up, trade papers, and look for these specific points:

1. Is there a thesis sentence? Underline it.
2. Does the author of the paper introduce the text and the author?
3. What do you think the author of the paper believes is the main idea of the text they are summarizing?
4. Are direct quotes used? Should they be? Would direct quotes and/or author tags make the summary more effective?
5. Look at the grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure. Underline any mistakes.

Mrs. Chumley and I were surprisingly pleased with the results of this first peer review; the students actively participated and had no problem critiquing each other's papers. They turned these in, and I reviewed their progress and comments, finding that they had no problem looking for the items we had suggested they look for.

The second draft consisted of 500 words and began their response portion of the essay. Mrs. Chumley and I decided we would experiment with this peer review, and we gave the students no direction on what to look for. We also placed the students in groups of four instead of in pairs. This turned out to be a mistake; the students traded papers, but made useless comments like, "I really liked what you said here" and "I think this is a great paper." The students also had a harder time focusing on their work and gossiped more about things not related to their papers. As Mrs. Chumley and I collected these drafts, we both decided that the group peer review was not a success for this particular class.

The next draft was 800 words. We had the students pair up instead of join groups. We also gave them a specific list of items to look for in each other's papers. Once more I was pleased with the results. The students made strong and helpful comments because we guided them through the peer review process. They also seemed to like the guidance in looking for errors and problems. One young man commented that by looking at his partner's paper for specific problems, he was able to fix his own paper's errors and problems. As I gathered this last draft, I was excited to see that these papers had more corrections and comments on them. I realize that this method of peer review may not work for every class, but it is the teacher's job to try different methods of peer review and see what works best with each particular class.

After Mrs. Chumley returned the final draft with her and my comments added, the students were given one week to complete and turn in their final copy. As I began reading these final copies, I immediately began to see an improvement in their writing. All but three of the papers were well organized, followed

the thesis well and did not introduce anything new to the paper. I still found problems with transitions, but for the most part, the students' paragraphs tended to follow their topic sentences. Both Mrs. Chumley and I agreed that the writing had progressed, and their grades showed as much. This time there were 4 A's, 8 B's 9 C's, 2 D's, and 2 F's. I believe Mrs. Chumley's twelfth grade class showed improvement in their grades and in their writing because they were taught a writing process.

Teaching high school students any method of a pedagogy process will only enhance their writing and prove a benefit once they begin their college careers. It does not matter what exact process students are taught, there are many variations and different opinions of how, what, and why a pedagogy process can or should be taught, but students have to be educated in some type of writing process in order for their writing to be organized, focused, and, well thought out. Certainly high school students should continue to be taught methods that will assist in their passing the standardized achievement exams which our government deems so important; however, once they leave behind their high school years and enter the college environment, they have to be prepared to understand the processes which college Freshman Composition will require.

Works Cited

- Beach, Richard. "Evaluating Students' Response Strategies in Writing about Literature." *Evaluating Writing*. Ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1998.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Composing Processes: An Overview." *The Allyn and Bacon Sourcebook for College Writing Teachers*. 2nd ed. Ed. James C. McDonald. Boston: Pearson Education, 2000.
- Campo, Vicky. "Invention Activity Late in the Writing Process." *Strategies for Teaching First-Year Composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2002.
- Connors, Robert J. "Introduction to D. Gordon Rohman's 'Pre-Writing: The Stage of Discovery in the Writing Process.'" *Teaching Writing: Landmarks and Horizons*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002.
- Dean, Deborah. "Revisiting the Writing Process: Rethinking Revision." *The English Record*. 53.2: 8–16.
- Guerin, Wilfred L. et al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Miller, Susan. "Why Composition Studies Disappeared and What Happened Then." *Composition Studies in the New Millennium*. 2003: 48–56.
- Norton, Donna E. "Composition: The Writing Process." *The Effective Teaching of Language Arts*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2004.

Ramage, John D. et al. "Writing as a Problem-Solving Process." *The Allyn & Bacon Guide to Writing*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 2003.

Reid, Stephen. "Techniques for Writing about Reading." *The Prentice Hall Guide for College Writers*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003.

Notes

* Name of school has been altered.

This page is intentionally left blank.

