



حوليات آداب عين شمس المجلد 45 (عدد يناير – مارس 2017)

<http://www.aafu.journals.ekb.eg>

(دورية علمية محكمة)



جامعة عين شمس

Post 9/11 American Dramas: A Postmodern Postcolonial Study of Wajahat Ali's *The Domestic Crusaders* and John Shanley's *Dirty Story*

Shaimaa Mohamed Saeed*

مدرس مساعد بقسم اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها، كلية الآداب والإنسانيات، الجامعة البريطانية في مصر.

Abstract

The focal point of this study is the date 9/11 which history immortalized as it witnessed the sudden attacks on one of the world's super powers, the United States of America. The repercussions of this date boomed in the world's four corners leaving behind feelings of insecurity and fears from the unknown. Whereas 9/11 had many influences on the international and domestic economic, political and social arenas, such influences were reflected in the literary arena as well. Many American playwrights were influenced by the attacks to the extent that such attacks have become the raw material formulating the dramatic substance of their post 9/11 plays and have induced the plays' dramatic conflicts. This study probes into postmodernism and postcolonialism, as two interrelated literary approaches having many intersecting points, to unravel the ideological and textual significance of the 9/11 events as depicted in the two post 9/11 American dramas: *The Domestic Crusaders* (2005) by Wajahat Ali (1980-) and *Dirty Story* (2003) by John Shanley (1950-). The study, moreover, proves that the combination of postmodern and postcolonial notions of marginality versus the centrality, cultural hybridity, and the representation of history along with examples of metaphor, irony, allegory, intertextuality, and metatheatre at unequal intervals in both plays stresses that the dramatic meaning of the date 9/11 is explicitly simple and transparent but implicitly sophisticated and multisided.

Keywords: American drama post 9/11- cultural hybridity- historiographic metatheatre -intertextuality- postcolonialism-postmodernism

© جميع حقوق الطبع والنشر محفوظة لجمعية كلية الآداب - جامعة عين شمس 2017.

*Most people are other people. Their thoughts
are someone else's opinions, their lives a
mimicry, their passions a quotation.*

- Oscar Wilde

Although the context, time and significance of Oscar Wilde's profoundly informative quote were meant to address people and life two centuries ago, the quote's timeline could be figuratively extended to describe the nowadays' postmodern and postcolonial post 9/11 life. It was meant to be a release of feelings of oppression and distress that Wilde was experiencing during his two- year imprisonment in 1897; however, it holds earnest insinuations for the theatricality of life, for a wide stage that people are performing on while not maintaining a clear identity or struggling in quest of such identity, for the representation of the unreal, and for the absence of genuineness. It also alludes to the dialogue-form, intertextual dramatic script that bears the actor's intense emotions and that is based on borrowed quotes. Wilde's quote is, therefore, a tacit reference to the postmodern and postcolonial post 9/11 theatre whose actors are "other people" in the sense that "their thoughts are someone else's opinions, their lives a mimicry and their passions a quotation" (Wilde 22). This is the type of theatre that Kerstin Schmidt calls "a theater of transformation" (11). It is a theater that transforms every trace of any traditional norm that would narrow down the scope of a dramatic performance. He asserts:

Transformative practices . . . ensure that postmodern plays do not rest at simply deconstructing dramatic constituents or destroying the communal orientation of theater. They rather evoke these constituents and the notion of a communal ritual while, at the same time, challenging and problematizing their possibility: Postmodern drama disturbs and subverts these features and constituents by transforming them. (11-12)

According to the quotation, "transformative practices" of the postmodern theatre interrupts the compatibly linear and traditional theatrical elements for the sake of generating new forms that are worth probing and that will be devoid of limitations. This lays emphasis on the exceptional and unique nature of postmodern drama and theater that open new vistas before their readers and audience, respectively. Thus, Schmidt intelligently and implicitly highlights the postmodern drama's "conceptual indeterminacy and the implications of its contradictory and fragmentary character" (15). Such announced fragmentation of the postmodern drama obliges the reader to deliberate on the post 9/11 fragmented selves, associating the postcolonial features with the postmodern ones.

The 9/11 events, as a matter of fact, propose postmodern and postcolonial issues and link the postcolonial to the postmodern. This is due

to the fact that the date 9/11 raises worldwide controversies over the binary concept of the marginal versus the center, the deconstruction of the Western hegemony, the representation of identity, the history of the East and the West, cultural hybridity, and the concept of resistance on the part of both the Self and the Other. In “Critical Exchanges in Postcolonial Studies Post 9/11,” Anna Ball emphasizes:

In this move towards self-scrutiny post-9/11. . . topics of the so-called margin—race, gender, ethnicity, religion—have been pushed center-stage in national and global affairs. . . postcolonialism offers . . . a variety of frameworks that might account for the paradigms of identity formation, power, and representation formed in the interplay of the marginal and central, local and global post-9/11. (296-7)

In the above quotation, although Ball’s main target was palpably to underscore the relationship between postcolonialism and the post 9/11 era, what she says tend to be shared with the postmodern ideologies that glorifies the marginal and studies it versus the central from racial, gender, ethnic and religious perspectives in order to preserve its identity during its long quest for power and dignity, the matter which also relates postmodernism to the date 9/11.

Accordingly, this study explains how Wajahat Ali’s *The Domestic Crusaders* and John Shanley’s *Dirty Story*, perfectly illustrate the common features characteristic of postmodernism and postcolonialism. The study, hence, comparatively analyses the two plays with respect to the general notions and the stylistic devices both movements share, thus presenting an ideological and textual analysis of them.

On the one hand, Wajahat Ali is an emerging Pakistani-American playwright who was prompted by his educator the American playwright Ishmael Reed to write a play about the positive and negative life experiences of Pakistani-American Muslim immigrants in a post 9/11 era after Ali had revealed an outstanding skill, as a student, in portraying dramatic characters and writing a well-knitted plot.

The Domestic Crusaders premiered in 2005 at the Thrust Stage of Berkeley Repertory Theatre and San Jose University Theatre, New York. The play is about a family that gathered to celebrate the 21st birthday of their son Ghafur. The family consists of six members: Hakim, the grandfather; Salman the father, a 54 year old engineer; Khulsoom, a 50 year old mother; Salahuddin, the elder son between 26-27; Fatima, daughter between 24-25; and Ghafur; the youngest son. This gathering is a fertile ground for debatable issues related to the image of Muslims post 9/11 and the policies adopted by America against Muslims as a result of the attacks. It provides an accurate depiction of the gap between three successive generations: grandparents, parents and children; moreover, it casts light on parent-children as well as husband-wife relationships within an atmosphere of

gender struggle for autonomy.

John Shanley, on the other hand, is a native American playwright who was concerned, in *Dirty Story*, with projecting one of the adverse effects of the 9/11 attacks: the coercively fierce measures Sharon took against Palestinians post 9/11 since he, upon George W. Bush's proclamation of his 'War on Terror,' "saw common cause with his own fight against Palestinian terror in Israel . . . and increased the level of IDF response against the Intifada" (Harms and Ferry 174).

Dirty Story was produced by Labyrinth Theater Company and premiered on February 18th, 2003. This play embodies the Palestinian-Israeli conflict through the portrayal of the female protagonist Wanda, a Jewish girl, who aspires to be a writer and the male protagonist Brutus, an eminent Arab author, who defends the Arab identity by rejecting to cede his properties to her. Wanda proposes her attempted novel to Brutus during an arranged appointment, and despite Brutus' dislike of her writing, another contact occurred between them ultimately terminating in a politically tense and allegorical struggle for the existence of nations, in general, and the Palestinian as well as Israeli nations, in particular.

There are three major postmodern and postcolonial notions that could be traced in the two post 9/11 American dramas; they are: the marginal versus the centre, cultural hybridity and the representation of history. Firstly, both plays revere the marginal and denounce the centre. This is definitely logical since minor attention was given to postmodern drama in general, as a subject of study, if compared to the innumerable studies conducted on other postmodern genres like "fiction and poetry in particular" (Schmidt 10). In other words, postmodern drama has itself been marginalized; thus, it is natural to find it casting light on the marginal obliging a "critic to be more attentive to ways in which gender and race are broached by artists" (Schmidt 24) and offering opportunities for "a revival of neglected discourses" (Schmidt 22). Christopher Butler further elucidates that the "the autonomy of the 'other' was thus transformed by postmodernism into very fragmented proclamations of marginality and difference, the 'deconstruction' of dominant attitudes, attacks on stereotypical judgements" (94). Thus, one can argue that the inferior Other, in a postmodern and postcolonial drama, is expected to be centralized through focusing on his marginality, deconstructing the behaviour of the centre, and lashing at any "stereotypical judgements" imposed on him by the centre.

The aforementioned proposition of the marginal versus the centre is highly manifested in *The Domestic Crusaders* and *Dirty Story* where the marginal is embodied not only in the female and male characters equitably but also in the whole Pakistani-American race of immigrants and the

Semitic race, respectively.

In *The Domestic Crusaders*, the female characters Khulsoom and Fatima feel marginalized in their family and in the American community that they are attempting to co-exist with. On the one hand, Khulsoom, who represents all Asian immigrant mothers, is regarded by her daughter Fatima and the American community when she first arrived in USA as an old-fashioned reactionary who has been described as “Fresh Off the Boat” or “FOB” (4) because of adhering to her culture’s customs, traditions and outfits. She tells Fatima, “*Hanh*, well, at least us FOBs were wearing something. All those *nangay*, naked hippie women throwing their panties, *astaghfirullah*” (4). Khulsoom also feels that she is her children’s and husband’s subject of criticism and that she is, as a mother, “blamed for everything” (13). She tells Fatima sarcastically but proudly: “Oh, sorry – I forgot your Ami is some backward, uneducated, *ghown*, village woman, hay na?” (4). Although she is proud of her ancestry, she highly understands how the superior Other judges someone like her but at the same time believes that she is privileged and can even leave her own special imprint on those who are to be considered superiors, which deconstructs their superiority. She is proved to be a lady who spurns any form of degradation with which she might be treated even by her husband. This was excessively palpable when she faces her husband with the fact that she can no longer endure his “belittling through the years” (76).

On the other hand, Fatima feels burdened with the fact that her family, especially her mom and brother Salahuddin, disapprove of the extremely liberal and daring feminist attitudes and beliefs that she adopts. Her mother criticizes her saying, “My only beti, twenty four years old. *Still* single! . . . Once such a nice girl, now wearing hijab, giving controversial speeches, getting arrested at the university protest, going out on the town with blacks – ”(7). Fatima faces her mother with the bitter reality that she feels her family’s house is not hers (5). She also expresses her annoyance at the fact that she is always to blame for inculcating politics in the mind of her brother Ghafur due to being an activist and for teaching him how to adhere to his beliefs and interests even if they conflict with his family’s; she says, “Blame me always. The middle child always becomes the voodoo child” (50). Moreover, she rages at her mother saying:

It was me all along. I confess . . . infiltrating Ghafur’s mind with propaganda. ‘Cause I have nothing better to do than to waste my time - because *of course*, according to you, I do *nothing* but waste my time, because all my activities are supposedly *useless* to backward women like you! (56)

As for Fatima’s brother Salahuddin, he usually makes fun of her “hijab” and her friends whom he cynically calls “radical ninja ‘sisters’” (9), and he undervalues whatever potentials they possess believing that they are incompetent to change the world’s views about Muslim immigrants. He tells

Fatima:

Why don't you lecture your feminazi fundo "sisters" about spending all their carefree time doing something useful- like learning how to cook? Or going to the gym? Maybe, maybe then they might trick some poor, blind FOB into proposing so he can get his visa – that's of course before they swell up like a naan after the marriage. (*Inflates his cheeks and raises arms around his stomach*) (11)

Not only does she feel underestimated by her family but also by the Pakistani- American patriarchal figures who look down upon the dark-skinned, Pakistani-American, and Muslim females who wear hijab. She exclaims, "That's exactly it. People treat us like 'jewels'- like we're some sort of commodity to be traded on the stock market" (29). This was also sensed by Khulsoom who tells her husband:

We're just boring and common . . . No reason to respect us, or treat us like a princess. But – oh, no – when Ms. Goree bee-lond woman comes . . . then there comes the combed hair, the suit and tie, the wide smile with the white teeth showing. May I open the door for you, Ms. White Hourain? May I get you your food . . . All of you colonized men- all the same with your hypocrisy! (28-9)

The above quote proves that the complex of the "dark-skinned" versus the light-skinned, the black versus the white, is deep-seated in the minds and souls of those who have been stereotyped as being inferior, which demonstrates an internal conflict that the Orient experiences. Furthermore, Ali reveals a great wit in depicting ironically the rejection of the Other even among people of the same race through the treatment Fatima receives from her own Pakistani- American community. She is convinced that she is "hated" and says, "The aunties all whisper behind my back . . . because I wear the hijab . . . They can't stand it that I'm actually making something of my life instead of becoming an obese, wrinkled, backbiting gossip hag" (31-2).

Ali, in addition, is extremely ironical to point out the fact that people who are complaining of being discriminated against by the Whites are themselves the ones who have a discriminatory attitude towards the Blacks. This is manifested when Fatima insists that her family, especially her mother, must renounce their discriminatory stand against the Blacks, and she believes that her parents are pointless in opposing her marriage to a black American convert whom she praises by saying: "He's such a good person . . . And he's smart and kind and he's passionate. He doesn't drink, and even before converting he never messed with girls or drugs or any of that. And he knows Arabic . . ." (69). Moreover, the above-mentioned

notion is evident when all the family members, except Salahuddin, express their aversion to allowing any of the Pakistani-American Muslim males to get married to a Jewish girl. The family members react indignantly upon raising the issue of a marriage that took place between one of their Muslim neighbours' sons and a Jewish girl. Salman says, "Of all the girls – couldn't find *one* decent Muslim one" (26), and Fatima believes that Jews "hate [their] people? Oppress Palestinians? Own Hollywood, distort the media? (27). On the one hand, Hakim understands that it is not forbidden in Islam to marry Jewish girls as they are "People of the Book" (26), but he asserts that "they have never respected [Muslims] and [their] ways- they will never adopt [their] customs and beliefs" (27). However, on the other hand, Khulsoom is worried about the offspring of such a match as kids will be "so confused", and they will "become atheists and druggies after the divorce" (27).

Moving to the male characters in *The Domestic Crusaders*, Salman, the householder, suffers psychologically at the hands of his boss Hunter at work who gave a post, which Salman should have been granted, to a 28-year old inexperienced graduate student because he is a perfect representative of an Arab with his name "Ab-doolah" and long beard just to show the company's foreign investors, as Hunter says, that "we, as Americans, respect their exotic culture and A-rab-esque heritage, and to prove it, we're gonna send 'em one of their own" (80). This disappoints Salman and makes him lament over the years that he spent in America working "faithfully, competently . . . night and day, like a dog" (79) and bemoans the fact that he had ultimately gained nothing except "a bloody nose and a bloody shirt" (79), which is a direct reference to the misfortune and distressed life he has been leading in America as an immigrant. Even Salahuddin does not feel that he is his father's favorite and that he is not in good terms with his dad. He tells Ghafur to absorb his disappointment from the slap his father gave him on knowing that he is no longer studying medicine, "I get pissed on left and right for twenty-seven years, each side of the face, and I say screw it . . . and I leave- and what? Does he ever once ask me to come back? (*Voice is cracked, starts choking up, albeit briefly*) Even once?" (65).

Through some of the situations that Hakim and Ghafur experience, Islam is proved to be marginalized and stereotyped among other religions because the superior Other associates it with terrorism and in turn Muslims are viewed as terrorists, which is condemned by the characters. For example, Salman's neighbours regard his family members as "freaks" and that their house "smells like Little Kabul" (Fatima 16). Khulsoom is shocked and says, "Kya? Kabul? We're not those *Afghanis*. We're *Pakistanis*! Why don't you tell them, Fatima? I've lived here long enough. They should at least give respect and know who I am At least not call me some *Afghanis*" (16). Hakim also narrates that one day a nearly eight-year

old boy asked him, "Are you related to Osama bin Laden? (16). He swiftly answers, "no, no, I am not. *He* is a terrorist who doesn't know the first thing about the religion of Islam. *I* am a proud Musalman, Alhamdulillah" (17). Furthermore, Ghafur, as a Muslim Pakistani- American and a 21 year old boy, while checking in for a flight back home, he is inspected thoroughly and calls it a "Muslim-mammal zoo exhibit" as the "body search" (40) attracted the attention of everyone at the airport. This took place because Ghafur was "wearing sandals, with a grizzly beard, with [his] prayer cap on . . . and a new paperback of *Jihad and Terrorism* . . . under [his] left arm" (40); he is a Muslim who has to be suspected of being a terrorist.

In *Dirty Story*, Wanda (Israel), Frank (U.S.A), and Watson (U.K) emblemize the centre while Brutus (Palestine) portrays the marginal according to the current worldwide constants. In the play, the Semitic race that is represented by the only female Jewish protagonist Wanda and the male Arab protagonist Brutus feels marginalized. At the outset of the play, Shanley, through stage directions, prepares the audience for such sophisticated atmosphere of marginalisation saying "*Brutus is drinking coffee, playing a game of chess alone. Across the way, another man, an aging English patrician, Lawrence, also plays chess alone. . . [Wanda] is pulling a six-foot palm tree in a luggage carrier*" (5). The word "alone" is indicative of how Brutus is considered an outcast. This has also been proved at different instances along the play when Brutus voices the fact that he is "broke" (19) and "poor" (60) and that he "can't tear [his] eyes away from the spectacle of the world passing [him] by" (19). Moreover, his marginalisation is further underlined when he addresses the three centres, Wanda, Watson and Frank, saying: "No one's talking to me! Do you think I am an extension of your imagination? You take what's mine and you give it away. You give away my home . . . I am suffering!" (73). On the other hand, Wanda's dragging of the huge "*palm tree*" refers to her desperate need for having an entity and an identity that would be fulfilled via colonialism. In addition, her fragmented identity is revealed when she expresses that she has a family whose members are scattered everywhere and that "someday, [she is] going to have [her] own place" because this is the dream that she "decorate[s] . . . in [her] head" (22). She feels that she is hated and that "people have this weird reaction to [her] (51). Even when she talked about her husband, she confesses that she failed in making him love her, but on the contrary she "was just helping him hate" her and her marriage was regarded as a "catastrophe" due to "boundary issues" which symbolically stands for "a problem in contemporary relations" (20).

Concerning the world centres, Frank and Watson, they are depicted as maintaining their everlasting real-life role of supporting Wanda and mediating between herself and Brutus. However, in the course of such role,

they never cease to underrate and marginalize Brutus through their attitudes. In reply to Brutus demand to be supplied with “guns” like Wanda, Frank asserts, “at your best, what you want doesn’t exist. And at your worst, you’re a genocidal street-hustling criminal fucker” (69). Moreover, when Brutus was asking for “half the apartment” and for the restoration of the normal arrangement of his belongings, Watson replies, “That isn’t the future you’re talking about, mate. That’s the past” (63). Both centres overlook and ignore the human needs of Brutus and treat him as a villain.

It is worth mentioning that Wanda, who is believed by the marginal to be the centralized Israel, views herself as marginalized while Brutus, who is supposed to stand for the marginalised Arabs of Palestine, is believed by the centre to be centralized. This is manifested in the following extract:

Wanda: Everyone wants to get away from me. Nobody likes me. It’s the story of my life.

Brutus: Do you think I’m popular?

Wanda: Compared to me, yes.

Brutus: I doubt that. (17)

In addition, both the centre and the marginal harbour bitterness for one another. From the very beginning, Brutus senses Wanda’s colonial intentions and reacts by “*pour[ing] his coffee into the palm tree*” (7) and “*grab[ing] her manuscript and throw[ing] it on the ground*” (17) to emphasize his rejection of the centre Other and to maintain his dignity as an Arab. Later, upon Wanda’s offer to decorate his apartment with “something green” (18), he then replies, “I’d have to water it. I don’t want to take that on” (18), which symbolizes his absolute disapproval of the least sign of colonialism that would bind him and his race to it forever. In fact, Brutus’ rejection of the centre Other is further clarified when he ordered Wanda not to dare write a book similar to the one she asked him to read in which the creation of a homeland is introduced within a fictional context: “Confine yourself to nonfiction . . . Your manuscript has no understanding of the possible, much less the real . . . it’s a gloss on a gloss. An utterly unoriginal,” (10) he says. However, it is worth illuminating that Brutus’ rejection of Wanda and his description of her book as “dead” (10) is based on his profound understanding of the devious history and plans of the centre Other. He tells Wanda, “I don’t like politics masquerading as science any more than I care for aggression disguised as dialogue” (13). Similarly, Wanda fills Brutus’ apartment with palm tree pots and takes possession of most of the apartment with the toilet on her side while ordering Brutus to take permission before going to the toilet and to flush if he really aspires for a peaceful coexistence, which displays how the centre adeptly humiliates and abuses the marginal. She also announces that she does not give the least heed to the suffering of Brutus, and she faces Brutus pointblank, “Well, I’ve stopped running; I have stopped dreaming of getting along with you. You can get along with me; you can leave, or you can drop dead. It’s up to you”

(73).

Moreover, while declaring their marginality, not only the marginal but also the centre censures “stereotypical judgements” (Butler 94). Each attempts to give justifications for the stereotypical images conferred upon them. Wanda justifies her colonial intentions saying, “I’ve had all this impermanence and all I dream of is of settling down and having a home” (18), “My grandfather lived there long before this guy” (47) and “I have a God-given right to be here” (67). She gives herself the right to occupy other’s lodgings based on the fact that she is “a productive member of a society” (60) if compared to Brutus who is viewed by her as a “bum” (60) and a “thug” (70). She fortifies her stance stressing:

I am a proud person. I put myself through college. I work two jobs. I try to make my own way. But I’m having to defend myself against somebody who’s just got nothing else to do. This guy’s been unemployed for like a century. His life’s a disaster and he’s decided to blame me. (48)

However, Brutus provides a pretext for his laziness and inability to be an actively efficient and “productive” member of the society claiming that he is “so angry” about how his belongings are being encroached and that he has lost the sense of “hope” he used to have before Wanda arrives at his apartment as he “can’t hope in this atmosphere of hostility and aggression” (60).

Secondly, the two post 9/11 American dramas highly demonstrate the concept of cultural hybridity. According to Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, hybridity is “the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization” (118). The term is mostly attributed to Homi Bhabha who gives a profound analysis of it in his book *The Location of Culture*. Bhabha stresses the fact that the culture of people living in a postcolonial era is the culture of living in the “beyond” which is not a novel vista nor is it a leftover of the past (1). However, in such “beyond,” the postcolonial person discovers himself in a point of transcendence where “space and time” overpass to create “complex figures of difference and identity, past and present, inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion” (1). Such figures suffer from “a sense of disorientation, a disturbance of direction, in the 'beyond': an exploratory, restless movement” (1). This “beyond” is considered by Bhabha as an “in-between” space that “initiate[s] new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself” (1-2). This “in-between” space “becomes the process of symbolic interaction, the connective tissue that constructs the difference between upper and lower, black and white” (4).

The new identities formulated as a result of occupying such “in-between” space are hybrid ones where “the representation of difference” in them does not reflect “*pre-given* ethnic or cultural traits set in the fixed tablet of tradition;” nevertheless, it is regarded, on the part of the ‘minority,’ as “a complex, on-going negotiation” (2) that attempts to acknowledge such new hybrid forms of identities that blend sets of the colonized-colonizer values together. In Bhabha’s viewpoint, such hybrid identities are constructed in the postcolonial discourse through the process of “mimicry” which is “the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*” (86). This means that the colonizer, in search for his superiority and dignity, tries to acquire part of the qualities of the colonized through a partial, i.e. “not quite” but not an absolute process of imitation or “mimicry” for the sake of producing an amended personality. Hence, such process is correlated with a state of “ambivalence” and “indeterminacy” that threatens the Other who is torn between the identities of the colonized and the colonizer. Moreover, Bhabha clarifies that “Mimicry” is both “the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which ‘appropriates’ the Other as it visualizes power” and “an immanent threat to both ‘normalized’ knowledges and disciplinary powers” (86) as the behavior and attitudes of such new hybrid identities will require “surveillance” since “in ‘normalizing’ the colonial state or subject, the dream of post-Enlightenment civility alienates its own language of liberty and produces another knowledge of its norms” (86).

Bhabha, through the ambivalent identities that are formed because of the interaction between the colonized and colonizer, explains that such ambivalence is viewed by him as a form of resistance to the colonial authority which works strenuously to maintain its identity through creating a replication in the name of reform and discipline. He says:

Resistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intention, nor is it the simple negation or exclusion of the ‘content’ of another culture, as a difference once perceived. It is the effect of an ambivalence produced within the rules of recognition of dominating discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference. (110)

In fact, Bhabha’s analysis of “cultural hybridity” could be applied to *The Domestic Crusaders*. In “Festival Features ‘Domestic Crusaders,’” Suzanne LaFetra says that *The Domestic Crusaders* “draws back the curtain on a Pakistani-American family showing the complicated world of pressures in being both Muslim and American today.” Moreover, in “Play Offers Glimpse Into Pak American Issues,” Ashfaque Swapan describes the effect of such culture clash on the Pakistani- American family saying, “the clash of cultures has taken a sharpened ugly edge since the terrorist attacks of 9-11, and it is beginning to cause fissures within the family. [Khulsoom’s]

children have dealt with it in different ways.” Furthermore, in “Aftermath and Domestic Crusaders Examine the Muslim Experience,” Alexis Soloski says that the play “features a Pakistani-American family beset by internal tensions and assimilationist pressures.” Accordingly, the Pakistani-American family in the play is said to live in this “in-between” space where both the Eastern and the Western cultures clash thus producing a hybrid identity that struggles to overcome the pressures imposed by such a clash through what Bhabha calls “mimicry” which occurs through the process of assimilation that results in the fragmentation of souls.

In *The Domestic Crusaders*, cultural hybridity and fragmentation are projected in the setting and the characters’ clothes and attitudes. First, the play is set in “contemporary suburban home...with the kitchen area ... opening into the family room” (2) with a family room that has a “Middle Eastern coffee table” (22), the matter which clarifies to the reader the hybrid style of decoration where both the American and the Eastern designs intermingle. Second, upon scrutinizing the external appearance of the characters, one finds that the American fashion intervenes in the characters’ outfits. Fatima wears “stylish red designer sweater and designer blue jeans. Green armband” (vi) despite putting on her hijab, Salahuddin wears a “Dark black designer pants,” “white, collared Banana Republic business-type shirt” and “silver belt”(vi), Ghafur wears a “Western clothing, green shirt, but also a black *Kufi* (Muslim skullcap)” (vii), and Salman wears “a simple white Hanes undershirt” (73). Third, upon examining the characters’ attitudes, one notices that Khulsoom, in the opening scene of the play, “goes over to the clock radio that has been playing the adhan, turns it off, and switches on the radio... She finally settles on an oldies station, which is broadcasting a classic by Tom Jones” after she had “finished with her supplications” (2). She kept singing and enjoying the song. Such duality in appearance and attitudes reflects how much the characters are highly influenced by the American culture so that on the one hand some, like Khulsoom, Fatima, Ghafur, Salman, and Hakim, are fighting to keep their identities in resistance to the American culture although it has been so difficult for them to detach themselves from such culture. On the other hand, Salahuddin has succumbed to the influence of the West, as clarified earlier, believing in its superiority and practicality while objecting to the constant blame laid by Muslims on “America for everything” (10).

In *Dirty Story*, the reader is confronted with the hybrid character Brutus who appears to be inhabiting what Bhabha calls the “beyond” and “in-between” where he oscillates between two cultures and between the past and present. He is “wearing tight-fitting pants and boots, a white shirt” (18) in “mimicry” of the American culture, but he admits having a “fourth wife” (23) and believes in recurrent matrimony. Besides, he claims that he is

“devout” (72) and at the same time “takes a drink of wine” (27). He exclaims that he lacks “an honest bone in [his] body,” “despise[s] honesty” and takes “indirection” as a general “modus” (21). The “in-between” space is highly manifested in the play’s last scene when the entire parties sit together to play a poker game including Brutus who acquiesces to the type of game the centres are playing and glorifies Frank by calling him “Caesar:”

Brutus: Can’t we play chess?

Frank: No. We got players to accommodate.

Brutus: All right.

...

Brutus: Would you mind if I called you Caesar?

Frank: All right, you can call me Caesar, Brutus.

Brutus: I want to deal.

Wanda: No, me. (75)

Eventually, such hybridity leads to an evident fragmentation of the soul and ambivalence of the mind to the extent that the marginal Brutus speaks of his weak point to the centre Wanda: “all I do is defend and adjust and curse and worship what’s already happened. I can’t capitalize on Today. I can’t grasp the Now. But it’s worse even than that. Because I can’t hold on to the Past, either. I’ve broken with everything. I’m in a soup” (22).

Thirdly, the past or history can never be excluded from the analysis of the postmodern and postcolonial post 9/11 American dramas, especially when Linda Hutcheon affirms that the past is all the time present in the postmodern writings while hinting at the “postmodern concept of ‘the presence of the past’” (*Poetics of Postmodernism* 4) and by coining the term “historiographic metafiction” (*Poetics of Postmodernism* 5) to give reference to the “self-reflexive” novels that “lay claim to historical events and personages” (*Poetics of Postmodernism* 5). Furthermore, in “Circling the Downspout of Empire: Post-Colonialism and Postmodernism,” she admits that “post-colonial literatures” discuss the oppressive history of colonialism in relation to the reassessed domestic “past” (152). Thus, the past does exist in the postmodern and the postcolonial literature, but the coherence of such “past” is lacking in any postmodern and postcolonial literary work, including the post 9/11 American dramas. This is stated pointblank in *The Postmodern* by Simon Malpas who settles the argument over the end of history in the postmodern world saying:

What has ended is not the production of events themselves, but rather our need or ability to form a narrative from them that demonstrates their coherent, developmental logic and points to a utopian future in which the conflicts and contradictions between them will have been resolved. (89-90)

According to Malpas, it is the organic unity and logical sequence of past events that have disappeared in a postmodern era but not the events

themselves. In the two post 9/11 American dramas, one can hear the voice of the past or history in manifold instances throughout each play but can never find a well-developed and full account of history there.

In *The Domestic Crusaders*, the voice of the past is heard from the start in the title which gives reference to the Crusades and the Crusaders and in the casting page where each of the characters' names is derived from a name of a historical figure: Khulsoom, the name of the prophet Muhammad's daughter Umm Khulsoom; Fatima, the name of the prophet Muhammad's dearest daughter; Salahuddin, Salahuddin Ayubbid who restored Jerusalem to Muslims; and Salman, from Sulayman, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire during the 16th century. Moreover, the voice of the past is heard while referring to the classical song of the old Welsh singer Tom Jones, the terrorist Osama bin Laden, the Afghans who seek asylum in the United States, the prophet Muhammad's tradition of feeding upon "honey," "dates," and "milk" (21), the Jewish race that hates and oppresses Muslims, the history of the British colonizers who "Come in-rape, loot, destroy, turn brother against brother . . . just for dawat and power" (47), the Saudis who are "whoring their oil in exchange for their Amreekan allowance" (48), the Turkish government which is "trying to be more European than Europe"(48), the Yemini Arabs who are "so pious with their liquor stores at every street corner" (48), the Wahabbis who are "spreading their Wahabbism with their millions to the Taliban" (48), the picture of the retired American football player Joe Montana, a painting by Van Gogh, and the twentieth century American poet T.S. Eliot. The voice of the past is also heard through Hakim, the wise grandfather, who narrates, from habit, moments in the history of India and Pakistan after gaining their independence and getting rid of the British rule. Hakim deplores this period when schism was common among Sikhs, Hindus and Muslims who battled together to gain control of the land and desperately avenged themselves believing that "I kill your brother, you kill my family. I burn your store, you burn my house" (98).

However, in *Dirty Story*, one could easily notice that history could be traced in the characters' dialogue. However, this history is not revealed in the form of a unified narrative, it is deconstructed into separate events stated in the course of the characters' discussions. Even the postmodern controversy or the end of history is raised by Shanley via Brutus while wondering: "what will be the effect on the biggest story of all? History. If Story abandons History, will we come to imagine History in other terms? Or is History, as the Germans so recently declared, dead?" (14). In fact, the voice of the past is always present, and it has controlled the characters' attitudes and feelings. For instance, Karl Marx is associated with the idea of "envision[ing] something new, something that does not exist" in order to

“set in motion its genesis” (9), thus reminiscing his past Marxist philosophies of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the memory of the Soviet Union leader Joe Stalin (1878 -1953) is revived to refute the fact that he is a “boy scout” (9) by recollecting the 1930-1955 labour camp “Gulag” in the Soviet Union that claimed the lives of many (9). In addition, Brutus was recalling proudly the dignified history of the Arabs when he says:

I wasn't exactly thinking about my childhood . . . I was thinking about my heritage. Which I saw in a movie once. The desert! An endless palace of sky. My domain. Riding my camel into infinity. . . Night comes. We make camp. We talk in the great tent about philosophy, mathematics. The hypnotic flames of the campfire blackening and illuminating our eyes. Spontaneously, we compose poetry of great insight and organic beauty. (58)

Moreover, Shanley points out to the Palestinian suicide bombers whose activities have begun since the onset of the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories. This is obvious in Wanda's words: "Courage? Courage is a virtue. When you say someone has courage, that's a compliment. We do not compliment people for exploiting social covenants like Freedom and Trust for the purposes of murder! "(64). He also alluded to Nihilism, a philosophy introduced in the early nineteenth century by Friedrich Jacobi, meaning the state of nothingness, i.e. living aimlessly without a clear objective. This allusion was made when Wanda was insulting Brutus by calling him “a nihilistic little git” (65). A reference to Abraham is also made in Frank’s words when he was trying to ease the tension between Brutus and Wanda. In such reference, Frank goes back to a great moment in the history of Islam when Allah ordered Abraham to slaughter his son as a sacrifice. However, when Abraham was about to obey Allah’s order, Allah sent a sheep to be slaughtered instead of his son. Frank says:

You guys believe in a vengeful God. But hey, we're all children of Abraham, right? That's some story. That's a fork-in-the-road story. God tells Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac. But at the last minute God said, " Abe, scuttle that idea. Human sacrifice, dammit, we're past that." I believe that was the beginning of the Jesus angle. Drop that eye- for- an- eye thing, move on. You know what? I'd like to think if Adolf Hitler was a Christian, he wouldn't a killed the Jews. (67)

Snapshots from the political history are also highlighted when Frank referred in the above quotation to Adolf Hitler’s holocaust occurring during World War II under the Nazi rule. In addition, this history is illustrated when Frank mentions Pearl Harbor, the American land that was suddenly attacked by the Japanese in 1941. Frank assumes, “I'd like to think, if Hitler was born-again, there never woulda been a Pearl Harbor” (67). When Pearl

Harbor is stated, it is followed by the memory of Hiroshima taking place in 1945. Brutus wonders, "But what about Hiroshima, Mister Nice Man? How do you explain Hiroshima?" (68). Brutus, in this quotation, is defending the Japanese by reminding the American character, Frank, of how atrocious the Americans are.

Furthermore, Ali and Shanley utilize literary devices, such as metaphor, allegory, irony, intertextuality, and metatheatre in their postmodern and postcolonial plays. Such devices can be tracked unevenly in each of the plays of the study. For instance, the title of *The Domestic Crusaders* is both metaphoric and ironic as the family members are compared to "Crusaders" who struggle to win a war of views that has been launched at home between them while speaking about the post 9/11 period. Moreover, verbal irony is the dominant form used in the play, which creates a comic effect during the attempt of each character to elucidate his/her life notions and criticize the other. Fatima disagrees with her mom's traditional nature calling her "Ms. FOB 2010" (4). Khulsoom makes fun of her daughter's defensive character by calling her "Ms. Barrister" (6). Salahuddin describes sarcastically the quarrel between the mother and daughter saying, "The battle of the hijabi versus the non-hijabi, round one!" (7); in addition, he cynically calls Fatima's friends the "insane Jihadi penguin squad" (10). Furthermore, he compares his mother to a "third-world dictator" (11) because of how skilful she is at managing the kitchen chores. Fatima, in an ironic tone, rejects Salahuddin's obsession with the American culture telling him:

You'd probably let your wife teach your kids that the Palestinians are rock throwing terrorists. And every Arab kid is a potential ticking human time bomb. And the Israelis (in *a baby-ing voice*) *obviously* are poor, defenseless helpless innocents who just happen to have one of the world's strongest militaries, nuclear capabilities, M16s weapons, and Apache helicopters thanks to direct support and aid from your United States of America! (28)

Khulsoom calls the white American female "Ms. White Hourain" (29) who infatuates the Pakistani-American men including her husband while Salman underestimates his wife's analysis of the father-son relationship by giving her the name "Mrs. Freud" (77). Furthermore, Ghafur ironically depicts the scene of his thorough examination at the airport by comparing it to a "Muslim-mammal zoo exhibit" (40). Even Ghafur shares the rest of the family members in their game of irony when he calls Fatima by the name

“Judge Judy” (67) asking her to voice her wisdom and “educate” (67) him after he is slapped by his father because of quitting the medical school.

Nevertheless, in *Dirty Story*, the characters, setting and actions are allegorical. As for the characters, Brutus represents the Palestinians; Wanda is Israel; Frank is the United States while Watson is Great Britain. In addition, Brutus’ apartment, the place over which Wanda and Brutus are disputing in act II, scene iii, stands for the occupied Palestinian territories. At the beginning of the scene, the stage directions draw a clear picture of the Palestinian- Israeli situation through the setting's description: "*a pile of [Brutus's] possessions heaped in a corner*" and many "*palms in pots*" (57) brought by Watson and Frank in the apartment. On the one hand, the scene of Brutus's belongings piled up in a corner refers to trespassing on vast areas of the Palestinian territories leaving behind the minimum to the Palestinians. On the other hand, the "*palms*" stands for the Israeli settlements that spread everywhere. Concerning some of the actions revealed in the stage directions, "*Frank and Watson come on with palms in pots, dancing*" (57), which allegorizes the United States' and United Kingdom's support for and organization of the establishment of settlements in Palestine. In fact, the United States’ alliance with Israel is manifested earlier in the play when Frank gives Wanda a "*remote-controlled toy tank*" (54) to use for terrorizing Brutus; the "*toy tank*" allegorizes weapons supplied by the United States to Israel. Moreover, Wanda "*puts a foot on [Brutus's] shoulder and shoves him down*" (57), which alludes to the exercise of oppression and humiliation in dealing with the downtrodden Other. In addition, "*Frank sits on top of a stepladder at the dividing line between Wanda's stuff and Brutus's stuff*" (57), which shows the affected role of mediation played by the United States in appeasing the heated up situation between both sides. However, Watson was seen "*stand[ing] upstage holding a club*" (57), which refers to the stand-by role played by Britain for taking severe action whenever needed.

Additionally, one of the most significantly meaningful allegories that Shanley spotlights is his implied allusion to the desecration of Al-Aqsa Mosque and the clash between members of different faiths over its affiliation through the depiction of Wanda’s encroachment upon Brutus Father’s “hatbox” which stands for the sanctified Mosque and the reaction of the characters, respectively:

Brutus: Stay away from the place where I pray.

Wanda: What do you mean? Your daddy's hatbox?

Brutus: Don't. That's where my father made his piety.

Wanda: I'm sure my grandfather prayed there, too.

Frank: I think Jesus ate dinner there.

Watson: Lunch it was!

Brutus: That's where my father talked to God. It's my only certainty. That's where I try to talk to God.

Wanda: May be it's where Abraham talked to God. (65-66)

In the above dialogue, the mention of both Jesus and Abraham conspicuously hints at the history of Christianity and Islam, respectively.

Concerning the examples of intertextuality, it is worth mentioning that the identification of intertexts, in the two post 9/11 dramas, entails recalling Julia Kristeva's investigation of Bakhtin's analysis of a "literary structure" and "literary word" (35). According to him, a "literary structure" is formulated upon associating it with "*another* structure;" moreover, a "literary word" is "*an intersection of textual surfaces* rather than a *point* (a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context." Thus, a text is created in relation to "history and society, which are then seen as texts read by the writer, and into which he inserts himself by rewriting them" (Kristeva 35-6). Bakhtin proceeds to elaborate that "the word in a text" is the product of two intersecting axes: a horizontal and vertical. By the "horizontal axis," he links a text to the "writing subject and addressee" while, by the vertical, he relates it to "an anterior or synchronic literary corpus." Hence, the outcome of such intersection is the discovery of multiple texts, which merge different entities together: the subject, addressee, and exterior literary corpus, in a sole text (Kristeva 36). In fact, this is the case with the two 9/11 dramas, the subject of study; such dramas could be considered, as it were, a dialogue between myriad texts that represent the words of the writer, the addressee and other parallel texts in the background.

In *The Domestic Crusaders* and *Dirty Story*, intertextuality is noticed in numerous instances. Apart from the texts generated by the author and that of the addressee, the original text directly and vertically leads the reader to a preceding corpus. It is the cultural corpus that the plays' texts underpin and through which rich significance is attributed.

In fact, the first intertext that the reader can detect in *The Domestic Crusaders* is part of the lyrics of Tom Jones' song "It Is Not Unusual" (3). Although Tom Jones is Welsh and his song dates back to 1965, Khulsoom enjoyably sings it while carrying out her house chores. Ali is intelligent enough to introduce this rock and pop American fashion in the first pages of his play to draw the reader's attention to the bicultural, fragmented nature of the Pakistani-American community that he is depicting and to portray a tendency towards assimilation. Moreover, an indirect reference to the English proverb "a way to man's heart is through his stomach" is made when Khulsoom was trying to advise Fatima on how to win her future husband's love: "I'll tell you a secret all wise women know: feed your man well with good food every night, and he'll never chase after another woman" (6). The playwright, here, sheds light on how the elderly are still

influenced by the social mores they were raised on. Moreover, a list of literature is embedded in the dialogue. For example, “*Webster’s Dictionary*” (8) is used by Salahuddin when he cynically describes Fatima’s eloquently grandiose speech. Samuel P. Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations” (8) is mentioned to stress that it is difficult for a Native American daughter –in– law to live in harmony with a Pakistani-American mother-in-law since the book focuses on the battle that civilizations are engaged in. The scientific, Australian magazine “*Cosmos*” (29) and the family, American magazine “*Reader’s Digest*” (72) are pointed out. The first alludes to Khulsoom’s wise analysis of how some of the family’s Pakistani-American male friends renounce their origins and desperately seek to win the favour of White American females by adopting the white American values while the latter shows the influence that the American culture has on Salman’s family. Moreover, the phrase of the English sociologist Herbert Spencer “survival of the fittest *and* the smartest” is directly stated by Salahuddin attempting to advise his younger brother Gafur on how it is essential for a person to be powerful enough in this world in order to be capable of living among the robust clan, “A bull amongst the cattle” (66). This view point, in itself, is paralleled with the Darwinian concept of natural selection that he introduces in his theory of evolution. Another wisdom given by Salahuddin to his brother is that he should not burden himself with altering the normal course of the world, and in order to support his argument, he cites T.S. Eliot’s line of verse, “do I dare disturb the world?” (66), which is taken from his poem “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” that was published in 1915 and that embodies the physical frailty and spiritual frustration man is experiencing in the modern world.

Concerning *Dirty Story*, mentioning the American film serial *The Perils of Pauline* of 1914 while Brutus was trying to avenge his Arab race of the oppression the Arabs experienced at the hands of the Israelis, Shanley directs his readers to the script of the movie that revolves around a damsel who is implicated in hazardous situations by many wicked men who target her inheritance and would like her to perish (Burstyn 211). Such intertext assimilates Wanda’s and Pauline’s alarming situations. Another intertext in the play is the reference to the lyrics of Richard Harris’ song “MacArthur Park” written by Jimmy Webb when the song was played on stage witnessing the moment Brutus “throws” Wanda’s script “on the ground” (17). The song introduces the metaphor of the “cake” that somebody has left “out in the rain,” and it was impossible to “take it” as it melted although “it took so long to bake it,” and it was so difficult to “have that recipe again.” This metaphor parallels with Wanda’s script whose papers were scattered on the ground and after she tries to collect them, she takes the decision to “throw” them “in the trash” (17) in disappointment. In fact, she made an effort to “bake it,” but all her efforts were in vain. Moreover, an allusion to T.S. Eliot’s poem “Waste Land” occurs when Wanda describes Brutus’s

apartment as a “wasteland” (18) before her arrival. In addition, Stephen Foster’s song “Camptown Races” (37, 76) was sung twice in the play once by Frank and Watson and the other by the entire characters at the end of the play. The lyrics of the song point out to a horse race where people bet their money on a particular horse and is symbolically used by Shanley through the characters to hint at the worldly race people are living and at the modern life which is a win-lose struggle. Furthermore, Shanley orients the reader to Christopher Marlowe’s play *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus* by mentioning the character Faust when Watson was doubting Frank’s identity due to his extremely vicious nature: “Faust or the devil?” (43), he wonders.

Furthermore, other significant intertexts are noticed in *Dirty Story* upon pointing out twice in act II, scene i, to the “Exodus” music played while Wanda was having a conversation with Frank seeking his support to triumph over Brutus and achieve her colonizing plans. Such music belonged to a song with the lyrics “the land is mine” sung by the American pop singer Andy Williams and composed for the 1960 American movie “Exodus” which is based on Leon Uris’s 1958 novel *Exodus*. Shanley is highly adept in his selection of such music which evokes in the reader’s mind the memory of the song’s lyrics that disclose a firm tendency towards colonization and that of the novel which circumvolves around “the pioneer settlements, illegal immigration to Palestine, the struggle for independence, the Jewish underground movement, and the historic moment of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948” (Weissbrod 129). Moreover, the music recalls the Torah’s “Book of Exodus” whose main theme is the “physical and spiritual birth of Israel as a nation” (Plaut). Thus, Shanley, via the three afore mentioned intertexts, prepares the reader for the intensified sense of challenge that will dominate his play in act II, scenes ii and iii.

In addition, in act II, scene iii, Shanley uses a piece of music from the 1962 British film *Lawrence of Arabia* while Brutus was reminiscing the old honourable history of Arabs and was lamenting the loss of the prestige they used to have in the past through their contributions to sciences and literature. Mentioning the film takes the reader to its script which was composed with the life and experiences of the British archeologist, politician, and army officer Thomas Edward Lawrence in the background. The lyrics of the song that Brutus was singing, “The sand is soft; Don’t need no mattress; I’m a nomad; I got no address!” (58), recollect from the film the character T.E Lawrence’s admiration for the desert and the Bedouins and his belief in their high efficiency in fighting the enemies. In the film, he tells Prince Feisal, the King of Greater Syria in 1920:

My lord, I think... I think your book is right. 'The desert is an ocean in which no oar is dipped' and on this ocean the Bedu go where they please and strike where they please. This is the

way the Bedu have always fought. You're famed throughout the world for fighting in this way and this is the way you should fight now! (Bolt 48)

In other instances in *Dirty Story*, the phrase "*Cherchez la femme*" was recurred by Wanda as follows: "*Cherchez la femme? Where has she gone? No more!*" (65; 70; 75); she was addressing Frank implicitly referring to the influence that women have on men forcing them to yield to their demands and symbolically pointing out to Israel which is manipulatively skillful at achieving its objectives. This phrase was initially introduced by Alexandre Dumas in the 1864 French novel **The Mohicans of Paris** where a woman was doubted to be involved in a crime ("*Cherchez*").

Moreover, it is worth mentioning that the historiographic nature of postmodern texts, which has been analysed earlier in this study, is viewed by the postmodern theorist Linda Hutcheon, in *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, as an indication of intertextuality. She asserts that "[literature and history] appear to be equally intertextual, deploying the texts of the past within their own complex textuality" (105). Hutcheon reaches such conclusion after introducing her justification at the beginning of her book, believing that:

History is not made obsolete: it is, however, being rethought—as a human construct . . . We cannot know the past except through its texts: its documents, its evidence, even its eye-witness accounts are texts. Even the institutions of the past, its social structures and practices, could be seen, in one sense, as social texts. (16)

She also adds that the aim of "postmodern intertextuality" is to heal the rift between the reader's past and present and to reword the past, which is extracted from a myriad of corpora, "in a new context" (118).

Finally, traces of metafiction are identified in the two post 9/11 dramas. The two post 9/11 texts are self-reverberated, and the texts' linguistic signs remind the reader of the fictional world that they are in contact with versus the representation of reality. Patricia Waugh states that metafiction "is a term given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artifact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality" (2). She adds that metafiction is "to create a fiction and to make a statement about the creation of that fiction" (6). In other words, a metafictional discourse directs the reader to the fact that it is a fictional work of art. In case of drama, the concept is usually named "metatheatre."

Metatheatre is, in fact, exemplified in many situations in *The Domestic Crusaders* where the characters proclaim the fictionality of the discourse. Khulsoom describes Fatima's defensive arguments as "theatrics" (18) while Ghafur advises his family members to "go to those churches and do some interfaith dialogue" (50) in order to ameliorate the image of Islam. The word "dialogue" evokes in the mind the art of dramatic composition.

Similarly, Hakim mentions the idea of acting in “acting like some mad man” (58) while commenting on Salman’s furiously mad reaction upon knowing that his son Ghafur quitted his medical school, and Salahuddin compares watching his family tense arguments to watching a “circus” (63) and he admits that he “Can’t wait to see what happens next” (63). On the one hand, Ghafur while giving his sister the floor to voice her wisdom to him tells her “now it’s your turn” (67) as if directing an actress to speak on stage; on the other hand, Salman at the end of scene ii, act II takes the role of the stage director and says, “The sun sets. A new day begins” (84).

In addition, clues for metatheatre exist in *Dirty Story*. The play starts with Lawrence lifting “*a sign which reads: FICTION*” (5) and then the reader notices that Watson “*raises a sign that says: NONFICTION*” (37), which demonstrates that the preceding scenes were fictitious. Afterwards, “*an imaginary horse*” (37) that Frank, Wanda and Watson ride is observed on stage bringing the reader back to fiction. Most importantly, the play ends with the characters talking to the audience and inviting them to the show as part of the dialogue and then continue acting the final scene:

Wanda (*To the audience*): Come and see us again.

Brutus: We’re here every night.

Wanda: It’s never exactly the same. But we’re here.

Frank: There’s a seat here for ya.

Brutus: After all, we’re playing with your money.

Wanda: And my life. (75)

To conclude, each of the post 9/11 American dramas, *The Domestic Crusaders* and *Dirty Story*, introduces an encounter between the postmodern and postcolonial ideologies. The two plays are rich in referents of the marginalised Self and the centered Other, cultural hybridity and the fragmented selves, and the representation of the past in multiple critiques and the disappearance of grand narratives. Furthermore, significant examples of metaphor, irony, allegory, intertextuality, and metatheatre from both plays are detected. Despite their dissimilar contexts, Pakistani-American immigrants’ life in *The Domestic Crusaders* and Palestinian-Israeli conflict in *Dirty Story*, and despite their writers’ disparate origins, the Pakistani-American versus the native American, respectively, both plays successfully reflect the intersecting features of both literary theories, illustrating the fact that the 9/11 events prompted some American playwrights to use the postmodern and postcolonial concepts that they were influenced by as an aiding tool for them to depict the 9/11 era with its diverse calamities and grave ramifications. Moreover, after examining two samples of the post 9/11 American dramas, it could be anticipated that the majority of such type of dramas will be postmodernly and postcolonially oriented both in form and content. Hence, it could be further deduced that the synergy between postmodernism and postcolonialism in *The Domestic Crusaders* and *Dirty Story* emphasizes the occurrence of what Schmidt

called "transformative practices," distinguishing such two plays together with most post 9/11 dramas, in general, from any other type of American drama by noticeable singularity.

الدراما الأمريكية ما بعد أحداث الحادي عشر من سبتمبر: مابعد الحداثة وما بعد الكولونيالية في العملين المسرحيين " غزاة البيت" لواجهات علي و" قصة دنيئة" لجون شانلي
شيماء محمد سعيد
مستخلص

تتمحور هذه الدراسة حول الحادي عشر من سبتمبر لعام 2001 الذي حُفر في ذاكرة التاريخ لما شهده من هجمات مباغته على واحدة من دول القوى العظمى، ألا وهي الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. لقد تردد صدق هذا اليوم في جميع أرجاء العالم؛ واختلطت فيه مشاعر انعدام الأمان بالخوف من المجهول. فلم يقتصر ما خلف هذا اليوم من آثار على الساحة الاقتصادية، والسياسية، والاجتماعية فحسب بل طالت آثاره الساحة الأدبية أيضاً؛ حيث تأثر الكثير من كتاب المسرح الأمريكي بالهجمات مما حثهم على اللجوء إلى تلك الهجمات لتكون المادة التي يصيغون منها البنية الدرامية لأعمالهم المسرحية، والتي ينسجون بها الصراع الدرامي الخاص بتلك الأعمال. لذا تتناول هذه الدراسة بالبحث نقاط الالتقاء بين نظريات ما بعد الحداثة وما بعد الكولونيالية، كما تستعين بها في تحليل العملين المسرحيين "غزاة البيت" (2005) للكاتب الباكستاني الأمريكي واجهات علي (1980-)، و"قصة دنيئة" (2003) للكاتب الأمريكي جون شانلي (1950-) بهدف كشف النقاب عن الدلالة الأيديولوجية والنصية لأحداث الحادي عشر من سبتمبر كما صورتها النصوص محل الدراسة. وتثبت الدراسة أن اجتماع المفاهيم الخاصة بحركتي ما بعد الحداثة وما بعد الكولونيالية- ولا سيما جدلية المركز والهامش، والتهجين الثقافي، والتمثيل التاريخي فضلاً عن التواجد الملحوظ لأمثلة الاستعارة، وأسلوب التهكم، والأمثلة، والتناص، وما وراء المسرح (الميتامسرح) حتى وإن كان على نحو غير متساو في النصوص محل الدراسة- يؤكد البساطة الشكلية لدلالة هذا التاريخ وشفافيته؛ بينما يرسخ مدى تعقيد مضمون هذه الدلالة وتعدد جوانبها.

Works Cited

- Ali, Wajahat. *The Domestic Crusaders*. San Francisco: McSweeney's, 2004. Print.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Post- Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Ball, Anna. "Critical Exchanges in Postcolonial Studies, Post 9/11." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*. 30.3(2008): 296-315. Web. 26 Mar. 2009 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10714410802143039>>.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Bolt, Robert. *Lawrence of Arabia*. Web. 18 May 2015 <http://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/Lawrence_of_Arabia.pd>
- Burstyn, Joan N. *Past and Promise: Lives of New Jersey Women*. NJ: Syracuse UP, 1997. Print.
- Butler, Christopher. *Postmodernism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2002. *Questia*. Web. 3 Sept. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=101644940>>.
- "Cherchez La Femme." *The Phrase Finder*. Web. 18 May 2015 <<http://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/cherchez-la-femme.html>>
- Harms, Gregory, and Todd M. Ferry. *The Palestine-Israel Conflict: A Basic Introduction*. London: Pluto, 2005. Print.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York:

- Routledge, 1988. Print.
- ." 'Circling the Downspout of Empire': Post-Colonialism and Postmodernism" *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature* 20.4 (1989): 149-175. Web. 19 April 2009 <<http://hdl.handle.net/1807/10262>>.
- Kristeva, Julia. *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. Print.
- LaFetra, Suzanne. "Festival Features 'Domestic Crusaders'." *domesticcrusaders.com*. Noor Productions. Web. 25 Dec. 2013 <http://domesticcrusaders.com/press_cctimes.html>.
- Malpas, Simon. *The Postmodern*. London: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Plaut, Rabbi W. Gunther. "The Book of Exodus." *My Jewish Learning*. n.d. Web. 16 Mar 2015 <<http://www.myjewishlearning.com/texts/Bible/Torah/Exodus.shtml>>
- Schmidt, Kerstin. *The Theater of Transformation: Postmodernism in American Drama*. New York: Rodopi, 2005. Print.
- Shanley, John Patrick. *Dirty Story*. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 2007. Print.
- Soloski, Alexis. "Aftermath and Domestic Crusaders Examine the Muslim Experience." *The Village Voice Theater*. Village Voice, 22 Sept. 2009. Web. 25 Dec. 2013 <<http://www.villagevoice.com/2009-09-22/theater/aftermath-and-domestic-crusaders-examine-the-muslim-experience/full/>>.
- Swapan, Ashfaque. "Play Offers Glimpse Into Pak American Issues." *domesticcrusaders.com*. Noor Productions, 29 Jul 2005. Web. 25 Dec. 2013 <http://domesticcrusaders.com/press_indiawest.html>.
- Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction*. New York: Routledge, 2003. *Google Books*. Web. 10 July 2014 <<https://books.google.com.eg/books?isbn=1136493891>>
- Weissbrod, Rachel. "Exodus as a Zionist Melodrama." *Israel Studies* 4.1 (1999): 129-152. *Project MUSE*. Web. 17 Feb. 2015. <<https://muse.jhu.edu/>>.
- Wilde, Oscar. *De Profundis*. Ed. Jim Manis. *Penn State's Electronic Classics Series' Oscar Wilde Page*. Hazelton: PSU, 2006. Web. 3 Feb. 2013 <<http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/oscar-wilde/De-Profundis.pdf>>.