

BERLIN/WALL: HARE'S EYES ON TWO WALLS OF THE WORLD

Kağan KAYA*

Abstract

The theatre audience currently has a thirst for hearing the political narratives of the playwrights. As media has lost its reliability all over the world, the fans of theatre have preferred watching more political plays than TV bulletins today. As one of the leading voices of the political theatre of the world, David Hare knows what expectations the audience has and what responsibilities political drama has. He handles the results of a lot of national and international political decisions over societies and individuals in his plays. In Berlin/Wall, which are two separate monologue readings, the British playwright portrays new life conditions of ordinary people of different communities via his own empirical observations and interviews after the two walls which were erected by world politics. This work primarily examines the sociological views and political narratives of David Hare about the present and future of Germany, Israel and Palestine among the traces of two walls.

Key Words: *Berlin, David Hare, Israel-Palestine, Political theatre, Two walls*

BERLIN/WALL: HARE'İN GÖZÜ DÜNYANIN İKİ DUVARI ÜZERİNDE

Özet

Günümüzde tiyatro izleyicisi, oyun yazarlarının siyasal anlatılarına şiddetli istek duyar. Medya dünya çapında güvenilirliğini yitirdikçe, tiyatro takipçileri, televizyon bültenlerini izlemektense daha çok siyasal oyunlar izlemeyi tercih etmektedir. Dünya siyasal tiyatrosunun önder seslerinden biri olarak David Hare, tiyatro izleyicinin beklentilerini ve siyasal tiyatronun sorumluluklarını bilir. Oyunlarında birçok ulusal ve uluslararası siyasal kararın toplumların ve bireylerin üzerindeki sonuçlarını ele alır. İngiliz oyun yazarı, iki ayrı monolog türde okuma olan Berlin/Wall'da, kendi deneysel gözlemleri ve mülakatları yoluyla dünya siyasetinin diktiği iki duvarın ardından farklı toplumların sıradan insanların yeni yaşam koşullarını yansıtır. Bu çalışma, iki duvarın bıraktığı izler arasında David Hare'in özellikle Almanya'nın, İsrail'in ve Filistin'in bugünü ve geleceği ile ilgili olarak toplumsal görüşlerini ve siyasal anlatılarını inceler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Berlin, David Hare, İsrail-Filistin, Politik tiyatro, İki duvar*

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalization has made everything upside down in dramaturgy. It is known that a political play may be one which aims at displaying and analyzing sociological pathologies for its audience. Although "in a sense all theatre is political" (Kritzer, 2008: 1), there are many changes in the subject matters of political plays as well as with the form and aesthetic of these plays with globalization. The world has been changing and the drama has been keeping step with this change. Rebellato comments on the affects of globalization in political drama:

Globalization has created dramatic and new conditions – and it is a testament to the abiding power of the political tradition that the rules of political theatre have been transformed in response. Where realism seemed essential, now a kind of non-realism seems so; where politics was the object, now it is ethics; where once playwrights proclaimed 'messages first', now aesthetic experiment may be the right means to achieve an effective political response to the challenges of a consumer culture and marketized world. (2008: 259)

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Ed. Böl. Öğretim Üyesi, SİVAS
e-posta: kkaya@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

This analysis makes clear that it is rather difficult to typify and limit political drama today. Martin states that “the form continues to morph” (2006: 15) in terms of the style of presentation and the subject matters it deals with. Thus, the playwrights are looking at the whole panorama of the globe through their much larger lenses nowadays. For instance, the background of the British stage is not merely Britain anymore. The British political playwrights prefer dealing with much more global and multicultural defects on their political stages, in that they know that political drama should reflect specific social ills of the whole world.

David Hare’s plays are also transformed from his state-of-the-nation plays to state-of-the-world ones. In the 1970s, Hare was considered one of the most successful members of the third wave playwrights in Britain. His early plays are about “the collapse of the English empire, the debilitating effects of the class system, the myths of patriotism, the loss of personal freedom” (Gussow, 1985); they are all based on state-of-the-nation tradition. They are the microcosm of English. About his early plays, Hare overtly confesses that he purposely tried “to show the English their history... How this Empire vanished... How ideals died” (Hare, 2005: 119) after the Second World War. Nevertheless, theatrical views of the playwright alter particularly with his Asian plays. He begins to use international documentary materials for his dramatic work.

Among active playwrights, perhaps the most outstanding exemplar of the theatre of ideas of the world is David Hare. Critics of Hare’s works “have never dismissed his eclectic exploration of the social and political milieu in which he lives” (Oliva, 1996: 224). The playwright has been using his inventive mind to construct his drama which tells about the daily political upheavals of the world. In **Berlin** and **Wall**, Hare mirrors his own personal ideas, attitudes and experiences in Germany, Israel and Palestine. The first of the monologues, **Berlin**, details Hare’s “baffled response to that confused and confusing city while working there on **The Reader**” (Curtis, 2009) of which the screenwriter is Hare. With his performance, the playwright was nominated for an Oscar award as the best screenwriter in 2009. **Wall**,

on the other hand, is “a far more sombre and serious essay on the monolithic ‘peace fence’ [that] Israel is quietly erecting along its border with Gaza” (Curtis, 2009). **Berlin** and **Wall** which were directed by Stephen Daldry premiered separately at the National Theatre and at the Court in April, 2009, and Hare performed both pieces together on Broadway in May, 2009.

2. HARE’S NOTES ON 775-YEAR-OLD BERLIN

David Hare is one of the most prominent peripatetic theatre men of the world. The playwright obtains a great deal of materials while travelling all around the world. He believes that “watching is doing – it is part of what makes him the playwright he is” (Kellaway, 2009). It is a fact that he effectively uses his documentary materials throughout his dramatic career.

In **Berlin**, Hare optimizes his materials. As he has been to Berlin for “over thirty years” (Hare, 2009: 3), he has enough to write on Berlin and the lives of Berliners. He has been to Berlin as a playwright, director, Golden Bear winner with his **Wetherby** in 1985, a jury member of Berlin Film Festival in 1997, and finally in 2008 as the screenwriter of **The Reader** – a Stephen Daldry film based on Bernhard Schlink’s novel. Each time, Hare feels the changing face of Berlin. However, during the last project, for the first time the playwright exactly discovers the capital city of Germany. As a voyager, he compares the new face of the city with its past version in an authentically dramatic presentation.

Hare’s drama is peculiar to him because he always uses a contradictory and an eclectic dramatic presentation. That kind of presentation makes his drama both fascinating and impartial. **Berlin** is a play that exemplifies the playwright’s eclectic creativity. Throughout the play, there is much to explore: the past and present of Berlin, vivid descriptions of the city with and without its wall, and some autobiographical details and reactions to his plays in Berlin. Furthermore, the play includes his personal opinions on British cinema telling about the war, indifferent world politics towards the construction of the Berlin Wall and the life style of the young

Berliners. Hare intermingles past with present, autobiographical with historical, "description with opinion" (Billington, 2009), political with personal and societal in his dramatic work.

While Hare is in Berlin, he seems to be focused primarily on the life before and after the Berlin Wall. The playwright always takes a tour around the city in his spare time. Thus, he sometimes finds a chance to speak to ordinary Berliners about the city. Once he hears from an old taxi driver that "they made a big mistake. They pulled it down. In fact I just read a piece in the paper saying for the forthcoming celebrations they're planning to project a hologram of the Wall, to get over the inconvenient fact it isn't there" (4-5). When Hare continues to speak to the driver, he realizes that Berliners feel perturbed a lot because "the city of the famous Wall not actually having a wall" (5). Berliners are namely worried not because they long for their past but because they are not able to trade on it. Hare realizes that "Berlin is harder than it used to be because the most famous landmark was gone" (4), and that's why "it's bad marketing" (5) for Berliners not to have a wall nowadays.

After indicating Berliner's worries about not having a wall ironically, Hare starts a nostalgic tour to Berlin, in that it is hard not to feel the weight of history in Berlin for him. In fact, he has been using the past to explain present and future events in the world politics arena for a long time. According to Nicholson "perhaps the most crucial lesson which Hare reveals through his use of historical perspective is that things have not always been as they are now, and that they do change" (2007: 188). In **Berlin**, the playwright conspicuously takes the exact picture of the Berliners who are in a great transformation for a long time. He seems to be worried about this transformation. Saying that "'it's a city for the young, it's a city for clubbing.' Jesus Christ, how many more times?" (7) Hare bitterly complains that especially young Berliners are fond of ignoring their history. Asking some certain questions himself, he even angrily reacts against this meaningless change in Berlin: "Is this city completely insane? Is the Reichstag a club? Is the Jewish Museum a club?" (7) as the young consider that the whole city is a club. Through artistic visual works a playwright usually reflects

history, culture, and his own consciousness. For Hare, **Berlin** is a play showing that any country's heart and soul should embrace its own culture and history.

In this sense, Hare's idealizing **The Reader** is rather important. He explicitly depicts it as a story of "post-war German Guilt" (7) unlike several British films. Moreover, he builds a parallelism between the young Berliners who ignore their history and the British cinema which distorts the historical facts. Thus, Hare's negative criticism of British cinema shows that art sometimes may keep silence against the truths of the world history. He shows his objection to such senselessness from the heart of cinema in Europe:

[A]re the British any better? 'The good war.' 'The just war.' 'Oh yes? If that's what it was, why do we have to pretend it was fought without cost?... You wouldn't know from British cinema that seventy-eight per cent of European Jews were deliberately murdered. Or that, in all, seventy-two million people died in that particular engagement. (9)

Not only cinema but also politics which builds the history may intentionally take no notice of sociological matters anywhere in the world. Although politicians have great roles in making history, they usually ignore the sociological concerns. In his drama, Hare always objects to such a disruptive indifference towards sociological happenings in the world. He exemplifies this in narrating the political silence all around the world over the construction of the Berlin Wall, which divided Germany into East and West in 1961:

The border was sealed while the world was on holiday. The Mayor of West Berlin, Willie Brand, was in Nuremberg. The President of America, John Kennedy, was sunning himself on Cope Cod. And the Prime Minister of Britain, Harold Macmillan, was on the Yorkshire moors, celebrating the first day of the grouse-shooting season. (16)

David Hare is always against the drama which keeps silence as well as the cinema and politics. If political drama has a mission to tell its audience world truths, then it must inform

them directly. Due to his being less provocative in his recent plays, "the theatre, for Hare, bears implacable witness to the world" (Megson and Rebellato, 2007: 244). According to him "it was impossible to avoid being a part of social and political life" (Reinelt, 1994: 129) that's why the playwright wants his audience always to be aware of what happens around them.

Hare intentionally informs his audience about contemporary Berlin. He notes that "as an adolescent I used to enjoy this, going to a strange city and scaring myself getting lost" (17). Hare needs losing himself in Berlin to provoke his thoughts of the new face of the city. As long as he has been lost in the city, he observes a lot of confusing details on the present life style. When the playwright accidentally comes across a restaurant called the Bandol which belongs to the daughter of his wife's friend, he realizes that Berlin is "about hanging out with your friends" (18). He has already known why "today it's as if the city's taking a holiday from history" (22) observing Berliner's being in accord with the contemporary capitalist and consuming culture which surrounded every part of the world. The playwright considers that there are a lot of Bandols; "sort of template[s]" (19), and they are the only worlds of those young people. Hare implicitly reflects the anomalies of capitalism over the new generation in Berlin. Taking Berliners' indifference towards their history into consideration, he directly expresses his feelings about the city:

Berlin, once the city of polarity, of East and West, of democracy and communism, of fascism and resistance, the twentieth-century battleground of art and politics is now the city of the provisional. And that's why people like it. It's not about ideas. It's about lifestyle. (22)

Despite indicating the rise in the standard of living, and great transformation in life style, Hare never mentions staggering political affairs in Berlin. For instance, one cannot learn that there is an increasing influence of conservatism in Berlin throughout the play. Nevertheless Marranca expresses that "it is hard to be in Germany; Berlin itself has a tough, masculine feel, corroborated by the groups of

young men one sees in the streets and train stations and who have been known to turn violent when threatened by the presence of people of colour" (2000: 2). Hare seems to restrict his subject matter which mostly deals with the denied German history by its young people.

According to the playwright it is the history which builds the current and future world. Therefore, the individual and political indifference after the reunification will also be judged in the future. Hare knows that every responsible person will account for his deeds in front of the history. He indicates that world politics always lacks an ideology for re-establishing the relations between the countries and communities during the political crises of the world. He initially emphasizes that the history will judge why the West did nothing while Germany was endeavouring to reunite:

Between 1989 and 2001 the West missed its greatest opportunity... At the start, our Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, was on the wrong side on two of the greatest issues of her day... [S]he fought German reunification. She was morally derelict and deserves to be condemned for it. She didn't move fast enough. But then nobody did. Between the ending of one Cold War, and the beginning of another, between the defeat of communism and its replacement by militant Islam as the West's readily convenient enemy, there was a real chance. International relations, the creative remaking of relations between countries irrespective of wealth or ideology, was briefly possible. Briefly. Nothing got done. What new world order? (22-23)

In his drama, Hare reminds his audience to judge current happenings all around the world. Thus, while resting his soul in Berlin, he tells about the past and present of the city of the juxtaposition of drama, cinema, music, and history, and solely makes his audience to evaluate his personal thoughts of the city. Although Hare seems to be angry with young Berliners' being broken off from their history, and he is against their ignorance and

senselessness in front of irritating change, he never imposes his personal thoughts on the audience. Behaving as if he came across only young and happy Berliners during his stay, he objectively reacts against the political and capitalist isolation of them. In **Berlin**, he openly warns his audience to be aware of the changing world conditions. Moreover, he implies that every young person should open his eyes wide to make true analysis of the deeds of the politicians.

3. HARE'S NOTES ON THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

David Hare is a playwright who always "put[s] people's sufferings in a historical context; and by doing that, [he] can help to explain their pain" (Hare, 2005: 124) in his drama. **Wall** is such a dramatic work in which the playwright puts sociological ills which stem from political affairs in Israel and Palestine on his stage. In that sense, Hare wishes his audience to think about all the difficulties in the Middle-East. In **Wall**, one can learn of the separation of two communities; the environmental, historical and religious problems in the process of constructing the wall in the border of Gaza; the deteriorating life conditions; and the expectations of Israelis and Palestinians.

Wall can be considered as the third Middle-East play of the playwright. In fact, Hare has not ignored the Palestine-Israel conflict since his first Middle-East play, **Via Dolorosa** which was on the Royal Court Theatre in 1999. In 2004, he penned **Stuff Happens** which cannot be merely regarded as a play questioning the U.S. and British administrations' discussion on the invasion of Iraq behind the closed doors. The Arab-Israeli conflict is "embedded in the Iraqi war planning" (Reinelt, 2005: 304) within the play, and the play also reveals that the U.S. administration of the period had contrasting ideas about this stormy area.

Hare passionately stresses that the leading countries of the world cannot produce any solutions for the Middle-East or global terrorism without solving the main political affairs of Israel-Palestine. Although **Wall** is quieter than **Via Dolorosa** and **Stuff Happens**, he implies that there will be no exact peace in the Middle-East in the near future if decayed

politics hang over the Middle-East. Therefore, in his recent works, as a positive dramatic reaction, he demonstrates his interest in the conflict.

However, there are various reasons for this focus. His writing on the Middle East is mostly based on his family life. He states that "so obviously, part of my interest in the Middle East comes from marrying into a Jewish family" (Sierz, 1998), but he also thinks that he is "being intrigued by the arguments between assimilationists and isolationists. And by the very different attitudes of Jews to Israel" (Sierz, 1998). Indeed, David Hare handles such a weighty international socio-political matter not because it enriches the world TV screens or flourishes popular newspapers. He supports the notion that it is crucial for the ordinary people who never have chance to make any notice of their real anxieties through the media which solely mirror fashionable events via the words of unreliable politicians.

In this sense, at the very beginning of the play, the playwright purposely wants to draw attention to the holy land announcing that "please: please, consider the state of affairs, consider the desperation, consider the depth of the despair. A country has reached a point at which eighty-four per cent of its people are in favour of building a wall along its borders" (29). This reproof indicates that **Wall** is full of dramatic warnings of the playwright about the separation of two communities in the Middle-East.

Hare is aware of the absolute change in Israel and Palestine although the construction of the wall has not finished yet. He thinks that the construction should not be considered only a physical separation of two communities. It also causes a mental separation. Moreover, Hare implies that the mental separation is much more dangerous for both communities than the physical separation causes. It is the result of dark and lopsided politics of both Israel and Palestine. The wall deepens the racial, cultural, and societal discrimination. It likely accelerates the radicalization process in the area. In order to view the mental separation even in words used to describe the construction by the Israelis and Palestinians, Hare states that:

Words become flags, they announce which side you're on. In this case, literally. The Israelis call it the gader ha' harfrada, which in Hebrew means 'separation fence'. The Palestinians don't call it that. Not at all. They call it jidar al-fasl al 'unsun which in Arabic means 'racial segregation wall.' (30)

In fact, for two communities wall means much more than literal meaning. Hare shares the thoughts of Yitzak Rabin, one of the former Prime Ministers of Israel about the idea of constructing a wall. Rabin argues that "the only way of protecting the country from infiltration by terrorists was by sealing itself off, by removing the points of friction between two communities" (30). The Prime Minister believes that "separation would not be a purely military tactic" (30) so that Israelis "have to decide on separation as a philosophy" (30). It is realized that as a result of all arguments throughout the country, Israel decided on the need of the construction after the second intifada, in 2002, the year which is the starting point of the absolute separation in minds.

After giving a brief political story of the wall, Hare shares some details of the construction plan. Indeed, the details are informative for the audience as outsider viewers. Although the audience does not have a chance to imagine the exact route of the wall, they can imagine how life has been changing in the holy land. In a wide angle, the statistical details of the construction may predict what physical and mental damages the wall has caused. Hare gives the facts about the construction:

[T]he fence should stretch a full four hundred and eighty-six miles, the entire length of Israel's eastern border... Varying in width between thirty and one hundred and fifty metres, this two-billion-dollar combination of trenches, electronic fences, ditches, watchtowers, concrete slabs, checkpoints, patrol roads, and razor coil is priced at around two million dollars per kilometre. It will one day be over four times as long as the Berlin Wall and in some places twice as high. (31)

Considering these technical details, one can clearly account for the distortion in environment. For the playwright, "theatre's political purpose is to portray the world, without artifice, and then permit an audience to scrutinise that portrait" (Megson and Rebellato, 2007: 244) thus he uses facts in his plays. Here, as an outsider environmentalist the playwright intentionally insists on giving the exact environmental problems that the wall has caused on its route:

Seventy-five acres of greenhouses and twenty-three miles of irrigation pipes have already been destroyed on the Palestinian side. Three thousand, seven hundred and five acres of Palestinian land have been confiscated, some of it so that the wall may run yards away from Palestinian hamlets and villages. Already, a hundred and two thousand trees have been cut down to clear its path. (31)

Hare not only shares environmental problems the wall has caused but he also shares some ideas of Israelis and Palestinians about the separation. Bull claims that "what chiefly preoccupies Hare is the analogy between public life and acting" (1983: 66). In Hare's drama the debate is endless. Similarly, Hare directly gives some examples on the main debate in **Wall**. According to him, Israelis have various ideas on the affair; they are both for and against the construction. Some Israeli friends of his feel that they hate the construction and are ashamed of it. One of them declares that the construction is "an acknowledgement of failure" (31), a failure of a whole nation. The playwright gets an impression that "even the most ardent supporters of the fence admit that it is, like the siege of Gaza, a source of huge inconvenience" (32). On the other hand, some Israelis think that the wall saves them from terrorist attacks as **Israel** has the right of self-defense. According to some Israelis although the terrorists have already changed their tactics; instead of suicide bombing they prefer using Qatam rockets, the wall works. It is expressed that "eighty percent of terrorist attacks against Israel have stopped. Have been stopped" (30). However, the other side of the wall has a common idea. A Palestinian professor Sari Nusseibeh of Al-Quds University

sums up their views saying that "the wall is a perfect crime. It creates the violence it was ostensibly built to prevent" (33). For Palestinians, the wall converts their country an open-air prison.

In this sense, Hare informs his audience giving the decisions of the International Court of Justice on the affair. He warns his audience that the Court displayed a negative reaction against the construction in 2004. It is verified that the construction is against the international law in The Hague. Hare reminds that "Israel is under an obligation to cease forthwith the works of construction... to dismantle the works forthwith... to make reparation for all the damage caused by the construction of the wall" (32-33) after the decision of the Court.

The life in the Middle-East has been deteriorating for both communities as the construction continues though international laws are against it. It is a fact that Hare's "politics onstage depends on the socio-political issues that foreground human behaviour" (Oliva, 1990: 155). For **Wall**, it seems that both Israelis and Palestinians have lost their identities. As "identity is the most significant contextual notion" (Oliva, 1990: 156) in his career, Hare reflects the changing identity of the people in **Wall**. He feels that everybody needs a "normal life" (35) in the Middle-East but nobody on both sides of the construction knows what the solution is. Thus, all the innocent citizens seem to have lost their ideals. Besides engendering individual identity crisis, wall has wrecked both the historical and religious identity, which irritates Hare most, and he directly objects to such a ruin:

Jerusalem used to be the spiritual capital... on every street corner, you could feel the history, but now with the hideous wall and the overbuilding and desecration of the landscape – I mean, what is going on? Aren't they destroying the very quality for which the city was meant to be precious? Aren't they killing the thing they love? Or is that my problem? Am I just a decadent Westerner who can't help thinking spirituality must have something to do with beauty? Am I the

only idiot who still confuses religion with aesthetics? (39)

After bringing his own reflections, the playwright seems to focus on the ideas of the non-religious Israeli settlers and the young people about hard living conditions. Many settlers know that they would be killed in case of leaving from their land. They are always under political pressure. On the other hand, for the young, it is obvious that they do not enjoy their uncertain lives in Israel. Hare thinks that the young generation are "more cosmopolitan... [T]hey're committed to Israel, emotionally they're committed to its survival, but... they want a good reason for living here rather in California" (36). According to him the new generation could possibly leave Israel mentally alone forever if they did not get what they want from Israeli politicians. It is a peaceful and secure life that they just need in Israel. Wu asserts that in his plays "what concerns Hare most is the uneasy paradox that fidelity to high ideals can destroy our lives" (1995: 98) but Israeli young people seem not to let such issues ruin their lives. The young people in Israel are about to get rid of their foundation ideology. The playwright observes that "the socialist idealism in which Israel was founded is long gone" (36). Nobody is happy there. The playwright feels that the young are bound to their country as they just believe that they must protect their country.

On the Palestine side the young people are not happy, either. Besides economical problems and unemployment, they are deceived or exposed to physical and psychological violence by the terrorist groups. For this reason, they cannot be persuaded that they will have a better life in Palestine anymore. In addition, Hare learns that they are exactly in danger of being terrorists. In that sense, he exemplifies a variation of Hamas torture technique against the young people in Palestine: "the victim is shown a wall on which a staircase is drawn, and at the top is a drawing of a bicycle. He says he can't get the bicycle because it's a drawing. He is then told if he doesn't bring the bicycle downstairs he will be beaten" (37). This metaphor reveals how the young people feel in Palestine. In fact it clarifies that "everything is a drawing" (37) for Palestinians, and they are unsatisfied with the new face of Palestine.

What is more dangerous is that neither Israeli nor Palestinian young people react against separation and the politics of their countries. Although they should look for a pretext to resume hostilities, they do nothing. One thing is certain in the holy land that wall surrounds the hope of all young people. It horns all hopes for a better future there, and makes the young passive victims of politicians who just think of themselves not the future of young people. Hare shares the words of a Palestinian playwright Salman Tamer: "these days it doesn't even have a protest movement. In the old days, there were peaceniks on the streets and long-haired students. Now they have almost no anti-war movement at all" (46). This manifests that the young of both countries have lost their senses. They have become unconscious about what happens around them. Hare implicitly identifies them as the puppets of politicians.

Maybe because of avoiding the socio-political matters in Israel and Palestine, or just owing a kind of western hedonism, the playwright recounts his activities there. He does what he does in Berlin. He wants to get lost in Nablus, a commercial Palestinian city in the past. He believes that the city "answers to something in [him]" (40). He feels that he has to find out a Bandol-like place there. Unlike Palestinians and Israelis who are deprived of exchanging and tasting their cultural beauties, he finds himself in Sheikh Qasim Cafe to have a rest drinking his Turkish coffee, and there he directly declares why he is writing about the Middle-East:

Recently, I found myself writing about Berlin because I don't understand it. Now I want to write about Israel/Palestine because I do. No, hold on, let me rephrase, that's a preposterous claim, nobody understands the Middle East – but put it this way: I recognise it. It answers to something in me. (40)

David Hare feels melancholic throughout the play. Wherever the playwright is in Israel or Palestine he feels a kind of agony. He perpetually hears that "the wall is a symbol we cannot live together" (45). However, Hare suggests that there is no need "to look at failure all day" (45). Although he knows that most of

the people "are living in order to survive" (47) either in Israel or in Palestine, he thinks that nobody has to suffer from the separation. The wall seems to be neither a political nor a sociological solution for both communities. The irresponsible leaders from both sides of the wall must not be **emboldened**, by their voters. Instead, they should be encouraged to pursue a path leading anywhere close to peace. For the playwright, it is wrong to watch the separation nonchalantly, and to consider it as the fate of the Middle-East. It is meaningless to become inured to agony, tears and war in the holy land forever.

4. CONCLUSION

David Hare has been theatricalising world politics for a long time. He is known as one of the most powerful playwrights of the state-of-the world theatre. Hare overtly demonstrates in his drama that "territory is no longer an adequate focus for political aspiration" (Rebellato, 2008: 258). Thus, the national playwright "moves away from the cliched fragments of the postmodern world" (Boireau, 2003:37), and creates his own the-state-of-the world drama. For Hare, writing is "to discover what you believe" (Homden, 1995: 238) that's why he searches for the political background of global happenings and uses them on his stage. He pokes everything related to globalization, and anatomizes the whole globe in his recent drama. He openly stresses that "most people's history is not in the history books" (Nicholson, 2007: 186), and he projects to manifest the real under-history by taking the experiences of individuals from various parts of the world.

In his trips to Berlin and the Middle-East, Hare listens to and empathizes with a lot of ordinary citizens. Besides, he interviews with historians, politicians, novelists and dramatists. The playwright discovers, learns and is enlightened in Germany, Israel and Palestine, and processes and presents his learning for the appetite of his audience on his stage. Therefore, it is restrictive to categorize him as merely a satirist playwright. Fraser claims that "the works of David Hare do not simply preach to the politically converted or alienate the politically complacent. Rather, they create a complex dialectic between

dramatic structure and implicit socialist critique through a subversion of audience expectation" (1996: 7). Furthermore, like in his early career, "past illuminates the present, while the present offers a perspective through which to re-evaluate history; either way works as a denigration, a cutting down of pretentiousness to size" (Cave, 1987: 181) in his monologues. Hare always comments on "how the decisions and choices made in life are forever indelible and how the past intrudes upon the present" (Oliva, 1990: 123) in his drama. He always searches for "a perspective from which a judgement on contemporary life could be made in the court of theatre" (Homden, 1995: 230) so that he clearly dramatizes the lives of Berliners, Israelis and Palestinians who have been traumatized by political decisions.

In his monologues, David Hare seems very conscious in the face of several socio-political pathologies. He conceptualises his anxiety about the awkwardness of political actors who distort international socio-political facts. Moreover, he concretizes his thoughts

about the irritating silence of people not as an outsider but like a Berliner, an Israeli and a Palestinian. As his plays "are not primarily didactic vehicles that assault the audience's sensibilities with dramatizations of social injustices" (Dean, 1990: 8), **Berlin** and **Wall** just tell the pure stories of the people who are affected by the construction of two walls. For the playwright, the walls not only isolate people from each other, but also their minds; they are not only physical but also philosophical, mental and cultural barriers.

The people "all live behind walls" (Hare, 2009: 45) nowadays but David Hare believes that nobody needs walls. Therefore, **Wall** and **Berlin** cannot be regarded as solely meditations. They are "gripping example[s] of humane reportage" (Billington, 2009), and the dramatic demonstrations of exorcise the guilt of the West. They could be regarded as the plays which are subject to every kind of barriers created by politics between the individuals and communities all over the world.

REFERENCES

- Billington, M. (2009). Wall. *The Guardian*, Retrieved September 12, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2009/apr/20/wall-david-hare-theatre-review>.
- Boireau, N. (2003). "Re-routing Radicalism with David Hare", *European Journal of English Studies*, 7/1, pp.25-37.
- Bull, J. (1983). "David Hare: The state of the Nation", **New British Political Dramatists**, Grove Press Inc., New York, pp.60-93.
- Cave, R. (1987). **New British Drama on the London Stage: 1970 to 1985**. London: Colin Smythe.
- Curtis, N. (2009). Blair is to blame for this mess and Brown can't help us, says our leading political playwright. *Evening Standard*, Retrieved August 10, 2012, <http://www.standard.co.uk/news/david-hare-blair-is-to-blame-for-this-mess-6865745.html>
- Dean, J. F. (1990). **David Hare**, Twayne Publishers, Boston/Oxford.
- Fraser, S. (1996). "Introduction", **A Politic Theatre: The Drama of David Hare**, GA, Amsterdam/Atlanta, pp 7-8.
- Gussow, M. (1985). "**David Hare: Playwright as Provocateur**", *New York Times Magazine*, September 29, 1985, Retrieved November 20, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/1985/09/29/magazine/david-hare-playwright-as-provocateur.html>
- Hare, D. (2005). "The play is in the Air", **Obedience, Struggle & Revolt: Lectures on Theatre**, Faber and Faber, London, pp.111-124.
- Hare, D. (2009). **Berlin/Wall**, Faber and Faber, London.
- Homden, C. (1995). "Conclusion: a statement of arrival," **The Plays of David Hare**, (Ed. C. Homden), Cambridge UP, Cambridge, pp.229-238.
- Kellaway, K. (2009). An Englishman in Berlin, via London's South Bank. *The Observer*, 15 February. Retrieved July 11, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2009/feb/15/davidhare-theatre>
- Kritzer, A.H. (2008). **Political Theatre in Post-Thatcher Britain: New Writing, 1995-2005**, Palgrave Macmillan, Great Britain.
- Marranca, B. (2000). "Berlin Contemporary: An Editorial", **A Journal of Performance and Art**, 22/2, May 2000, pp.1-6.
- Martin, C. (2006). "Bodies of Evidence", *TDR (1988-)*, 50/3, Autumn 2006, pp.8-15.
- Megson, C. and Rebellato, D. 2007. "Theatre and anti-theatre: David Hare and public speaking", **The Cambridge Companion to David Hare**, (Ed. R. Boon), Cambridge UP, Cambridge, pp.236-249.
- Nicholson, S. (2007). "'To ask how things might have been otherwise...': History and memory in the work of David Hare", **A Cambridge Companion to David Hare**, (Ed. R. Boon), Cambridge UP, Cambridge, pp.183-199.
- Oliva, J. L. (1990). **David Hare: Theatricalizing Politics**, (Ed. O. G. Brockett) UMI Research Press, Ann Arbor, London.
- Oliva, J. L. (1996). "David Hare (1947-)", **British Playwrights, 1956-1995: A Research and Production Sourcebook**, (Ed. W. W. Demastes), Greenwood Press, London, pp. 219-231.
- Rebellato, D. (2008). "From the State of the Nation to Globalization: Shifting Political Agendas in Contemporary British Playwriting", **A Concise Companion to Contemporary British and Irish Drama**, (Eds. N. Holdsworth and M. Luckhurst), Blackwell Publishing, Ames, Iowa, USA, pp. 245-262.
- Reinelt, J. (1994). "Fanshen: Hare and Brecht", **David Hare: A Casebook**, (Ed. H. Zeifman), Garland Publishing Inc., New York, London, pp. 127-140.
- Reinelt, J. (2005). "**Stuff Happens by David Hare; Nick Hytner**", *Theatre Journal*, 57/2, May 2005, pp.303-306.
- Sierz, A. (1998). To each his Via Dolorosa. Retrieved May, 21 2012, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/1998/1948/396_via.htm
- Wu, D. (1995). **Six Contemporary Dramatists: Bennett, Potter, Gray, Brenton, Hare, Ayckbourn**, St.Martin Press, New York.