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This paper is a psychoanalytic literary study of the online performance *Domestic Tension* (2007) by the Iraqi-American artist Wafaa Bilal. Fundamentally built on the psychoanalytic theories of Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan, Julia Kristeva’s theory of abjection is well suited to be the critical tool to analyze the online performance *Domestic Tension*. This paper yields answers to these questions: How does Bilal transform his body into an abject body? How do the Brechtian theatrical techniques suppress any cathartic experience by the audience? The paper concludes that Wafaa Bilal has performed abjection in which his body is transformed into an abject body. These viewers-cum-shooters have finally “disavowed” Bilal’s body and abstained from their cannibalistic desires, and rather started chatting with him online.
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Performing Abjection in Wafaa Bilal’s Domestic Tension

Julia Kristeva’s theory of abjection, published in her book Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection (1982), is used as a critical tool to read Wafaa Bilal’s online performance Domestic Tension (2007) as a performance of abjection. Wafaa Bilal, an Iraqi artist, incarcerates himself for a month in an installation art gallery, where viewers can log on the internet to contact or shoot Bilal with a robotic paintball gun. Bilal--in a black vest, goggles, and Palestinian Keffīyah--runs around the room to evade the shots of the viewers with no safety or food for a month. Drawing on Julia Kristeva’s theory of abjection and the works of her predecessors Sigmund Freud and Jacques Lacan, this paper is a psychoanalytic literary study which endeavors to find answers to the following questions: Had abjection been represented in arts and literature before? How does Wafaa Bilal transform his body into an abject body? With regard to the killing of Bilal’s bother by drones in Iraq, how does Bilal convey the terror that every Iraqi lives in for fear of being killed by drones through his performance? How does the paintball robotic gun, controlled from afar like drones, turn into a cyborg? How do the Brechtian theatrical techniques, used by Bilal, not provide a catharsis to the audience through a performance of abjection, but rather a way to think of the horrors of modern warfare in Iraq?

In what follows, the key concepts of Julia Kristeva’s theory of abjection are defined. These concepts are: ‘abject,’ ‘maternal body,’ ‘food loathing,’ and ‘disavowal’. The first term ‘abject’ breaks down the binary opposition of the subject versus object which was previously introduced by Jacques Lacan. In her book Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection, Kristeva states that the subject and object are not opposed locations but complete identities. The abject is neither subject nor object but rather it threatens “the logical certainty of the subject/object or self/not-self binarism” (Wolfreys 3). Kristeva asserts that the abject forms a constitutive outside on which normative selfhood and society depend: it is “the horror that [civilizations] seize on in order to build themselves up and function” (Kristeva, Powers 210). It is a combination of the self and the other; it is ambiguous, and its ambiguity “disturbs identity, system,
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order” (Kristeva, *Powers* 4). Therefore, the abject is placed out of the order and in horrific conditions where it is confronted with filth, waste, or corpse. The second term is the ‘maternal body’ in which Kristeva likens the separation (abjection) between the infant and his breastfeeding mother with the biblical ritual of circumcision of the infant, as she contends that “circumcision would thus separate one from the maternal feminine impurity and defilement; it stands instead of sacrifice” (Kristeva, *Powers* 99). She goes on to explain the intricate relationship between the infant and his mother and the constitution of the human psyche as she claims that abjection has two sides: one maternal and the other social, as Kelly Oliver writes:

In terms of the maternal body, the infant is weaned off of breast milk. In terms of the social, the infant learns that it is not an animal and therefore must abstain from incestuous, cannibalistic, or murderous urges. Therefore, abjection is a vital part of psychic development and necessary for weaning a child from its dependence on its mother’s body. Kristeva also argues that abjection is part of the process of becoming a human being. (Oliver “Kristeva and Food” 1317)

Therefore, the maternal phase and the social phase are integral to the development of the infant. As a fundamental phase in the psychosexual development of the infant, abjection forces the infant to abandon breastfeeding and consequently becomes capable of abstaining from incestuous, cannibalistic, and other bestial behavior towards the mother and the society. Kristeva adds that when milk develops a skin on its surface; it is abjected, despite of the fact that milk is “a medium that is common to mother and child, a food that does not separate but binds” (*Powers* 105). This abjection of the maternal body is what paves the way for the food taboos and the biblical food prohibitions which Kristeva discusses lengthily in her book. According to Kristeva, ‘food loathing,’ the third term, is “the most elementary and the most archaic form of abjection,” it is the boundary between humans and nonhumans. (Kristeva, *Powers* 2). Unlike animals, the human body becomes “inedible, not literal flesh and blood that like animals can be consumed, but rather metaphorical flesh and blood” (Oliver “Kristeva and Food” 1319). This
abstention is what is termed “disavowal,” the fourth term of the study, which paves the way for the construction of its identity. Thus, the infant learns to mark the boundaries between what is legal and what is not in its community. In addition, the abject is marked by being uncategorized, as it is “neither fish nor fowl; but rather, it is the in-between that resists categorization.” This resistance to categorization is what makes the abject provoke “fear and fascination” at the same time (Oliver “Kristeva and Food” 1317).

There are many studies which tackled Domestic Tension from the perspectives of technology, audience participation, geopolitics, and religion. From the technology perspective, Domestic Tension was studied with a focus on the social media as a stage. In Bree Hadley’s article “Social Media as Theatre Stage: Aesthetics, Affordances and Interactivities,” he reviewed many plays, such as National Theatre of Wales’ The Radicalization of Bradley Manning, Adam Cass’s I Love You Bro, Liesel Zink’s Various Selves, Brian Lobel’s Purge, and Wafaa Bilal’s Domestic Tension, all of which used social media as a stage. Hadley added that Domestic Tension was “an effort to make them (the audience) think about their attitude towards others” (90). According to Hadley, Domestic Tension was a big success, but it came with a very high price: Bilal suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) from the 65,000 shots he had received during the month of his installation project. Sibel Deren Guler, Madeline Gannon, and Kate Sicchio’s article “Superhumans and Cyborgs” in the book Crafting Wearables, explored the intersection between technology and arts. It documented how Bilal used a camera in the back of his head in his digital show 3dri. They also added that Wafaa Bilal’s art focuses on provoking a dialogue about international politics and dynamics; Bilal has lectured internationally about the critical situation in Iraq and Saddam Hussein’s regime. He uses technology and media in his work to connect to his audience and invite them to participate in his performances. (147)

Laura Levin’s article “Embedded Performance” followed the contemporary performances of camouflage such as performative
photography of Janieta Eyre; environmental, immersive, and site-specific performance of Liu Bolin; activist infiltration by The Yes Men, and solo artworks like Wafaa Bilal. She asserted that Wafaa Bilal’s *Domestic Tension* was a “response to the deaths of his brother and father in Iraq in 2004 and opened out to larger questions about dehumanizing modern technologies like drones, operated remotely by military personnel sitting at computers in a distant country” (137). In the dissertation “Art and Conversation: Disturbance in Public Space,” Arthur C. Danto referred to political artworks which confronted spectators with “materials of reality in order to produce reactions that are continuous with those of real life” (Oketch). According to Danto, the distance between art and reality should dissolve and this could be done through “disturbation.” By applying this theory to many political artworks, including Wafaa Bilal’s *Domestic Tension*, the study concluded that the use of the virtual reality in the performance encouraged “anti-social or dehumanizing behavior” as the audience were able to shoot from a distance.

Rachel Ruth Zylka’s thesis *Power Performance: Benevolence and Violence in the Work of Chris Burden, Barbara T. Smith, Yoko Ono and Wafaa Bilal* traced the constant flux of power between the viewers and the performers in the way of who relinquished power to whom. Performers sometimes relinquish power to the viewers and turn to be ‘powerless,’ sometimes performers retain this power and impose on the viewers certain restrictions. Drawing on the works of Chris Burden, Barbara T. Smith, Yoko Ono, and Wafaa Bilal, the audience reception and the power relations could be gauged and analyzed. Alan Ingram’s study “Experimental Geopolitics: Wafaa Bilal's *Domestic Tension*” examined Wafaa Bilal’s *Domestic Tension* as a form of geopolitics in which the artist lived for a month in front of a webcam and paintball gun that could be controlled remotely via the internet. Ingram argued that “experimental tactics adopted by contemporary artists open up geopolitics for reflexive interrogation and creative refashioning in ways that were suggestive for alternative geopolitical projects” (123). Rachel Wagner’s study “First-Person Shooter Religion: Algorithmic Culture and Inter-Religious Encounter” explored how religions and video games were providing the spectators with structures which gave them temporary
escape from their lives. The study also endeavored to prove that video games could do some of the functioning of religious activities. Now, it is evident that none of the aforementioned studies has tackled *Domestic Tension* as a performance of abjection and the idea that the robotic gun is a cyborg has not been discussed or investigated either.

Finding an answer to the question “How had abjection been represented in literature and theatre before?” necessitates tracing the representation of abjection in art and literature. In arts, abjection flourished in the paintings of Mapplethorpe, Kiki Smith, and in the films of Andy Warhol where they depicted fleshly scenes of disease, waste, nudity, dismemberment, and fragmentation. For example, in Andy Warhol’s film *Beauty #2*, half-undressed couple were filmed, lying in a bed, smoking and kissing. When the female revolted against the heterosexual life that the film stages and that operates then, this female is threatened with “exclusion altogether, as one who is worshipped and silenced, rendered abject and unpresentable, or sometimes both.” (Gilbertson 31-2).

In Literature, scenes of abjection were abundant in the novels of “Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* and the Robert Mapplethorpe *Self-Portrait*” (Kutzbach 45). The most representable example of abjection is Franz Kafka’s short story “The Hunger Artist.” In his article “Performing Hunger: Fasting in Franz Kafka’s *Hunger Artist* as Poetic Practice,” Sabine Wilke asserted that Kafka’s story reflected the cultural practice of fasting as “an artistic performance on the thematic level” and “a narratological problem” on the poetic level. It tells of an artist who makes a spectacle of himself through fasting. He tours numerous European cities, placing himself in a cage, and fasting for forty days. He is pleased when he sees crowds of people coming to visit. Some spectators are in doubt; they come late at night to check whether the hunger artist is hoarding any food to eat later. Gradually, the interest of people faded to watch the hunger artist in his emaciated look. They come to watch other tricks which beguiled them more. The hunger artist becomes worried and desperate; he turns skinny and aloof with his place dirty and disgusting. He is left as an abject to many spectators. Finally, he confesses to one of
the watchers that had he found the food which tasted good to him, he would not have to fast at all.

In theatre, it was Antonin Artaud’s Theatre of Cruelty which brought abjection to the theatre. Artaud deliberately introduced scenes of blood, pain, sex, and gore to shock the audience into experiencing the subconscious. His plays *The Cenci* and *Jet of Blood* revolutionized the stage by showing the audience scenes of abjection and death. The corpses had functions in his plays, as Kristeva confirmed, “An 'l' invaded by the corpse: such is often the abject in the text of Artaud (“Approaching Abjection” 144).

Afterwards, the use of animal corpses was extensively used in the works of Hermann Nitsch in his Radical Theatre Group *Orgien-Mysterien-Theatre* which staged rituals using animal corpses and bloodshed to shock the audience, as the art critic Stefan Beyst confirmed:

No wonder that Nitsch comes to poach on the territory of Artaud and Sade. Things come to their apogee in the ‘fantastic drama’ ‘Die Eroberung von Jeruzalem’, conceived for real corpses which Nitsch sarcastically calls 'the favourite of his opponents.

Artaud’s performances were the spark which ignited the interest of many directors to perform abjection on the stage. Kira O’Reilly staged performances which involved animals, as she did in her play entitled *Falling Asleep with a Pig* (2009) in which O’Reilly lived with a live pig called Deliah for some days in a specially constructed sty, as she commented, “*Falling Asleep with a Pig* creates a situation where a human animal (myself) and a non-human animal (a pig, specifically Deliah, a Vietnamese Potbellied pig) share a specially designed and constructed dwelling for 36 hours)” (Snæbjörnsdóttir 39). O’Reilly also staged a play entitled *In the Wrong Places* with “a female pig cadaver weighing approximately 48 kgs that has been slaughtered for food consumption, so the internal organs have been removed” (Snæbjörnsdóttir 39). In the same vein, Günter Brus performances shocked the audience by “cutting his thigh with a razor blade, was to urinate into a glass, and then drank from it, and while rubbing excrement onto his body, he also masturbated” (Blau 25).
After defining the terms of the study, examining the previous studies, and delineating a historical background of how abjection existed in arts and literature, the study tackles the analysis of the play. There is a short introduction about Wafaa Bilal and the conditions of making the performance, people who helped him, obstacles that he faced, plot, themes, and techniques used throughout the online performance. The study relies primarily on the diary of Wafaa Bilal of the 30 days of the performance—published in his book *Shoot an Iraqi: Art, Life and Resistance under the Gun*, which also contains an autobiography of his formative years in Iraq—and on the online performance *The Paintball Project* on YouTube available at the URL https://youtu.be/EQ6XbZzIyVk.

The plot of the performance is composed of 30 episodes: each corresponds to a day of the 30 days of the online performance. It starts with ‘Day 1’ where Bilal feels discomfort from the stress and the constant shooting of the robotic gun until ‘Day 30’ where Bilal is extremely exhausted. His performance is always interspersed with Bilal’s memories of Iraq, the tragic death of his brother, the tough days of Saddam Hussein, the horrors of the robotic gun, and his chats with the online viewers. By the end of the performance, Bilal’s body is completely deteriorated from the stress, the velocity of the bullets, and the insults hurled at him all day long. He has gained much weight and his body is full of wounds and cuts from the shots of the robotic gun.

Bilal collaborated with the *Washington Post* Journalist Kari Lydersen in turning his installation art gallery into a book entitled *Shoot an Iraqi: Art, Life and Resistance under the Gun*. In this book, Bilal gave important insights into his personal trajectory as an ordinary Iraqi, a refugee, and an artist, which could not be separated from the political and social context of the performance. In his book, Bilal incorporated a diary of his performance and an autobiography during his formative years in Iraq. The autobiography traced his childhood memories as well as his life as a refugee in Saudi Arabia until he was deported to the US in 2003. In his autobiography, Bilal stated that he was born in 1966 as a Shiite Muslim in Najaf, Iraq and that his formative years were marked by the horrific rule of Saddam Hussein. He also recounted memories of his
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turbulent relationship with a callous father. In 1991, he refused to participate in the invasion of Kuwait and fled to a refugee camp in Saudi Arabia, where he lived for two years before moving to the US in 1993. In America, he showed a remarkable talent in his art shows and galleries and began to spread awareness of the tragedy of the Iraqis after the American invasion in 2003. In 2005, Bilal launched the video game “The Night of Bush Capturing: A Virtual Jihadi” which was a hack of Al-Qaeda’s video game “The Night of Bush Capturing” in which Al-Qaeda added “a new skin” to turn the old game “Quest of Saddam” into a hunt for Bush, as he confirmed that he “has hacked Al-Qaeda’s version of the game to put his own more nuanced spin on this epic conflict.” (Bilal, “A Virtual Jihadi”). Thereinafter, Bilal drew the attention to his projects and art galleries. In 2015, Bilal created an online performance entitled 168:01 to encourage donors worldwide to give to build the library of Baghdad.

In the book Shoot an Iraqi: Art, Life and Resistance under the Gun, the conditions underlying the initiating of Domestic Tension were revealed. In 2007, the performance was installed in Flat File galleries in Chicago, USA with the help of “Susan Aurinko, the owner of the FlatFile Galleries which were founded in Chicago, USA, in 2000. They include contemporary art and sculpture” (Bilal, “Domestic”). Shawn Lawson was the artistic collaborator of the project, Ben Chang was the art institute professor, and Dan Miller was the art and technology professor who designed and assembled the robotic gun.

The idea of the play came to Bilal after the assassination of his brother Haji by a US drone in Iraq. Bilal was appalled by the disparity between the perpetrator and the victim, as he confirmed:

In early 2007 I saw a TV interview with a young female American soldier whose job was to drop bombs remotely on Iraqi targets, directing them from a computer console in Colorado. It struck me that Haji’s death had been orchestrated by someone just like this young woman, pressing buttons from thousands of miles away, sitting in a comfortable chair in front of a computer, completely oblivious to the terror and destruction they were causing to a family--a whole society--half way across the world. (Bilal, Shoot 10)
The whole experience of killing his brother by a US drone in Iraq left Bilal traumatized. Therefore, he set up the project to show the world how detached were the US soldiers in modern warfare, as he said, “I need to connect to my life as an artist in the comfort zone of the United States to the terrors and sorrows of the conflict zone” (Bilal, Shoot 1).

Killing by drones placed the American viewers in front of the reality of the modern warfare for the first time. Since time immemorial, direct encounter between armies was the norm. After the killing of thousands of Americans in the guerrilla warfare in Vietnam, the US developed nonconventional weapons to control the airspace of the enemy rather than sending troops to engage in direct battlefields. After September 11\textsuperscript{th} and the ensuing War on Terror, these weapons were widely developed to fight in Afghanistan and Iraq without military deployment. Drones were used at first in surveillance and then in combat zones. Run from thousands of miles away and by soldiers who were completely detached from horrible reality of war, drones turned into advanced weapons which succeeded in keeping its enemies in constant fear.

The theme is performing abjection. But how does Wafaa Bilal perform abjection in his online performance? First, abjection “(in latin, \textit{ab-jicere}) literally means to cast off, away, or out and, hence, presupposes and produces a domain of agency from which it is differentiated” (Fellugo). Bilal incarcerated himself away from the people in an art gallery where he returned again under their gaze but through a webcam. Bilal performed abjection by two ways: first, he functioned as an abject by living in an undesirable state of being in his art gallery. Second, Bilal was accused of being a homosexual and that qualified him to be an abject. First, the living conditions in the art gallery were unbearable, as Becker asserted:

Each time I entered the space, I was brought to tears. What had once been a spotless, white-cube gallery had become, over a short time, startlingly chaotic. Wafaa’s installation room was covered in a sticky, slippery, soupy yellow paint, whose fish-oil smell permeated everything. It seemed impossible to breathe, let alone sleep, eat, write, or think in such a space. As Wafaa wrote at the time, “The scene is like some natural disaster--except it’s not
Due to the sordidness, squalor, and inhuman conditions of the performance, the performance had taken a heavy toll on Bilal’s body. The view from the webcam was ominous and eerie: Bilal gained much weight; he grew a beard; dark circles formed under his eyes; his voice became harsh; his clothes were disorderly; the yellowness from the pellets glowed all over the room, creating a sense of uncanniness; the room looked dirty and littered with glasses and plastics; and the robotic gun was unstoppable, following and shooting Bilal wherever he went. The only sounds heard were Bilal’s movement, his panicky voice, his loud breathing, and the mechanic shots of the gun. This high-pitched sound of the robotic gun shots exacerbated the physical decline of Bilal who was already on the verge of collapsing. In describing his deteriorating state, Bilal wrote “I developed insomnia, nightmares, paranoia, and other post-traumatic stress symptoms, shortness of the breath, chest and abdominal pain, strange feckles on my skin, rashes from fish oil, exhaustion” (Bilal, Shoot 116).

These disgusting conditions of Bilal’s room are what Julia Kristeva describes as “confront(ing) undesirable” state of being, which clearly qualifies Bilal to be an abject (Kristeva, Powers 47). These conditions represent a threat of death; however, death is always viewed as a part of the human being that we attempt to ignore or reject, as Kristeva asserts:

No, as in true theatre, without makeup or masks, refuse and corpses show me what I permanently thrust aside in order to live. These body fluids, this defilement, this shit are what life withstands, hardly and with difficulty, on the part of death. There, I am at the border of my condition, as a living being. My body extricates itself, as being alive, from that border. Such wastes drop so that I might live, until, from loss to loss, nothing remains in me and my entire body falls beyond the limit--cadere, cadaver. (Kristeva, Powers 3).

Another thing which qualifies Bilal to be an abject is being accused of homosexuality. Bilal is labelled a homosexual by some online
homophobic viewers although he is not explicitly labelled as such by the media outlets. These viewers write insulting remarks on his wall online.

I wanna have sex with him
Those are cum shots on the glass….
Baba ghanoush
Waterboard him…make him talk.
I’m gonna waffle his … (Bilal, Shoot 83)

They aim the robotic gun, a phallus symbol, at Bilal’s back and hurl insults and swearing words at him. Bilal is aware of shooters’ lewd behavior and describes the performance as a “sexual metaphor” and adds that the shooters have “this testosterone-driven male impulse to fire, to ejaculate, to aggressively leave their slimy and pungent mark on a space or being before disappearing without a word” (Bilal, Shoot 134).

In wars, it is evident that the two fighting parties seek to feminize each other by accusing each other of homosexuality and these wild accusations pave the way to demonize and degrade the other. The homosexual is an abject as Covino argues, in his study The Abject Body: Toward an Aesthetic of The Repulsive, that the abject is “the ugly, rather than the beautiful”; it is the “unwanted body, the homosexual” (8). As an abject, Bilal remains ‘uncategorized’ to the viewers as he is a hero to some and a mere homosexual to others. This can be explained only through abjection in which the abject “provokes both fear and fascination” (Oliver “Kristeva and Food” 1317).

Sometimes, sex and death are associated as when Bilal recounts a similar incident, back when he was in Najaf, Iraq, where hundreds of bodies were about to be buried and the Islamic traditions necessitated that they had to be washed--kids would sneak and climb on the roof of the washhouse and “peer into the courtyard just to see the naked women; some would lie there on the roof with their hands in their pants, masturbating” (Bilal, Shoot 70). This is exactly like the viewers/shooters of the performance who find that Bilal is an erotic object, while living in filth and squalor. Some disavow his body, others indulge in ‘eating’ or eroticizing his body, as Bilal comments, “I often felt that way during the paintball project, when I was exhausted, stressed out and in pain, and the
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shooters were getting such a thrill from targeting me--I wouldn’t be surprised if some of them were masturbating, too (Bilal, *Shoot* 39-40). These horrible living conditions and the accusation of being homosexual are all indications that Wafaa Bilal is performing abjection. Through abjection, Bilal distorts the order and ruptures the political stability of many Americans and worldwide viewers, shocked them into awakening, and placed them in the line of fire.

Techniques are used to accentuate the status of abjection of Wafaa Bilal and to disengage the audience from being under illusion: the yellow paint pellets of the robotic gun, the ritualistic killing under the gaze of the online viewers (The Eucharist), food loathing, and the robotic gun. Bilal uses yellow color in the pellets of the robotic gun rather than the red one which signifies blood, killing, injury, or the menstrual period in order to alienate the audience from fully engaging in this terror and allow them to think the reality of war without falling into catharsis. Therefore, Bilal resorts to Brecht’s alienation effects to disengage the audience from empathizing with him and awakens the viewers to the reality of the virtual war. Instead of causing catharsis, *Domestic Tension* drives the viewers to act positively. Thus, the number of the viewers who begin to chat with Bilal, rather than shoot him, increases by the end of the performance. Some donate food, others participate in halting the hacking attempts of the robotic gun by the online hackers, as Bilal notes:

But something amazing is happening online. People are writing scripts to turn the gun left, to keep it from shooting me. “Keep turning LEFT save the guy” is being posted over and over. They’re trying to protect me. It gives me a rush of hope. My voice trembles with gratitude as I talk to the webcam. I wipe away tears as I look into the camera and thank them. After all the cruelty hurled at me yesterday, this kindness is a life preserver. (86)

In his book *Shoot an Iraqi*, Bilal mentions clearly that he is not a martyr and he does not intend to be, as when he confirms, “I hate the idea of martyrdom in general; I believe in surviving” (75). However, the theatrical technique of *Domestic Tension*, where Bilal offers his body to
be shot by the online viewers and before the whole world, bears a significant affinity to the Christian ceremony of the Eucharist, which, in turn, represents sacrifice. According to the Bible, the Eucharist or the Holy Communion is based on the incident where food and body exist before the communicants. Christ gives his disciples bread and wine and commands them to “do this in memory of me” (King James Bible Luke 22:19). The Sacrament, bread and wine, is to be consumed on the dining table. Roman Catholics believe that the Sacrament is the body and blood of the Christ himself. In this way, Christ offers his body to his disciples as a sacrifice for their sins, as he says, “Take, eat; this is my body” (King James Bible Matt 26:26). He also holds a cup of wine and says, “And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, 'Drink of it, all of you; for this is my blood'” (King James Bible Matt 26:27). Overall, the majority of the Christian denominations celebrate the Eucharist which simply refers to Christ’s sacrifice of himself on the cross.

In her book Animal Lessons: How They Teach us to be Human, Kelly Oliver draws a comparison between the Eucharist in the book of Sigmund Freud’s Totem and Taboo (1921) and in Julia Kristeva’s Powers of Horror. For Freud, the Eucharist is a “ritualistic repetition of the Totemic celebration of eating the father” (294). He traces the origin of the human sacrifice and how it changes to be an animal sacrifice, passing from the father to the son and finally to the animal. He starts by explaining how the law of talion (an eye for an eye) makes the humans demand a sacrifice in case of a murder, as he states:

The law of talion, which is so deeply rooted in human feelings, lays it down that a murder can only be expiated by the sacrifice of another life: self-sacrifice points back to blood-guilt. And if this sacrifice of a life brought about atonement with God the Father, the crime to be expiated can only have been the murder of the father. (Totem and Taboo 179)

According to Christianity, the son replaces the father to achieve the full atonement from the sin, as Freud asserts:

He (the son) himself became God, beside, or, more correctly, in place of, the father. A son-religion displaced the father-religion.
As a sign of this substitution the ancient totem meal was revived in the form of communion, in which the company of brothers consumed the flesh and blood of the son—no longer the father—obtained sanctity thereby and identified themselves with him. (*Totem and Taboo* 179)

Thus, for Freud, the Eucharist is “elimination of the father, a repetition of the guilty deed” (*Totem and Taboo* 179). Meanwhile, Kristeva sees the Eucharist as “a disavowal of the mother, the primal ‘object’ of the urge to ‘devour’” (Oliver, *Animal Lessons*, 294). For Kristeva, bringing together body and bread is a taming of the cannibalistic desires, as she notes:

By surreptitiously mingling the theme of ‘devouring’ with that of ‘satiating, ‘that narrative (The Eucharist) is a way of taming cannibalism. It invites the removal of guilt from the archaic relation to the first pre-object (ab-ject) of need: the mother. (*Powers* 118)

Kristeva sees the move from the ritual of sacrifice to the ritual of purification as “a move away from violence and toward more sublimatory and therefore more humane forms of regulations. Her analysis sees ritual sacrifice as glorifying the violence of killing, whereas the rituals of purification sublimate it” (Oliver, *Animal Lessons* 295). Thus, *Domestic Tension* bears a great resemblance to the ritual of the Eucharist. For example, Bilal’s gallery is similar to the altar; and the webcam, which transmits the scene to the whole world online, is likened to the dining table of the Eucharist. The robotic gun has been used by the online shooters as an agency to ‘devour’ the flesh of Wafaa Bilal. In so doing, the online shooters, who come to celebrate, are the communicants who “consume” or ‘devour’ rather than sympathize with Bilal. These viewers were two different types: the first type just watched the performance, the second engaged by shooting. Thus, in *Domestic Tension*, the audience participation is a trap, since Wafaa Bilal succeeds to place the viewers in the shoes of the soldiers who control the drones from afar. Therefore, *Domestic Tension* is a ritual of purification of the viewers-cum-shooters, as it seeks to domesticate the cannibalistic desires of the shooters through
exposing Bilal’s body, which functions as the maternal body--the body of Christ or the son who sacrifices his body instead of the body of the father--and consequently draws abjection. In her book *Julia Kristeva: Psychoanalysis and Modernity*, Sara Beardsworth asserts that “Because it (Christianity) identified abjection as a fantasy of devouring, Christianity effects its abreaction” (137). Therefore, shooting Bilal is a fantasy of devouring, as when the audience shoot Bilal with such vigor and robustness, he runs and tries to evade their shots, performing a ritual of purification by reenacting the murder of his brother Haji by the US drone. In so doing, Bilal’s body has turned to be a sacrifice for all the bodies of the Iraqis killed by US drones. Further, these shooters experience a ‘disavowal’ of the abject’s body and some just log on the website without even aiming the gun at him.

“Food loathing” is used as a technique in the performance. It is achieved when Bilal does not hoard any food to eat later, as Becker writes, “For those guests who came to these events he probably appeared like the Hunger Artist in Kafka’s parable” (xix). Bilal relies entirely on the kindness of friends and strangers who bring food to him, as he says:

> When I stepped into the paintball gallery for my month of captivity, I intentionally did not bring any food with me. I wanted to leave my fate, my well-being in the hands of the community, to take a leap of faith and hope they would care of me. (*Shoot 62*)

He sees that hoarding food will lessen his suffering and distract the audience from believing in his cause. Food is prohibited since Bilal is at war. Like soldiers at the line of fire, food is “an indulgence” (Bilal, *Shoot 147*) or a break from the shooting, as Bilal himself expresses:

> I have always; even as a child eating from the collective pot at the family meals, I would make my own plate with a controlled portion. But in the paintball project, food become one of the only sources of comfort and release, a kind of negotiating chip between my mind and body, an indulgence I granted myself to convince my body not to rebel against all the abuse. (*Shoot 147*)
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In addition, Bilal does not want fixed times for his meals, nor does he want the online shooters to feel that he is at ease in his self-imposed incarceration. The existence of daily meals is the boundary between war and peace. It is also the boundary between humans and nonhumans that is why food prohibitions and fasting are solemn and widespread traditions in all Abrahamic religions, as Kristeva holds:

When food appears as a polluting object, it does so as oral object only to the extent that orality signifies a boundary of the self’s clean and proper body. Food becomes abject only if it is a border between two distinct entities or territories. A boundary between nature and culture, between the human and the non-human. (Powers 75)

The robotic gun, in the performance, is controlled by viewers who take turns to shoot Bilal. Like the unmanned drone, which killed Bilal’s brother in Iraq, the robotic gun is a “cybernetic organism, a hybrid of machine and organism, a creature of social reality as well as a creature of fiction” (Haraway150). The idea of making the robotic gun and connecting it to the internet goes back to Dan, a friend of Bilal, who is very apprehensive of “creating a monster” or a “stealth weapon” (Bilal Shoot 20). Dan and Bilal are shocked to find out that the bullets used are “shot with such velocity that one point they cracked the protective Plexiglas shield behind which Wafaa can retreat to compose his thoughts and monitor the project’s chat room on his computer” (Becker xv). In addition, the robotic gun’s sound is horrible: it is like a sound of a “.45 caliber semiautomatic” (Becker xvi).

Technically, it is a robotic gun controlled by the shooters, so it is part human and part machine. The human part appears when Bilal develops a connection to it and feels lonely when it stops, he says:

I felt as though I were watching my relationship with the gun. I despised it, cursed it, I never wanted to see or hear it again. But in that situation of isolation and stress, it was my steady companion, constantly alive and in motion. When it was silent, I felt lonely and abandoned. (Bilal, Shoot 93)
The machine part is exposed when the robotic gun pokes its head and roves round the room looking for Bilal everywhere until it finds him and shoots him mercilessly. Even more appalling, when it is hacked by some online viewers and starts shooting indiscriminately with a high speed, friends and some online viewers rushed in to reprogram the gun. Becker describes this moment when she says:

That day, said the gallery attendant, they had run out of paint balls since hackers had found a way to turn the gun into a machine gun, and the pellets were flying nonstop and out of control. Friends were reprogramming the gun, and others were taking up a collection to buy more paintballs. (xvii)

Whether Bilal is seen as lethargic, apathetic, and helpless, the robotic gun is regarded as Bilal’s antithesis. It is vital not apathetic; it works without stopping; and it is robust and decisive. The robotic gun is an ambiguous hybrid: it shifts identities since the viewers see it as a male-machine or a phallus by which they can shoot at Bilal. It is the agency of the shooters which constitute a great disturbance and anxiety to Bilal, but Bilal, strangely develops a connection to it. The robotic gun has turned, from an ordinary machine controlled from a distance, into a real rogue monster which acts on its own, triggering into memory the notorious case of unmanned Reaper drone which acted out on its own and was about to shoot objects in Pakistan. In his article “Machine Rebellion Begins: Killer Robots Destroyed by the US Jet,” Page Lewis asserted that “it was reported that the Reaper drone was shot down by a ‘manned’ US fighter Jet before it could carry out its (unilateral) invasion plans.”

To conclude, all the questions of the study have been answered. The study traces the trajectory of abjection in literature from Franz Kafka’s The Hunger Artist to Antonin Artaud’s theatre of cruelty. Bilal succeeds in transforming his body into an abject body by placing himself for 30 days in front of webcam in horrible conditions with no food or safety. Wafaa Bilal, who represents the familiar foreigner, must be rejected by millions of viewers, who represent the American self, to establish the borders of America’s unified subjectivity. This familiar foreigner is suddenly recognized as a threat to national security by the
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American self, so he must be shot and rejected. Bilal chooses the internet as a stage to widen the popularity of his online performance and to attract many viewers. Wafaa Bilal offers his body to the online viewers-turned-shooters who first prey on his body, eroticizing it, then they disavow his body. The viewers feel abjected by the horrors which Bilal lives in. Many theatrical techniques are used to highlight the objective of this online performance which is to perform abjection. Instead of pushing the abject to the margin to maintain a societal system and order, Bilal succeeds in placing the abject in the center, before millions of viewers, leaving a gun in their hands to shoot or chat with him. In so doing, Bilal disrupts the societal norms and regulations and raises awareness of the killings by drones. At the end of the performance, Bilal declares the end of the online performance and the silencing the robotic gun, “we silenced one gun today and I hope we will silence all guns in the future” (Becker xix).
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