



Citation: T. Rezaei, A. Khalifezadeh (2021) Social Control and Submission in Edward Bond's *The War Plays*. *Aisthesis* 14(1): 183-199. doi: 10.36253/Aisthesis-11591

Copyright: © 2021 T. Rezaei, A. Khalifezadeh. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<http://www.fupress.com/aisthesis>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Social Control and Submission in Edward Bond's *The War Plays*

TAHEREH REZAEI¹, ASIYEH KHALIFEZADEH²

¹ Assistant professor of English Literature at Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran

² Graduate student of English Literature at Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran
trezaei@atu.ac.ir; Asiyeh.khalifezadeh@gmail.com

Abstract. Reading Edward Bond's *The War Plays* in light of Theodor Adorno and Sigmund Freud, the writers of this article intend to investigate the interconnection between the mechanisms of social control and the psychology of submission. To this end, socio-political institutions in *The War Plays*, represented by *the army* and *the state*, are seen drawing on Adorno's concept of *identity-thinking* (*Identitätsdenken*), by which the cognitive potentials of the characters are systematically suppressed. Also, uninhibited aggression of characters will be discussed in view of the mechanisms of sublimation, and *the addendum* (*Das Hinzutretende*), by which the complexities of the response characters give to the situation of coercion is elucidated. In *The War Plays*, socio-political institutions promote violence to produce socially conditioned victims. These aggressive victims, we conclude, would cooperate with power for the preservation of the *status quo*, yet challenge the system momentarily through expressing their sufferings.

Keywords: Edward Bond, *The War Plays*, Identity Thinking, the Addendum, Sublimation.

INTRODUCTION

Edward Bond's preoccupation with social and political issues in mid-twentieth century, including war, nuclear disasters, and military conflicts, alongside renunciation of human rights by restrictive social orders, class-war, and violence, most manifests itself in his oeuvre published through the years after the Second World War. Through the medium of drama and highlighting themes such as human brutality and their never-ending struggle for survival in capitalist societies, Bond gives life to characters who do not seem to have an understanding of their potentials and who live their lives as if their whole life is imposed on them. Bond makes these characters suffer and tolerate beyond their capacity. Subsequently, they end up responding to violence with different forms of violence. As Jenny Spencer and Jane Spencer remark, Bond is «known for his seriousness [...] and his vio-

lence» ([1992]: 143). Violence in the works of Bond has earned him controversial fame among dramatists who directly point at social mechanisms as the real source of human suffering, hostility, and aggression in modern society.

More often than not, Bond's drama foregrounds his conviction that in an unjust society drama should deal «with the relationship between the individual and society» (Bond[1996]: 169), and reflect on the question «what it means to be human» (Bond[1996]: 169). This is, Bond believes, because «reality tends to be subordinated to ideology» and «Drama is the means ... to circumvent this» (Bond [2000]: 181). Likewise, what Bond portrays in his *The War Plays* is an excessive level of social domination over the lives of highly ideologized and manipulated characters. Starting from birth, the characters of the plays are taken on a journey to the hell of self-alienation in which they have no adequate response to the question «what it means to be human». Utterly powerless in relation to the rigid social order presented in the plays, the characters ultimately yield to the demands of a selfish and ruthless society that treats them not as human beings, but as social atoms expected to act as demanded.

Written in a harsh and powerful style, *Red Black and Ignorant* epitomizes the inculcation of the ruling ideologies in human beings and the subsequent diminution of subjectivity. Families are forced to sell their neonates to the system so that they have no chance of developing the power of independent critical thought. Born and raised in the context of war and massive nuclear explosions, the children are taught how to materialize the standards of their war-torn community. The characters, namely Monster, Wife, Son, Buyer, the neighbor, and the neighbor's wife, are all in a situation of scarcity that leads to a struggle for food and the resulting acts of aggression. The play effectively illustrates the grown-up Son's adaptation to a world that is full of injustice, hatred, and indignation. The play ends with the death of Monster at the hands of his soldier son who, due to the widespread famine, is given the order to kill an old man in his neighborhood.

The second play, *The Tin Can People*, traces the actions of the nameless survivors of a nuclear disaster in the absence of social institutions. Despite the abundance of food and political freedom in the second play, similar patterns of action develop in both *The Tin Can People* and *Red, Black and Ignorant*. The characters' inability to change is interpreted as them being controlled by the same strict social and psychological forces that operated before the breakout.

Lastly, *Great Peace* can be regarded as a combination of the first two plays. In the initial setting of the play, soldiers, including Son, are given an impossible order: they must return to their birthplace and eliminate a child. After hours of deliberation, Son responds to the order by killing his own sibling. The second part of the play illustrates Woman who is shocked and traumatized by the death of her baby at the hands of her son. Carrying a bundle which she thinks is the dead baby, Woman sets off into the wilderness. There she meets a pregnant woman who has never seen a baby and is on the verge of giving birth to one. The mother dies in childbirth and the Woman leaves the baby, reasoning she cannot nurse two babies. The play ends with Woman finally coming to terms with her traumatic experience, assisting a real human being in an act of real compassion and refusing to join a newly formed community which leads to her probable lonely death in the wilderness.

Literature exploring Bond's *The War Plays* is limited and most of it views the plays as explorations of violence on the stage as a mechanism of raising consciousness among the audience about the threats of nuclear annihilation and the corrupt realm of politics that authorizes such threats. From this perspective, the plays «confront squarely and explicitly the issue of the day» (Witham [1998]: 297) and do the admirable job of foregrounding the present concerns about nuclear advancements.

The War plays, however, does more than exploring violence: through presenting a wide range of dehumanized characters within their socio-political context, these plays investigate the

«function of technology and the deification of the object over the people who produce it» (Castillo[1986]: 82) as the reason for widespread violence in human communities. The root of this reversed mastery is explored in the characters' social relations which convince them that they are nothing more than a tool or a machine. Likewise, these plays are viewed as a demonstration of the inevitability of «corruption, perversion, or destruction of any instinctive moral goodness by social conditioning» (Inns [1993]: 86). Most of the characters in the plays are perceived to be socially conditioned victims whose actions are directly mediated by the social system.

However, none of these studies provide a theory or an analysis as to how exactly the characters of *The War Plays* are rendered inhuman by their society, and more importantly, why the characters do not resist the dehumanizing social forces they encounter. This study, therefore, sets itself the task of illuminating the issue under consideration. In doing so, the article delves into the way socio-political institutions in *The War Plays* act as antagonism when they aim to mediate and control the characters' actions. Since these institutions are represented by «the state» and «the army», this article will focus on selective scenes involving these organizations and their confrontation, whether directly or indirectly, with the characters. In view of the fact that there are no social institutions represented in *The Tin Can People*, the scenes are selected from *Red Black and Ignorant* and *Great Peace*.

For this purpose and under three thematic headings, identity thinking, sublimation and the addendum, the article will first explain how the aforementioned social institutions in Bond's *The War Plays* take control of the cognitive realm of the characters' lives by eradicating and repressing their heterogeneous or non-identical properties from the conceptual system of their thought. This phenomenon Adorno refers to as «reality's compulsion to identity»; «a cultural impasse whose solution may only rely on aesthetic identity» (Adorno [1997]: 4). Whereas, Adorno contends, inclusion should be about the diversity of thought,

exploring and valuing differences and embracing distinctive and dissimilar characteristics to create, nurture, and embed an inclusive culture, the totalitarian character of identity thinking in these plays creates identical and substitutable characters. Leaning on Adorno's understanding of identity thinking and its subsumptive rationality, it will be then argued that politically organized institutions in *Red Black and Ignorant* and *Great Peace*, rely on the reduction of cognition and elimination of authenticity to create submissive characters.

Thereupon, it will be argued that the characters' realm of cognition is not the only permeable sphere of individual life presented in the plays. Consulting Freud's concept of sublimation and his analysis of group psychology along with Adorno's observation of fascist propaganda, it will be discussed that in the community of these plays, domination over the instinctual life of the characters is the second source of domination illustrated in the plays. Suppression of the expression of uninhibited libido in the form of sublimated human behavior and liberation of inhibited instinctual energy in the form of excessive aggression is considered to be the reason why the characters assigned to the army cooperate with the coercive system presented in these plays. This form of domination entails the liberation of the unconscious desires of aggressive instincts; thus, Freud declares, this process takes place with the instinctual approval of the individual; while at the same time domination is being intensified.

Furthermore, Adorno's concept of «the addendum» is employed to illustrate the internal conflicts and the suffering of the characters who are, in the process of socialization, extremely externalized, both instinctively and cognitively. Adorno's addendum is primarily a critique of the Kantian position that reason can be practical on its own; it is also a response to «the idealist equation of reason and freedom» (Adorno [2006]: 183). In response to Immanuel Kant who endorsed the idea that rationality and reason are the sole driving forces of an action, Adorno

contends that without a physical impulse no free and moral action can take place. Accordingly, after shedding more light on the concept of the addendum and its psychic/somatic nature, it will be demonstrated that, when put in extremely difficult situations, two of the most externalized characters of *The War Plays* - the two soldiers - cannot comply with the rationalized order that dictates each should kill a civilian, and end up resolving the situation with killing members of their own family. Despite their mode of rationalization which is in total conformity with the ruling system and its particular form of instrumental reasoning, the characters fail to perpetrate the action and illustrate a divergence of insight/reason and action. Eventually, they respond to the situation with an action that is neither rational nor purely impulsive. Adorno's addendum which has been frequently interpreted as an image of the reconciliation of mind and body, generates the discussions provided in the last section of this article.

1. IDENTITY THINKING IN RED BLACK AND IGNORANT AND GREAT PEACE

Identity thinking treats the "unlike" as "like" and then subsumes them under general conceptual categories. While identity thinking implies that the concept is rationally identical with the object it refers to (Rose [1978]: 44), for Adorno, this mode of subsumption is necessarily coercive and does violence to the particular or non-identical characteristics of concepts. Adorno condemns this reductive character of identity thinking and asserts that in the course of history concepts are used by social institutions to control cognition and make thinking succumb to the prevailing interests. As the medium of human cognition, the diminution of concepts anticipates the limitation of intellect and genuine apprehension (Adorno [2004]: 161). This paves the way for social domination over the cognitive content of the thinking subject. In the absence of inherent properties and particular characteristics, Adorno asserts, the rul-

ing cognitive ideal becomes the whole of thinking and, consequently, the subject loses its critical potential (Adorno [2004]: 85).

Viewed in this way, for Adorno, identity thinking is not concerned about the genuine existence of the subject or the object. Rather, it is more about what something «represents» or to what category the subject belongs (Adorno [2004]: 149). This aspect of identity thinking is overtly observed in Bond's trilogy of *The War Plays*. What, at first glance, unites the three plays of *The War Plays* is that most of the characters are nameless. The characters are referred to as Woman1, Woman 2, Soldier 1, Soldier 2, Soldier 3, Captain, Monster, etc. In his commentary on *The War Plays*, Bond explains that «the characters are not named because although they are not symbols their lives are social forces - and the forces are clarified by the crises. But there is another reason. They have lost their names because they have lost themselves» (Bond [1998]: 361).

In view of Adorno's assertion that the identifying mode of thought sacrifices particularity, foregrounds similarity, and ultimately reduces the subject to a substitutable representative of a category, the namelessness of the characters of these plays is attributed to their social configuration. Since, for Adorno, the identity that is gained through identity thinking is necessarily dependent on external and social factors (Jarvis [1998]: 166) for its existence, the namelessness of the characters, as Bond explains, illustrates the point that they, rather than being individuals with private interests, are treated as social forces. Most of these nameless characters are the economically underprivileged members of the community whose survival in their community depends on their subsumption into the community. For this to happen, they are forced to abandon their uniqueness and lose that necessary element that Horkheimer and Adorno believe is required to have a name: a life of their own (Horkheimer, Adorno [2002]: 123).

Act five, titled «Selling», in *Red Black and Ignorant* gives a clue as why these characters, rather than being individuals with private inter-

ests and a life distinct from their social existence, can be considered as, to borrow from Horkheimer and Adorno, «the mere stuff of classification» (Horkheimer, Adorno [2002]: 6). The Buyer has come to announce that it is time Monster and Wife sell their child:

*BUYER. I am the Buyer
The Register of Births records the birth of your son
He is now at the age to learn to speak
I have come to buy him.* (Bond [1998]: 16)

Wife's statement, «he's too small to sell» (Bond [1998]: 16), indicates that this transaction is legal and normal. She applies reason to her feeble attempt at resistance when she declares that she did not expect the buyer to come so soon. The Buyer bases his rationale for this haste on the claim that the children's training must begin at an early age to have full effect. Wife's conversation with the Buyer makes it clear that the parents in this community do not play the conventional role of parents in the families. As is indicated by the quality of interaction between the buyer and the parents, it is the instrumental rationality of identity thinking that governs their existence.

The price, however, sparks off considerable debate between Buyer and the parents. The buyer warns the parents that their procrastination will result in their children being «scattered like dry beans on the supermarket floor» (Bond [1998]: 17) waiting «to be weighted and priced» (Bond [1998]: 17). That said, the parents still haggle over the price. This conversation between Buyer and the parents is expressive of two basic features of identity thinking: 1) identity thinking identifies what can be calculated and made use of in practical terms; 2) it subjugates cognition and the conceptual realm of thought as a precondition for social domination over individual lives. The buyer's mode of rationalization conforms with Adorno and Horkheimer's understanding of identity thinking, since, as the buyer contends, these children will be trained in thinking as is expected of them. The result is, their cognition will be limited to the given and their genuine existence sacrificed for social totality.

The Buyer specifically stresses the importance of the child's transferal before his thoughts are formed. Only this way «he will learn to think and behave in such a way that the community will welcome him» (Bond [1998]: 16). Otherwise, the Buyer declares, the child is as good as trash on the street and «there are many types of incinerator devices for disposing of unsellable goods which if left lying about» (Bond [1998]: 18). He also directly points out that these children are to be used for the benefits of the state when he says:

*BUYER: ...The good citizen is satisfied more by serving than being served
MONSTER. That's what you'll train him to think
BUYER. Certainly
And then he won't object will he?
His opinions will be formed even before he knows the subjects on which he holds them
Could life be more trouble-free?* (Bond [1998]: 18-19)

In this scene, the parents make clear that they are not concerned with anything but the material aspect of both themselves and their child's existence. The buyer's interest in the transaction, on the other hand, is suggestive of reasons beyond materiality. He indicates that the children are welcomed to this community as long as their thinking faculty is governable; and when cognition is manipulated, «the moment of thought that resists totalisation» (Gritzner [2015]: 9) is eliminated. Thus, with buying children before their cognition is developed, this community is protecting itself from the new generation's critical observations.

As Adorno observes, identity thinking takes an affirmative stance towards the status quo; the thinking subject no longer possesses the revolutionary power of a critical mind that could rise up against the normalized state of affairs (Adorno [2004]: 85) when his/her cognitive power is constrained. And In this play, everyone, including the parents and Buyer himself, are directly taught how to think; the conversation reveals that Monster and Wife were once sold to the state as well.

Individuals, according to Adorno's views, in order to maintain their uniqueness need «to have

a cognitive content other than that which is provided for» (Bernstein [2004]: 37) by their social systems, if they want to stay immune from the destructive character of identity thinking. The reductive character of identity thinking makes itself fairly perceivable in this scene since the buyer and the parents' dialogues indicate that these children are valuable as long as they do not develop dissonant characteristics or a cognitive content of their own.

Moreover, each individual, in order to survive in this community, needs to acquire the necessary characteristics required for their subsumption into specific categories; in this trilogy, almost all of the individuals who belong to the category of "women" or "soldiers" behave the same way. All of them ultimately surrender to the demands of the state and the pervasive mode of rationalization even when they fractionally display differential characteristics. This is because survival requires that each newborn be subsumed into the homogeneous whole and be alienated from its dissonant characteristics. What happens when the parents fail to sell their children on time is that the children «run wild» and thus they need to be disposed of. This is implicative of Adorno's claim that an identitarian society «tolerates nothing outside it» (Adorno [2004]: 172). Children whose cognitive development does not take place under the supervision of the state, Buyer indicates, cannot fit in this community because they will not know how to materialize the standards of the state.

In both *Red Black and Ignorant* and *Great Peace*, characters are enmeshed in circumstances of scarcity resulted from war and nuclear explosions. Hence, a widespread sense of struggle for survival is implied in both of these plays. What is clear is that the parents sell their child in exchange for «subsistence for twenty years» (Bond [1998]: 17). The parents negotiate with the buyer for a price not specified as food, clothes, or currency, but subsistence for specific number of years. In this context «subsistence» can be interpreted as the state's guarantee of the parents' mere «continued existence» (Wilson [2007]: 18). As Adorno and Horkheimer contend, the individuals'

struggle for self-preservation in identitarian societies ultimately lead to their self-destruction. This is due to the assumption that in such societies the self has to do violence to the non-identical or the heterogeneous aspect of itself so that the identical or the homogeneous part can continue to exist (Horkheimer and Adorno [2002]: 42). Assuming that survival is more than having access to food and other necessities of life, it can be concluded that the living characters in these plays do not really survive in their communities; with the elimination and repression of particularity and unique qualities, as Adorno and Horkheimer assert, the survival of these characters is considered as nothing more than continued existence.

In addition, identity thinking in *Great Peace* is represented in the form of the mimesis of death. Since identity thinking treats nature the way it treats concepts and subjects, those properties of nature that cannot be subsumed under general categories are rendered imperceptible by the rationality of identity thinking. As Wilson poetically depicts the situation, nature is reduced «to a blank verse» (Wilson [2007]: 16). Consequently, the exclusion of nature's unidentifiable properties from view, transforms nature into an inanimate object. Paradoxically, the more the objectified subject posits itself over and against the objectified nature, the more it becomes like the nature which it has treated as empty matter (Wilson [2007]: 18). The result is, the hierarchy between the subject and the object – nature – is blurred and the subject seeks to liken itself to the object it tries to control. This, in turn, brings about a fluidity of identity between the subject and the object (Huhn [2003]: 4). As a result, as Caillois declares, the subject develops the «desire to recover its original insensate condition» (qtd in Armstrong [2012]: 111) through submerging into the object it imitates. Since this desire acts as an intermediate stage toward the subject's ultimate end (Fortin [2011]: 185), Horkheimer and Adorno relate it to Freud's death drive and Caillois' concept of mimesis (Horkheimer, Adorno [2002]: 189).

Scenes nine, ten, eleven, and twelve all entitled «Wilderness» in *Great Peace*, present the woman

carrying a bundle wandering in the wilderness seventeen years later, after her son had killed her baby. There she meets the same soldiers who were given orders to eliminate babies. The traumatized woman seems saner than the apparently sane soldiers; they think they are dead. They also try to convince the Woman that she is dead, too. The soldiers describe scenes of dying:

PEMBERTTON. *If you'd saw what we saw you'd 'ave an excuse for not noticing you're dead
We was corpsin civvies in a quarry - ran out of ammo -
(Points.) just that one box left
We was going back t' the quarry: then it 'appened: the end of the world they talked about
No explosion, just the wind
We was down in a gully, a sort of defile
All the bodies - livin an dead, army an civvie - shot up in the sky
It was full of bodies whirlin around in circles like a painted ceiling
The wind blew em up there
Whirlin round over our 'eads - looked like a dance.* (Bond [1998]: 168)

One reason why the soldiers think they are dead could be attributed to the traumatic experience of being exposed to massive scenes of dying. Another reason could be discussed in terms of the way Adorno and Horkheimer explicate identity thinking: In this scene the soldiers who are told what to do and how to think are on their own. Now that the army is gone they seem to be incapable of standing out as individuals against their environment.

As Woman points out:

*But you could settle down - build permanent shelters - if yer looked after the soil things might grow
Yer could still do your foragin
Yer'd be comfortable in winter - take care of each other when you're ill
Yer wont want t' march when you're old
Per'aps other people'll find yer - there might be children my child could grow up with.* (Bond [1998]: 180-181)

As the play indicates none of this happens. After seventeen years the soldiers are still wandering through the wilderness, thinking they are dead. It could be inferred that these soldiers are imitating their landscape; it seems that the soldiers' inner and outer landscape is the same. As explained, mimesis, for Adorno and Horkheimer, is the attempt to immerse into nature, to become one with nature. The nature, as described, appears to be barren and dead:

WOMAN. *No food since days
(Gestures around.) 'S'dead - no rain.* (Bond [1998]: 165)

At the end of this scene the soldiers lapse into a collective phase of dementia, asking to be «corpsed»: «If we're dead why dont we put ourselves in the ground» (Bond [1998]: 180). They voluntarily keep asking to be shot to prove they are dead. It is interpreted that, since with the soldiers' identitarian mode of thought, the boundary between the object and the subject is abolished and the soldiers no longer view themselves as valuable to a system, they are imitating the object, the dead nature, and trying to submerge into what they have been imitating for a long time.

2. SUBLIMATION IN THE WAR PLAYS

The sphere of cognition, as Adorno contends, is not the only source of domination in modern capitalist society. Adorno refers to Freud's theory of sublimation and group psychology to develop his own account of fascist propaganda whereby sublimation of instincts is hindered in the ideological interests of the dominant powers.

Sublimation, as Freud describes it, «is the normal maturation of individual» (Freud [1962]: 44). This process transforms the individual's initial impulses into socially acceptable behavior. Sublimation necessarily involves the repression of excessive libido and aggressive instincts. Through sublimation instinctual energy finds its expression in tendency for sexual union and different forms of love (Freud [1949]: 38). It is also what prepares

the individuals for higher artistic, scientific, and different aspects of cultural development (Freud [1962]: 44) when it successfully puts limits on the liberty of destructive instincts. This account of sublimation is ascribed to the individual's normal maturation in normal circumstances, as when the individual is given the chance to channel his uninhibited instinctual energy into proper and civilized expressions.

A profound alteration in the individual's mental development, however, Freud observes, is possible when the individual is assigned to an organized group. Adorno adopts this account of Freud's sublimation and group psychology to assert that fascism exploits and utilizes the «irrational, unconscious, [and] regressive» (Adorno [1991]: 134) instincts to liberate inhibited instinctual energy in the form of aggression and violence. Since the liberation of destructive instincts entails the subject's instinctual satisfaction and approval (Marcuse [2002]: 82), he/she willingly yields to the demands made by the group's leader (Adorno [1991]: 134).

In *Red Black and Ignorant* selling the children to the state provides a huge blockage in the normal sublimation of instincts. Freud considers sublimation as an important aspect of cultural and individual development (Freud [1962]: 44) because it puts a limit on destructive instinctual energy for the sake of both the subjects and their community. Selling the children to the state indicates that if limitations are to be imposed on the instinctual energy of the characters, it will not be for the interests of the characters because «the good citizen is satisfied more by serving than being served» (Bond [1998]: 18). Therefore, it can be inferred that the children's instinctual energy will be directed towards the fulfillment of the state's aims.

Given that in the scene discussed in the previous section, the role of the families in the upbringing of their children is debilitated and none of the subsequent actions provide information as how the children are being trained and educated immediately after the state receives them, it is not clear how sublimation of instincts

takes place in this community. Nevertheless, it becomes clear that the child, now referred to as Son, joins the army in his adulthood. The Son displays characteristics that indicate his aggressive instinctual energy is liberated rather than sublimated. Scene seven, entitled «The Army», in *Red Black and Ignorant* starts with the parents, Monster and Wife, helping «the Son to put on a bullet-proof army jacket and combat helmet and give him a rifle» (Bond [1998]: 27). Son starts singing The Army Song:

*I am the army
My legs are made of tanks
My arms are made of guns
My head is made of bombs
I am the army
[...]
When a soldier heaves a grenade what does he see: a
body explode like a bottle on a wall
When a soldier slits a belly what does he see: guts spill
like clothes from a suitcase
When a soldier fires a bullet what does he see: blood
spurt like water from a hosepipe
That is the soldier's reward for his skills: the pleasure of
seeing the way he kills
[...]
Bow down and worship me. (Bond [1998]: 28)*

This army song is not like the typical military songs. It does not speak about the great amount of pride a soldier takes in serving his country and protecting the civilians; nor does it embody the ideals of a military organization or anything that can be attributed to a devoted patriot. This song, it can be argued, is full of what we may call the aggressive and «narcissistic» attitude of a soldier who seems to be inflicted with great delusions of power and grandeur. All the traces of humanity leave this army song with the line that says «that is the soldier's reward for his skills: the pleasure of seeing the way he kills» (Bond [1998]: 28). This military song illustrates how far a soldier is allowed to go in expressing his narcissistic attitudes and his aggressive desires. Moreover, a lack of the proper sublimation of instincts in the form of acceptable human behavior is present in

this army song. The song contains lines such as «and wipe my arse on the lists of the dead» (Bond [1998]: 28) and «my breath is toxic gas» (Bond [1998]: 27). These lines indicate that Son is proud of characteristics that are not only aggressive, but also defamatory and repulsive.

In Freud's psychology, the normal sublimation of the instincts of aggressiveness and libido takes place when the child's infantile development is supervised by the parents or people with whom the child can have the chance to develop emotional attachments; but in different situations, as when the individual forms part of a highly organized group such as an army, he/she no longer materializes the values of the «high culture» or the sublimated expressions of his/her instincts. Within the group, the individual is a powerful self who can act on the impulses of his/her unconscious and thus carries out actions and approves of things he/she would otherwise refrain from (Le Bon [2001]: 4). As Monster remarks, «he [the Son] does things he cant tell his parents» (Bond [1998]: 29). The reason why in the army individuals are capable of destructive actions, Freud asserts, is due to the evolving libidinal ties between the members and the leader or the leading idea whereby the individuals identify themselves with the power that stems from the collectivity and the leader (Freud [1949]: 120); thus, developing a narcissistic cathexis. This can explain why Son's army song contains statements such as «bow down and worship me» ([1998]: 28).

Scene eight, «No one Can Willingly Give up the Name of Human», in *Red Black and Ignorant*, demonstrates that Son enjoys being part of the army. In her attempt to justify her son's actions, Wife declares that «the army wont let him out and if he didn't obey orders he'd be shot» (Bond [1998]: 30). Son responses to his mother with the statement, «I like the army» (Bond [1998]: 30). And the reason why he likes the army is because:

*When you're a soldier all your problems are solved by training
Kill or be killed
No apologies or explanations*

*You always gab about right and wrong
Do what's right? - its as much use as an overcoat to a corpse.* (Bond [1998]: 30)

As attested by Freud's group psychology and Adorno's observation of fascist propaganda, domination over the individuals who are bound to the group with the ties of identifications, takes place with the instinctive approval of the individual (Freud [1949]: 75); it also prevents the normal sublimation of individuals by repressing the uninhibited instincts and liberating the inhibited and destructive libidinal energy in the form of aggression (Freud [1949]: 118- 119), as is the case with Son or the children who are to be soldiers. This explains why Son finds it pointless to brood over the question of right and wrong. As Adorno explains, when the subject is assigned to a highly organized group such as an army, he develops a weak ego and a manipulated id (Held [1980]: 135) devoid of moral standards. It could be asserted that as a member of the army, Son no longer possesses moral standards by which he could operate.

In spite of the fact that *Red Black and Ignorant* provides access to the dialogues of one soldier only, the beginning of scene eight indicates that all the soldiers in this community are considered to be infamous by the civilians. Edward Bond's description of soldiers in his *The War Play* poems confirms the assumption that soldiers of this community are a fearsome group; and «in a few years people started to flee from the soldiers» (Bond [1998]: x).

MONSTER. *Anyone see you enter the house?*

SON. *Why?*

MONSTER. *It would be marked as the home of a soldier.* (Bond [1998]: 29)

The reason why the Son is back home, he explains:

*Every squaddie's been sent back to his own street to shoot one civvie-corpse
[...]
When you've got gunsights for eyes and triggers for fingers you can call yourself a soldier*

MONSTER. *You'd do that?*

SON. *Following the reason yeh.* (Bond [1998]: 30)

The reason why each soldier is given the order to eliminate one civilian is due to the widespread famine and food riots. Son justifies the action declaring the army is doing this for public good. Wife supports Son claiming if he does not kill the only neighbor they have, then Son's superior officer would kill both of his parents to punish him for being a coward. Determined that the order is reasonable and the action should be performed, Son leaves the house to carry out the deed; but he cannot bring himself to shoot the old sick neighbor who Wife assumes is going to die soon anyway. Son does not kill the sick neighbor and, shockingly, kills his father instead; as Bond puts it, «instead of killing the senile neighbor (who is as helpless as a child and will soon die), [he] kills the wrong man - his father» (Bond [1998]: 344).

Since *Great Peace* follows the same pattern and also provides information in greater detail, in what follows, Son's incapability to kill the sick neighbor will be discussed along with analyzing the repeated situation in *Great Peace*. In both plays, the two sons initially do not exhibit signs of resistance to the order; they strongly rationalize the required action and they believe it must be carried out. They also convince their mothers and in return get encouraged by them to get the job done. However, they cannot bring themselves to act on reason and resolve the situation by killing the wrong characters.

The opening scene of *Great Peace*, «Military Post», displays a group of soldiers who are ready for new orders. The Captain explains that food supplies are limited and the situation is debilitating. He continues:

Under government emergency regulations food will be restricted to civilian elements needed to assist in the recovery programme

[...]

The harsh truth is that most of them [the children] would die of

malnutrition in the fullness of time

[...]

To prevent this waste every soldier will return to his place of civilian domicile and eliminate one child.
(Bond [1998]: 101)

Including Son, there are five soldiers present in this scene and none of them makes a remark that could remotely be interpreted as a sign of resistance or disagreement. Furthermore, a sense of responsibility is entirely vanished from this scene. As explained, this is because, more than regarding themselves as particular individuals, the soldiers view themselves as part of a powerful structure led by a powerful idea or a strong leader (Rensmann [2017]: 350). This is why, Adorno asserts, in military groups soldiers are capable of the most horrible and collective acts of crime without displaying a sense of resistance or responsibility.

In act three, «The Woman's House», Son is at his mother's house. There are two babies in the house, his little sibling and the neighbor's, who leaves her baby with Woman - Son's mother - while she is at work. Son needs to get his mother out of the house before he can perform the action. He sends the woman out to get him cigarettes; but he cannot act. In the absence of Woman another soldier shows up to tell him he does not have much time; he still does not act. When Woman returns Son tells her why he is home. Woman tries to protect both of the babies, she suggests they should take the babies and run away. Son insists that «the worse an order is the more they make sure it's obeyed» (Bond [1998]: 117). Son delivers a convincing speech as to why this order is right and must be carried out. He then takes the neighbor's baby and leaves the house. He spends hours with the baby but cannot kill it. Eventually, in act four, he returns the baby to its mother. In the next act, Son kills his own sibling.

Bond does not provide us with any details about the inner workings of his characters. So it is not clear why Son does not kill the baby when he has the chance. He rationalizes the order and he is also aware that if he fails to perform the action someone else will. Yet he cannot do what he thinks is right. Adorno's concept of the addendum or «the additional factor» (Adorno [2006]: 229),

can provide an explanation as why the two sons of *Red Black and Ignorant* and *Great Peace*, while rationalizing the action, fail to perform it and end up resolving the situation with a relatively more dreadful action.

3. THE ARCHAIC STAGE OF THE ADDENDUM

Adorno's concept of the addendum first appeared in the nineteenth lecture of his series *History and Freedom*. He initially describes Addendum as «"the additional factor", a term somewhat arbitrary chosen» (Adorno [2006]: 229). Later on Adorno uses the term as a noun in a four-page section in *Negative Dialectics* and also in "Marginalia to Theory and Praxis". He also describes the moment of the addendum in his *Problems of Moral Philosophy*, albeit without dubbing the term. Also, as Walschots maintains, the term *hinzutrende*, an adjective, occasionally appears in Adorno's oeuvre particularly in his *Aesthetic Theory* and *Zur Zetakritik der Erkenntnistheorie*, but only to refer «to an "addition" rather than to the concept of the addendum» (Walschots [2011]: 1).

Adorno's rejection of Kant's claim that reason is practical on its own (Kant [1997]: 101), sparks off Adorno's discussion of the addendum. For Adorno a psychic element is necessary for action to make a material and meaningful effect in the world; however, it is never sufficient. As Adorno argues, «the will that has been reduced to pure practical reason is an abstraction» and « [t]he addendum is the name for that which was eliminated in this abstraction; without it, there would be no real will at all» (Adorno [2004]: 229). Thus, what Adorno captures with the idea of the addendum is something physical added to a mental component. More precisely, Adorno refers to the addendum as an impulse that is «intramental and somatic in one» (Adorno [2004]: 228-229). This means that Adorno rejects Descartes substance dualism¹ and Kant's distinction of mind/body and

claims that the two are intimately interconnected. Likewise, Joel Whitebook compares Adorno's the addendum to Freud's conception of instinct² as «a frontier entity on the border between the mental and the physical» (Whitebook [1995]: 260). Quoting from Adorno, he explains:

This means that, as 'it denies the Cartesian dualism of res extensa and res cogitans, «the addendum has an aspect which under rationalistic rules is irrational». The impulse represents «a phase in which the dualism of extra-mental and intra-mental was not yet thoroughly consolidated ... nor [is] ontologically ultimate» and thus contains the conditions of «the will's transition to practice» and of the extension of freedom to «the realm of experience». (Whitebook [1995]: 260)

As indicated, it is the impulsive nature of the addendum that renders it «irrational under rationalistic rules». Nonetheless, it is because of this impulse and the interconnection of mind/body that human action is possible in the first place. Without the physical side of this impulse, Adorno argues, there would be no moral action, no human will, and no sense of freedom.

In his book *Aesthetic Theory*, Adorno mentions aesthetic identity as an «aid to the non-identical» and with this description creates an implied parallel between aesthetic identity and the addendum. As art establishes its autonomy from empirical reality, human subject retains its freedom from cultural «monstrosity» (Adorno [1997]: 4) through having recourse to the impulsive acts of the addendum. By «negating the closed confines of the ever-same» art retains its authenticity which entails «scaring», «damaging» or «disrupting» itself (Adorno [1997]: 23). In these acts of scaring, or the return of impulsive and the irrational, the subject reveals what is most natural: nature in the subject. This archaic and irrational impulse appears when the subject is under tremendous amount of pressure and thus reveals his/her unfreedom and at the same time gives expres-

¹ Descartes substance dualism refers to the distinction between «the inner "thinking" substance and the outer

reality to which action belongs» ([Adorno[2006]: 232).

² See Freud 1989, 562-567.

sion to his desire for autonomy and freedom (Adorno [2004]: 222); hence, the addendum is the spontaneous manifestation of the subject's desire for freedom from external forces, the same way aesthetics is the promise of authenticity for art; a freedom and an authenticity that are gained at a high price.

In *Red, Black and Ignorant*, scene eight, Son is sent home «to shoot one civvie-corpse», but being left to decide which on his own makes it hard for him to accomplish the mission. The imprecise order as to who must be killed is a chance for Son to make decisions and thus to evaluate right and wrong. This situation of decision-making exerts immeasurable pressure on the soldier who «kill[s] or [is] killed» and looks for «[n]o apologies or explanations» (Bond [1998]: 30). According to Adorno in his lecture on *Consciousness and Impulse*, a sense of freedom exists in subjects when they can «confront [their] actions with the consciousness with which [they] act» (Adorno [2004]: 230). A soldier, therefore, is unfree since the element of consciousness does not exist in his world; he kills mechanically and obeys orders without questioning. So, when a chance for decision making appears, consciousness becomes feasible. As Adorno explicates the relation between impulse and consciousness, when consciousness participates in reflexive actions, «the additional factor [...] as a constitutive element of the will came into being» (Adorno [2004]: 236). As a result, when in the corner house to kill a neighbor, Son suffers from indecision, evident in the soliloquies that intersperse his dialogue with the neighbor lady:

*The room seemed bigger when I was a child
I could touch the ceiling
My mother (why dont you kill him?) is cooking
Its late
(He'd lie on the floor like a raincoat in a jumble sale
For anyone to buy
You put it on and look in the mirror
The stranger's still wearing it)
My mother said hurry
Bolt the door after me so that even I couldnt get in.*
(Bond [1998]: 36-37).

This pressure leads to a build-up of instinctual aggression, culminating in Son shooting his father. This act of patricide, or scaring oneself by damaging a sibling, can be interpreted as the result of the «withdrawal of libidinal energy from external reality» (Adorno [2006]: 231), which opens up a chasm between the inner and the outer, ultimately leading to a more excessive form of instinctual aggression liberated through the addendum.

Adorno relates the appearance of the addendum to the internalized social norms at a specific socio-cultural context and the inner conflicts they create when the subject is under the obligation to carry out a deed he/she believes is right and reasonable, but cannot properly justify it. Under such circumstances, this archaic impulse appears to rescue the subject from his/her rationalized obligations and the following conflicts (Adorno [2006]: 234). For Son, the order is to the benefit of the civilians who will suffer from famine in a year so gravely that, as Son explains, «[n]ext year you'll be so hungry you'll be like corpses who eat the nails out of their coffin and then look round for something else» (Bond [1998]: 30-31). In this way the order is reasonable to the soldier, and yet he cannot justify killing the old man in the neighborhood. Out of this conflict between the reasonable and the unjustifiable, the addendum is borne. Hence, the addendum is a critical response to the historical context in which the subject is trapped (Hammer [2006]: 121). The irrational mode of rationalization internalized in the subject in a particular socio-historical context brings about inner conflicts which ultimately result in preventing the subject from properly fulfilling the obligation in question.³ Consequently, the subject «must

³ To further illustrate this point, Adorno brings up «the problem of Hamlet». For Adorno, Hamlet is incapable of performing an action he deems rational and reasonable. And «Hamlet's withdrawal of libidinal energy from external reality» (Adorno [2006]: 231) is the reason behind the chasm that is opened up between his consciousness and actions, inner and outer. Hamlet's entire relation to his external reality becomes problematic when, as a conscious and rational human being, «withdraws his actions

perform regress; he must return to an earlier archaic stage» (Adorno [2006]: 234) to resolve the situation.⁴

The addendum, therefore, has a regressive side as well as a progressive side. Although it can be emancipatory, it is only so through bringing destruction. The irrationality, impulsiveness and freedom of the addendum resembles the freedom of art in Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory* in which an "unfree society", very much like the society in which the soldier lives, "afflicts" art with autonomy, abusing its detachment from «religious, political, and other social roles» to «perform an ideological function» (Zuidervaart [1991]: 32). The same way, the impulsive actions of the soldiers give expression to their desire for freedom from their restrictive social context, but at the same time abuses them by exerting even more pain on them.

The experiences of suffering and inner conflicts, Adorno declares, are the necessary conditions for the emergence of the addendum. Adorno believes that rationalized thought accompanied by feelings of suffering and inner conflicts indicate that the subject is not free; and the response to this situation is an irrational violent outburst

from the realm of irrational, corrupt, bad reality confronting him» (Adorno [2006]: 233). Thus, he remains locked inside his chain of thoughts, «incapable of translating the father-ghost's demand for revenge into the decisive deed» (Hammer [2006]: 118). This is because, as an outstanding example of a self-reflective character, Hamlet's own rationality does not entirely conform to the heroic culture of vengeance. The reason why Hamlet cannot bring himself to act is because he is «unsure about how he will ever succeed in emerging from his own rationality so as to transform into reality what he has perceived to be rational» (Adorno [2006]: 233). What Hamlet needs, in order to carry out what he thinks is right but cannot justify it, is a shock experience, or what Adorno refers to as «a sudden impulse» that throws the subject into irrational action.

⁴ At the end of the play, Hamlet, whose interior monologue prevents him from carrying out the deed, suddenly and irrationally, in a manner that leads to his own death, goes on a killing spree and stabs everyone who crosses his path (Adorno [2006]: 233).

through which the subject expresses his/her wish for autonomy and freedom (Hammer [2006]: 119). It also requires a somatic element to push the subject into the violent action. In *Red, Black and Ignorant* the fear of the Officer's punishments is the somatic element, and in *Great Peace*, the somatic element necessary for the addendum to move Son into the violent action is the pressure of time; the job has to be carried out by morning and it is almost morning. The two Sons, nonetheless, go against their rationalizations and postpone the action. This could be interpreted as a sign of self-reflection which is a necessary element of the addendum (Adorno [2006]: 233).

In the following scene, «Military Post by a Quarry», Bond highlights the insensibility of the soldiers who after committing a horrible deed are having a casual conversation. The soldiers appear calm and normal as before, except Son. He is distanced and disconnected from the other soldiers; and when the Corporal orders him to pick up a cigarette packet, he refuses to obey. The Captain comes in and repeatedly orders Son to pick up the packet. Son, however, remains silent and motionless until he is finally shot. Son's refusal to do a simple task after killing his sibling on an order indicates that what he did was not entirely an act of duty/reason, but had a compulsive/irrational component to it. As noted, the addendum indicates a mournful critique of the existing society and when it appears it tends to disconnect the subject from the community (Hammer [2006]: 119). It is not clear how the other soldiers carried out the order. If, for a moment, they did reflect on the action, given that in this scene they all appear normal and casual, based on Freud and Adorno's analysis of group behavior, it could be deduced that they all retreated to their id and gave a free reign to their destructive aggressive instincts, but Son did not do his murderous duty the normal/reasonable way. By killing his own sibling while he had the chance to kill a stranger, Son breached the army code of rationality. No more being regarded as a keg in the wheel of the military force, the Captain shoots him and gets «rid of a weak element» (Bond [1998]: 150).

As claimed by Freud and Le Bon, being a member of an identitarian group requires that each subject acts with the ferocity of a barbaric; without a trace of deliberation or self-reflection (Le Bon [2001]: 8). In moments of being trapped between the inner and the outer, self-reflection can lead to a reawakened irrationality and a relatively more aggressive action (Adorno [2006]: 233). This aggression in *The War Plays* committed by the two soldiers cannot be contained by the military code of proper violence and is therefore a threat to it. Being a threat to its context, this aggression can be interpreted as an attempt to liberate the perpetrator from the constraints of that context. This impulsive aggression that Adorno calls the addendum «is the strongest and most immediate proof that there is such a thing as freedom» (Adorno [2006]: 235) and explains why the two soldiers have recourse to a more aggressive act.

Bond's *The War Plays* ends on an equivocal note: emergence of a new human community and the refusal of Woman to join it. The addendum, therefore, though an undeniable clue for the existence and reality of the impulse to freedom, is always unmanageable and at times very destructive, the same way, it can be argued, as Bond's art is inconclusive and ambivalent. As James Hellings explains, Adorno's aesthetic discourse, art itself is the addendum, surpassing its author and its spectators (Hellings [2014]). Thus by revealing the mechanisms of domination, Bond and Adorno ruminate over the possibility of counter-actions and freedom, and yet refuse to hail the additional factor or the impulsive behavior as necessarily redemptive. The addendum or the additional factor, thus, highlights the unpredictability of human actions even in strictest social contexts in both its promising aspect and its detrimental quality.

CONCLUSIONS

Edward Bond's *Red Black and Ignorant* and *Great Peace* depict characters who are embroiled in circumstances of scarcity resulted from nuclear explosions. These characters' survival in the

aftermath of war entails their dehumanization which is resulted from encroachment of social force upon their life. This encroachment occurs through manipulating and controlling the two most important private realms of the characters' lives: their cognition and their instinctual life. As a result the characters surrender to the prevailing antagonistic social forces and even cooperate with the dehumanizing strategies presented in the play and in this way maintain the status quo.

At the beginning of this article, Adorno's understanding of identity thinking was employed to demonstrate how the state takes control of the characters' system of thought in *Red Black and Ignorant*. As discussed, identity thinking aims to subsume particular phenomena under general categories. Identitarian societies, for Adorno, are necessarily totalitarian; these societies do not tolerate what they cannot identify and that which is not identical with the rest of the society. Thus, individual lives are rendered meaningless outside of the community. Inclusion into the community in identitarian societies necessarily entails that the individuals abandon critical abilities and dissolve into the unthinking whole, pigeonholed and identifiable. This reductive process represses the individuals' potential for critical observations because their cognition is formed in accordance with external forces.

At the beginning of the first play Buyer shows up at the door of a family to purchase their son. It is revealed that Buyer's insistence on the immediacy of the transaction and on-time delivery is due to the necessity of the state's supervision over the cognitive development of the child; the state will teach the child how to think and behave. This transaction is necessary for both the state and the parents; the state will achieve mastery over the child's life and the parents will be provided with minimal resources that are necessary for their survival at a time of privation.

Then, it was argued that based on Adorno and Horkheimer's critique of identity thinking, survival in identitarian societies cannot be interpreted as more than continued existence. Since all the characters, including Buyer, were sold to the

state, they are all separated off from their intrinsic and heterogeneous characteristics. In order to be subsumed into the community, the characters are forced to do violence to their particularity and abandon their unique existence. Thereupon, it is demonstrated that in *Great Peace*, identity thinking treats nature the way it treats individuals: as identity thinking reduces individuals to empty bodies, it also reduces nature to mere objectivity, a blank canvas devoid of inherent properties. Regarding nature, Adorno and Horkheimer assert, identity thinking takes the form of the mimesis of death, in which mimesis implies affinity with the object. Meaning, the subject does not merely imitate the object, but it seeks to assimilate what it imitates. Accordingly, it was discussed that the soldiers of *Great Peace*, who seem to be imitating the dead landscape in four scenes of the play, exhibit the desire to be shot and dissolve into nature.

In the second section of this article, it was discussed that conceptual domination is not the only source of domination presented in these plays. Consulting Freud's group psychology and Adorno's analysis of fascist propaganda, it was explained that instinctual domination, especially when the subject is assigned to a group, assists the state for full mastery over the individuals' actions. For this form of domination, the normal sublimation of instincts must be repressed. The normal sublimation of instincts, Freud contends, is hindered when the role of the family in upbringing the subject is eliminated. The son of *Red Black and Ignorant*, which is sold to the state, scarcely displays signs of sublimated behavior. His dialogues are aggressive and his army song is indicative of his narcissistic attitudes. Freud's observation of group psychology suggests that when an individual is assigned to a highly mechanical group such as an army, aggressive expressions and narcissistic attitudes replace the sublimated expressions of instinctual energy. This is because such groups, based on Adorno, repress the uninhibited expression of sublimated behavior and in turn liberate the inhibited instinctual energy in the form of aggression.

Accordingly, the soldiers of the two plays do not exhibit signs of resistance to the order that commands each soldier should return to his street and eliminate one civilian. All soldiers, including the two sons of the plays, rationalize the order. However, unlike the other soldiers who successfully carry out the action, these two soldiers end up killing the wrong people.

These two soldiers' incapability to perform the action was analyzed in terms of Adorno's concept of the addendum, or the additional factor. The addendum or the irrational impulse, Adorno declares, appears when the dominated subject is inflicted with unresolvable inner conflicts. In situations when the subject is under tremendous amount of pressure - as when he is under the obligation to perform a specific action he believes is right and reasonable but cannot properly justify it - he/she ends up responding to the situation with an excessive form of aggression through the addendum. Further, it was elaborated that Adorno's addendum appears when the subject develops the desire to distance himself/herself from the specific socio-cultural period he/she is trapped in. The outlet of the aggression through the addendum, according to Adorno's views, is a mournful critique of the existing situation whereby the subject directs his aggression towards both himself and the wrong target. Accordingly, after hours of hesitation which is interpreted as a sign of self-reflection, the Son of *Red Black and Ignorant* kills his father, and the Son of *Great Peace* kills his sibling.

The two sons, who are considered to be two of the most aggressive and dehumanized characters in *Red Black and Ignorant* and *Great Peace*, display inability to kill two strangers; it is also clear that they cannot refuse the order. Both their cognition and their instincts are manipulated; thus their rationalizations are radically influenced by the state and the army. Conversely, the addendum, Adorno argues, is a purely archaic impulse that cannot be manipulated by external forces. That the sons, instead of killing strangers, should kill members of their own family is expressive of their suffering and the need to expand the suf-

fering into tangible experience in their external reality. Addendum is interpreted as a mournful critique of the existing and a sign of these two characters' suffering. This research considers these two sons as two extremely dehumanized characters who are not aware of their own suffering and who are forced to express their devastation with self-destruction - through the destruction of kin. The moment of the addendum renders this suffering perceivable, both to them and to the audiences of the plays.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., 1951: *Freudian Theory and the Pattern of Fascist propaganda*, in *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, ed. by Arato, A. and Gephardt, E., Continuum, New York, 1982, pp. 118-137.
- Adorno, T. W., 1966: *Negative Dialectics*, transl. by Ashton, E. B., Taylor & Francis, London, 2004.
- Adorno, T. W., 1991: *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. by J. M. Bernstein, Routledge, New York.
- Adorno, T. W., 1997: *Aesthetic Theory*, transl. by R. Hullot-Kentor, ed. by G. Adorno, R. Tiedemann, Continuum, London and New York.
- Adorno, T. W., 2006: *History and Freedom: Lectures 1964-1965*, transl. by R. Livingstone, ed. by R. Tiedemann, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Armstrong, T., 2012: *Biological Tropes in Interwar Poetry*, in Holmes, J. (ed.), *Science in Modern Poetry: New Directions*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.
- Bernstein, J., 2004: *Negative Dialectic as Fate: Adorno and Hegel*, in Huhn, T. (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Adorno*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 19-50.
- Bond, E., 1996: *Letters*, vol. III, ed. by I. Stuart, Routledge, Oxon.
- Bond, E., 1998: *The War Plays*, Methuen Drama, London.
- Bond, E., 2000: *The Hidden Plot: Notes on Theatre and the State*, Methuen Publishing Limited, London.
- Castillo, D. A., 1986: *Dehumanized or Inhuman: Doubles in Edward Bond*, "South Central Review", 3 (2), pp. 78-89.
- Fortin, D. T., 2011: *Architecture and Science-Fiction Film: Philip K. Dick and the Spectacle of Home*, Ashgate Publishing Company, Burlington.
- Freud, S.: 1949: *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, transl. by J. Strachey, The Hogarth Press Ltd, London.
- Freud, S., 1962: *Civilization and its Discontents*, transl. by J. Strachey, Norton & Company, New York.
- Freud, S., 1989: *Instincts and Their Vicissitudes* In *The Freud Reader*, ed. by P. Gay, W.W. Norton and Company, New York, pp. 562-567.
- Gritzner, K., 2015: *Adorno and Modern Theatre: The Drama of the Damaged Self in Bond, Rudkin, Barker and Kane*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Hammer, E., 2006: *Adorno & the Political*, Routledge, New York.
- Held, D., 1980: *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Hellings, J., 2014: *Adorno and Art, Aesthetic Theory Contra Critical Theory*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T.W., 2002: *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical fragments*, transl. by E. Jecott, ed. by G. S. Noerr, Stanford University Press, Redwood City (CA).
- Huhn, T., 2003: *Heidegger, Adorno and Mimesis*, in "Dialogue and Universalism", 13, pp. 1-12.
- Innes, C., 1993: *The Political Spectrum of Edward Bond: From Rationalism to Rhapsody*, in *Contemporary British Drama 1970-90*, ed. by H. Zeifman, C. Zimmerman, The Macmillan Press LTD, London, pp. 81-101.
- Jarvis, S., 1998: *Adorno: A Critical Introduction*, Routledge, New York.
- Kant, I., 1788: *Critique of Practical Reason*, ed. and trans. by M. Gregor, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- Le Bon, G., 2001: *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*, Dover Publications, New York.

- Marcuse, H., 2002: *One-Dimensional Man*, Routledge Classics, New York.
- Rensmann, L., 2017: *The Politics of Unreason*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Rose, G., 1978: *The Melancholy of Science: An Introduction to the Thought of Theodor W. Adorno*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Spencer, J. S., Spencer, J., 1992: *Dramatic Strategies in the Plays of Edward Bond*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Walschots, M., 2011: "Adorno's «Addendum» to Practical Reason", Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 20, <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/20>.
- Whitebook, J., 1995: *Perversion and Utopia: A Study in Psychoanalysis and Critical Theory*, The MIT Press, London.
- Wilson, R., 2007: *Theodor Adorno*, Taylor & Francis, London.
- Witham, B. B., 1998: *English Playwrights and the Bomb*, "International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society", 2, pp. 287-301.
- Zuidervaart, L., 1991: *Adorno's Aesthetic Theory : The Redemption of Illusion Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought*, The MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).