

FREUD'S LAST DEATH

A play in 2 acts

by

David Adams
95 Lyon Street
New Haven, CT, 06511
203-772-6672
david@cpnn-world.org

*

October 18, 2011

(c) David Adams





FREUD'S LAST DEATH

Time: October 12, 1986

Scenes:

1) Hofdi House, an isolated house on the tundra in Iceland which is portrayed as a flat screen or curtain with doors on the house that open. This scene can then be lifted where it serves as a background for the rest of the play. . (Note: in order to make this work, it may be necessary to have two overlapping scenic panoramas, one a distant scene of Hofdi House and the tundra, and the other an up-close view of the front of the house - the latter can be lowered just for the emergence of Reagan, Gorbachev and photographers, and then raised again.)

2) An underground bunker in a secret location in the Soviet Union. There are five parts to the bunker set.

To the left the control room of the Soviet ICBM (Inter-continental ballistic missile) system with control panels, huge television screens, flashing lights and military men quietly sitting and occasionally talking inaudibly or moving in and out of the room. Above the consoles is a huge map of the world with lights in various places, including moving lights for long-range bombers in the air at all times..

In the center, a small communications room with military men again wearing headsets in contact with the Soviet President and his staff.

At the right a vault sealed from the other chambers by an entry section where one must put on special microbe-free spacesuits and communicate with each other by microphones in the headsets so that their voices are muffled. In the center of the vault is a glass sarcophagus, dimly lit, like that of Lenin in his tomb in Red Square, but it is not Lenin. It is Freud! Behind the sarcophagus is a bank of scientific instruments with various colored lights, some flickering, some steady, and the electronic screen of an electroencephalogram showing the activity of brain waves.

Finally, stage right, at the front of the stage, with the sarcophagus room behind, there is a simple table with coffee where the scientists can escape and talk among themselves

Characters:

Presidents Reagan, Gorbachev and photographers - a cameo appearance with no words spoken, just flashbulbs popping

Colonel Dirk Austin of the United States Air Force, special assistant to the President of the United States.

Colonel Anatoly Sokolov of the Soviet Air Forces, in charge of the special Soviet project for disarmament.

Colonel Stanislav Petrov of the Soviet Air Defense Forces, retired, formerly head of the Soviet ICBM force.

Doctor Persikov, in charge of maintenance of embalming

Professor Tamara Roshchina, political psychologist with the Soviet Academy of Sciences

Professor Vladimir Rimsky, neurophysiologist with the Soviet Academy of Sciences

Professor Lester White, anthropologist from a small American university.

Doctor Bonnie Finkelstein, psychoanalyst from New York

Professors Rimsky, Roshchina, Finkelstein and White are friends, having met previously at a UN conference .

Dr Sigmund Freud

The play is in 2 acts with an intermission.

ACT ONE

The front curtain rises, revealing the flat screen or curtain showing Hofdi House with only tundra behind it. At first there is no movement, but then the doors of Hofdi House open and photographers pour out and make a semicircle on the stage facing the doors. Reagan and Gorbachev emerge. The shake hands and talk for a minute inaudibly, Reagan gesturing characteristically. Then they go back inside through the doors and the photographers follow them, leaving the stage empty.

The Hofdi house/tundra set rises revealing the bunker set behind it, but the Hofdi House and tundra do not disappear. Instead, they hover over the bunker set and slowly darken as the spotlight opens on Colonel Austin at center stage, dressed in full military uniform – American.

"Good evening. I am Colonel Dirk Austin, special assistant to President Reagan, and I address you today at a time of extraordinary crisis. We now have over 5,000 ICBMs with nuclear warheads aimed at the Soviet Empire and they have several thousand aimed at us. It will take only a few to destroy the major cities on each side, and if the full arsenals are deployed, it is likely that most if not all life on the planet earth will be extinguished from the consequent radiation. Although it may not be evident to you, I can say with certainty that those of us who are involved are worried. We face the possibility of World War III and the destruction of civilization as we know it. In fact our sources tell us that recently there was an error in the Soviet defense system and it was only the decision of one officer that stopped the launching of the Soviet missile system in response.

At this moment our President Reagan and President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union are meeting in Iceland with the proposal for a treaty to reduce the tension and the number of nuclear weapons deployed. Our hopes go with them.

More than ever before, we need to learn from history. And it seems evident that we should recall a similar time, 54 years ago. It was 1932, Mussolini in Italy and Stalin in Russia ruled by terror and intimidation. Japan had invaded Manchuria. In Germany, the Weimar Republic was on its last legs and Hitler waited in the wings. It was that moment, faced with the menace of fascism and war that Albert Einstein wrote to Sigmund Freud."

The spotlight shifts to Dr Rimsky, dressed in the white coat of a scientific laboratory, who reads the words of Einstein with a strong Russian accent:

Dear Mr. Freud:

The proposal of the League of Nations and its International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation at Paris that I should invite a person, to be chosen by myself, to a frank exchange of views on any problem that I might select affords me a very welcome opportunity of conferring with you upon a question which, as things now are, seems the most insistent of all the problems civilization has to face. This is the problem: Is there any way of

delivering mankind from the menace of war? It is common knowledge that, with the advance of modern science, this issue has come to mean a matter of life and death for Civilization as we know it. . .

Freud is read by Freud himself, with a voice that seems to be generated by a computer as the spotlight shifts to the sarcophagus at the right deep stage in which he is encased.

Dear Mr. Einstein:

. . . the question which you put me--what is to be done to rid mankind of the war menace?--took me by surprise. And, next, I was dumbfounded by the thought of my (of our, I almost wrote) incompetence; for this struck me as being a matter of practical politics, the statesman's proper study . . . But then, I reminded myself that I was not being called on to formulate practical proposals but, rather, to explain how this question of preventing wars strikes a psychologist. . .

Conflicts of interest between man and man are resolved, in principle, by the recourse to violence. . . .

The most casual glance at world history will show an unending series of conflicts between one community and another or a group of others, between large and smaller units, between cities, countries, races, tribes and kingdoms, almost all of which were settled by the ordeal of war. Such war ends either in pillage or in conquest and its fruits, the downfall of the loser . . .

You are amazed that it is so easy to infect men with the war fever, and you surmise that man has in him an active instinct for hatred and destruction, amenable to such stimulations. I entirely agree with you. I believe in the existence of this instinct and have been recently at pains to study its manifestations.

. . We assume that human instincts are of two kinds: those that conserve and unify, which we call "erotic" (in the meaning Plato gives to Eros in his Symposium), or else "sexual" (explicitly extending the popular connotation of "sex"); and, secondly, the instincts to destroy and kill, which we assimilate as the aggressive or destructive instincts. These are, as you

perceive, the well known opposites, Love and Hate. . .

. . . we are led to conclude that this instinct functions in every living being, striving to work its ruin and reduce life to its primal state of inert matter. Indeed, it might well be called the "death instinct". . .

The spotlight fades slowly on the sarcophagus and shifts back to center stage where Colonel Austin intervenes:

Unfortunately, we must interrupt Freud's letter at this point, as he is about to receive some visitors.

The spotlight opens in the anteroom of the sarcophagus room where five people are starting to put on their microbe-free suits that look like spacesuits.

Dr Persikov, is speaking with a Russian accent.

Now you will understand why this mission must never be discussed, and why we have taken such care to maintain its secrecy. There were no more than ten people in the world that know about this room, and now, with the four of you included it is 14. If I am not mistaken, Dr Finkelstein and Dr Roshchina, you are the first women ever to enter this room.

Dr Roshchina,

Apparently this is also the first time any women have entered this bunker. Obviously, war is a man's game and women are not allowed.

Dr Persikov

I assume they told you that under no conditions you may talk about this outside of here. Can you imagine what will happen if others find out and believe they can be preserved and live forever?

Professor White, dressed informally in a sweater and jeans, American.

Excuse me, Dr. Persikov, but how can you expect me to believe that Dr Freud is still alive.

Persikov:

You don't need to believe me. You will see for yourself. But you must prepare yourself for the shock. No one has ever come out of here the same! In fact for that reason, we have allowed very few visitors since the original embalming in 1942. You're an anthropologist. Your business is to seek out and understand the most unexpected aspects of humanity. But this will go beyond anything you can imagine. It will be as if you came upon a lost tribe that is halfway between human and ape, or that you have encountered . . .

Dr Roshchina:

I must say that I don't believe I am doing this. I feel like I have been invited here by Woland of Master and Margarita. . .

Dr Finkelstein, dressed in an over-sized, off-pink pant suit:

As far as I know, Freud died in London, in 1939.

Persikov:

It is best that everyone should continue to believe this, as it will enable us to keep the secret. But in fact, he was kidnapped and brought here in 1939 and did not die for another two years. It was at that time that Professor Abrikosov was ready to conduct his experiment for direct thought control of a microphone. Little did he realize that this could be continued after the body was formally dead and embalmed.

Finkelstein:

And if what you say is true, how can you be sure that we will not betray

the secret?

Persikov:

We have to take that risk. But you will meet Colonel Petrov this afternoon and I think he will convince you that it is a risk that we must take. If there is truly a death instinct, as Freud has said, then we must take this into account.

Persikov helps them adjust the helmets of their anti-microbe suits and opens the heavy vault door, inviting them into the room with the sarcophagus. Lights go off elsewhere on the stage but the spot on the sarcophagus remains dim as the four scientists gather around it.

Persikov speaks, his voice heavily muffled as he speaks via the microphone in the helmet of his anti-microbe suit:

Please do not touch anything. As you can imagine, the apparatus is quite delicate and requires very exact calibration.

In fact, behind the head of the cadaver we see the bank of scientific instruments, the electronic screen showing functioning brain waves. Persikov picks up a special microphone and begins speaking into it.

Good morning, Dr Freud. This is Persikov.

There is a pause of perhaps 10 seconds, during which time Rimsky is looking intently at the complex electronic apparatus behind the head of the cadaver, and Persikov is watching him intently, as if afraid he may touch something. Then the response comes, the voice of Freud as if produced by a computer. As the words emerge, the line of the electroencephalogram behind the sarcophagus changes its rhythm in coordination with the words.

Good morning, Persikov.

Persikov:

This is a special day, Dr Freud. You have visitors, four in fact.

Freud:

Indeed, this is a surprise. I hope it is a pleasant one.

Persikov:

I hope you will find it pleasant, but I have to tell you we have come here to make you work.

Freud:

What do you mean?

Persikov:

The world has once again fallen into a catastrophic situation, a matter of life and death for civilization as we know it, even worse than when Einstein wrote to you in 1932. Although we no longer have Einstein with us, the scientists I have brought to meet you are deeply involved in this question and need to have your advice. But let me explain the situation to you. I believe you know that the Great World War that began in 1939 was ended by the use of the most terrible weapon ever invented, the atomic bomb, the bomb that was imagined by Einstein at the time when you corresponded. One bomb destroyed the entire city of Hiroshima, Japan, killing hundreds of thousands of people with the most horrible death imaginable, by burning and by radiation poisoning. Now there are thousands of bombs mounted on rockets, aimed by the Americans against us, and by us against the Americans. They are set to go off with only five minutes after detecting incoming missiles by radar, and if that should happen we will likely destroy most life on the planet. Recently, we had a computer error that ordered our rockets to be fired, and it was only the refusal of one person, Colonel Petrov, who stopped it.

Freud:

In fact, as you say, the situation is much worse now than in 1932! Despite my habitual pessimism, I am surprised that the world has degenerated to such a point.

Persikov:

You will understand why we have established a special task force at the level of the President to make a disarmament agreement with the Americans. In fact, at this very moment, our President Mikhail Gorbachev is meeting with the American President Reagan, and we have carefully prepared very reasonable proposals for their meeting.

Freud:

And what do you expect of me?

Persikov:

We must know if there is a death instinct. You must help us with this question.

Freud:

I see. And what is the interest of this to your special task force?

Persikov:

First of all, we are not fully confident that the American President will agree to our disarmament proposal, or that his advisers will support them. In fact, we are convinced that it is finally a question of psychology. We need to understand if they are driven by the death instinct of which you have spoken., and if so, how to overcome it. And more generally, can we achieve peace, or are we doomed eventually to destroy ourselves?

Our task force has made contact with scientists in the United States, and

together with one of our own best scientists, we have come here today to seek your advice. Please know that your advice as a scientist is as respected as much as ever, and perhaps even more so as the years go on.

Freud:

I fear you will be disappointed by my advice, as I have had no reason to change the pessimism that I had fifty years ago, even though ... the assumption of the existence of a death instinct or a destruction instinct has always roused opposition even in psychoanalytic circles. However, I am pleased to meet the visitors and speak with them. Perhaps they will inform me more than I can inform them. Who are these visitors?

Persikov:

They are Professors Vladimir Rimsky and Tamara Roshchina of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Professor Lester White, anthropologist from Podunk University in the United States, and Doctor Bonnie Finkelstein, psychoanalyst from New York. They come to us with a very special background, as they were part of an international team of scientists that met earlier this year in Seville, Spain, to consider whether war is part of human nature. But I will let them introduce themselves to you.

Pause, as no one starts to speak.

Profesor White and Dr Finkelstein start speaking at once, and stop together, each saying excuse me and signaling the other to begin.

Finkelstein:

Dr Freud, it is a great honor to speak with you. I am Dr. Bonnie Finkelstein. I am a psychoanalyst, trained at the New York Institute as much in your tradition as possible. I celebrated 20 years of private practice last year, and I continue to be amazed that there is so much we do not yet understand. And frankly this meeting today is the most dramatic. I must say that I never dreamed I would have this opportunity, and it leaves me rather breathless.

Freud:

It is my pleasure. Perhaps you will bring me some news of the present state of psychoanalysis.

Finkelstein:

I hope that we will have the time for this, as I would like very much to have your opinion about some of the recent trends. For the moment, however, I think I should yield to my other colleagues who are also looking forward to our conversation.

White:

Good morning, Dr Freud. I am Professor Tamara Roshchina of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Freud:

Good morning Herr Professor Roshchina..

White:

I have many questions to ask you, but I think I must wait and coordinate the questions with my colleagues here. Let me introduce the other two members of our group, Professors Lester White from the United States and Professor Vladimir Rimsky of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Professor White is a cultural anthropologist, and Professor Rimsky is neurophysiologist which will probably be of great interest to you since neurophysiology was your original training as well.

Freud:

Yes, as you probably know, I have always believed that our understanding of the human psyche should be based on a solid grounding in neurophysiology. There is nothing that happens without the work of the

nervous system. I suppose that you share that view.

Rimsky:

Yes, I agree with you, but I must say that I have seen many things in my laboratory that I cannot yet explain by the action of nerve cells.

Freud:

At least you are working in the laboratory. . .

Persikov:

Gentlemen, I propose that we give Dr Freud a rest, and confer among ourselves for a time.

As the four visitors start to leave the room, one hears from Freud, always in his computer-generated voice:

I look forward to speaking with you later.

The spotlight shifts to the radio room where Colonel Austin is speaking with Colonel Sokolov. His accent is distinctly American, perhaps from Texas.

Are you optimistic that there will be good results from the meeting?

Colonel Sokolov, his accent heavily Russian, but with a Southern accent, as if from the Caucasus region.

At least there is a chance since they are meeting without military advisers. At the Geneva meeting last year, your Pentagon and CIA advisers made sure there could be no progress. And at least we don't have to worry about security in Iceland.

Austin:

Security has always been a problem.

Sokolov:

Yes, especially for our initial plan. Our idea was to have them meet in Chernobyl, so they could know firsthand the meaning of a nuclear catastrophe. We thought it would help motivate them to reach some good results.

Austin:

So, you were worried about the security from the radiation that is still out of control in Chernobyl?

Sokolov:

No. The radioactivity problem we could handle. It's more serious than that. The last time one of your Presidents went against the will of the CIA, it was JFK and you know what happened to him. We could not be sure that the Chechen terrorists, who are well-armed and coached by your CIA, would not penetrate into the Chernobyl region. Just imagine the consequences of a repeat of the JFK assassination, but in our country, and carried out by Chechen terrorists instead of Cuban exiles!

Austin:

I see what you mean! So, they are meeting in Iceland instead. Have you made contact now with your team of psychologists that is with Gorbachev?

Professor Roshchina joins them.

Sokolov:

Colonel Austin was just asking about the news from Reykjavik.

Roshchina:

I spoke earlier with my colleague Dr. Denisov..

Austin:

What does he say?

Roshchina:

He says that President Reagan is difficult to understand. He does not seem like other political men.

Colonel Austin laughs:

No, he was a Hollywood actor. You never know what he is going to say.

Professor Roshchina:

That is a problem for us. Frankly, another disappointment for us is the fact that Nancy Reagan did not accompany her husband on this trip, since she has a more independent mind and is not afraid to give her opinions to the President. In fact, we have inside information that she is against the concept of mutual deterrence.

The light fades in the radio room and the spot briefly illuminates the control room. The voices from the control room are not audible, but business seems to be as usual.

Again the light fades and focuses instead on the table at stage right with the sarcophagus in the background. The scientists, except for Professor Roshchina, are having coffee.

Persikov:

What do you think?

Professor White:

I suppose it is a trick, I have to say that you have done it extremely well. I have the feeling that we are really speaking with Dr Freud.

Persikov:

And if it is a trick, what then?

Professor White:

I suppose it makes little difference in the end. What is important is Reykjavik and whether we can make a contribution to the peace process, and if this trick can help us, so much the better.

Dr Finkelstein:

I agree with you, and whether this is true or not, it reconnects me to certain parts of my life that have been turning points. I don't know if you are aware of this, but Anna Freud was one of my teachers.

Persikov:

And as for you, Professor Rimsky?

Rimsky laughs lightly:

You know, a good scientist must always be open to new discoveries and they come in disguise. You don't understand them at first, but in fact if it is a true discovery, the more you look at it, the more you do not understand.

In any case, we have a job to do. Whether or not this trick can help us, we are obliged to make a report on the death instinct, and the deadline is this evening. Since we have so little time, I think we should get started.

It is Professor White's turn to laugh:

Rimsky, you are a hard task-master. I feel sorry for the people in your laboratory. You probably make them work on weekends and holidays. I remember how you made us work in Seville. We didn't get a chance to sleep for two nights!

Rimsky:

And did we get results?

White laughs again:

What do you think, Finkelstein. Did we get results?

Finkelstein nods her approval.

Judging by the great effect that the Seville Statement is having, I have to say it was quite remarkable!

White:

Can we take a break for a few minutes?

The Group disperses and the spotlight follows White to far left stage where he meets Roshchina.

White:

I have looked forward to seeing you, Tamara. Would it be fair for me to ask how is your family?

Roshchina:

They are OK, but its probably best not to talk about that. It is enough to say that I think about you all the time, even when I am with them. But we cannot go back to Seville. It can only be a special moment in our

memories.

White:

I understand. But also, I cannot forget you.

Roshchina:

Tell me instead what you have been doing.

White:

Since Seville I have been working day and night, more inspired than every before, and I have completed a draft of the history of the culture of war. Can I send it to you.

Roshchina:

Yes, I will be happy to read it and tell you what I think. You can send it to the address I gave you for my sister in Moscow.

White:

That is the good news. But the bad news that my anthropologist friends are not interested. They say that the time is past for such big ideas. I try talking to people in other academic disciplines as well, and what I see is a terrible crisis. Just when we need new thinking, it seems that all of our intellectuals are retreating in to a kind of mediocrity. At least in your case you are working with your political leaders, so there is a chance of having some effect.

Roshchina:

Yes, but I have to say that this also can be very frustrating. You know what they should do, but you have no power to make them do it. But at least there is some talk of new thinking.

Rimsky finds them:

We are waiting for you to go in again to see Freud.

Roshchina:

I'll join you in just a moment. I have to check back with our radio contact in Reykjavik.

The spot follows Rimsky and White as they rejoin Finkelstein and Persikov at the table.

Persikov:

I suggest we begin with only one or two questions. We should not strain Dr Freud for long intervals as we have no idea what are the limit of his nervous system.

White:

So what are our most pressing questions?

Finkelstein:

Obviously, we should ask him about the death instinct and its relation to war?

Rimsky:

Before that, however, I think we should share the Seville Statement with him and get his reaction.

Finkelstein and White:

OK.

We could pose it this way: "What is the scientific evidence for a death

instinct?"

White:

Very good. And then I think we should add, "What is its relation to war?"

They all nod agreement and stand up to go back to work. At this point, Professor Roshchina rejoins them.

White:

What is the news from Reykjavik?

Roshchina:

It is quite unbelievable! As you know, we set up this meeting to be a personal conversation between the two men, with a minimum of advisers. In this way, we are trying to eliminate the influence of your military-industrial complex. President Gorbachev is presenting a radical plan to cut the nuclear weapons stockpiles by 50%. And we thought it was too radical. But, believe it or not, your President Reagan has proposed cutting out ALL nuclear weapons. Apparently, he is acting on his own, because our military advisors assure us that their American counterparts will never agree to this.

White:

Of course!

Roshchina:

But that is not the only problem. It seems that Reagan actually believes in the idea of Star Wars, that there can be a fool-proof missile shield, and that is the basis for his proposal. It is a crazy idea but hopefully we can get him to compromise on it!

White:

Yes, he can be crazy! Gorbachev will need all the help he can get from your team of psychologists!

Persikov:

Dr. Freud is awaiting us...

The spotlight fades and focuses instead on the corpse in the sarcophagus while we dimly watch the five scientists put on their microbe-free spacesuits. The electroencephalogram shows the large slow waves characteristic of deep sleep. In the background now we hear the sounds from the radio room and the missile control room, sounds of machines, radios, inaudible voices.

The five scientists enter the room with the sarcophagus, one at a time, led by Dr. Persikov who first addresses the corpse of Freud:

Dr Freud. I hope you had a good rest as we have come back to you with some questions. You will recall I am accompanied by Doctors Rimsky, Finkelstein , Roshchina and White.

Freud:

I have looked forward to your return, as I have questions for you as well.

Rimsky:

First of all we would like to share with you the Declaration on Violence, on which we worked earlier this year in Seville, Spain, along with another dozen scientists from around the world. And we will appreciate your candid thoughts about it. Dr White will present our conclusions.

White:

I hope you will forgive me for being very brief and leaving out many of the

scientific details, since we have so little time.

Freud:

Yes, please proceed.

White:

Is war part of human nature or is it a cultural invention? We must answer this question if we are to abolish war. Therefore, we examined this question with leading specialists in animal behavior, psychology, genetics, neurophysiology and anthropology. After carefully considering all the data, we concluded that there is no scientific evidence that war was inherited from our animal ancestry or that there is any instinct, genetic code or brain mechanisms for war. We concluded that war is a cultural invention, and to use the words of my great colleague Margaret Mead, "the same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace."

Roshchina:

Unfortunately, in our work, we overlooked the question a death instinct, and where it might be a factor in war. That's why we have come to you. In your opinion, what is the best evidence for a death instinct, and is it a cause of war?

Freud:

I am not sure what is the best evidence, but perhaps the most obvious is the manifestation of the destructive instinct in sadism and masochism. We have long known that sadism represents a particularly strong mixture of the instinct of destruction and the love impulse; while its counterpart, masochism, would be an alliance between sexuality and destruction at work within the self.

But perhaps the strongest evidence is the phenomenon of suicide. There are some neurotics in whom, to judge by all their reactions, the instinct of self-preservation has actually been reversed. They seem to have nothing in view but

self-injury and self-destruction. . . . It must be supposed that in such people far-reaching changes have taken place, as a result of which there have been set free excessive quantities of the destructive instinct directed inwards.

Suicide often comes at the end of a severe case of melancholia, where the excessively strong super-ego which has obtained a hold upon consciousness rages against the ego with merciless violence, as if it had taken possession of the whole of sadism available in the person concerned. What is holding sway in the super-ego is, as it were, a pure culture of the death instinct, *which* succeeds in driving the ego into death, The ego sees itself deserted by all protecting forces and lets itself die.

Rinsky:

I thank you for this most thoughtful answer. But what is the relation of this to war?

Freud:

Before dealing with this, let me ask you a question. Have you made advances in the understanding and treatment of sadism, masochism and suicide, and has new scientific knowledge become available in the years since I was dealing with them? For example, I have always hoped it would be possible to explain suicide in terms of the effects of particular chemical substances upon the amount of energy and their distribution in the apparatus of the mind.

Finkelstein:

I have to admit that we psychoanalysts are still dealing with these phenomena in the same way as you were doing, and we have found no great breakthrough in terms of neurochemistry.

Rinsky:

This is a question that has occupied my laboratory in Moscow for many years. We have established an animal model for what you have called the

death instinct, using tree shrews or wild rats. If one of them is left in a cage with another that has defeated it in a fight, it is often the case that the animal will die and we can find no cause of death by autopsy. It is as if, to use your words, that the animal sees itself deserted by all protecting forces and lets itself die. But we have searched in vain for the physiological mechanism that can explain this occurrence. Frankly, I am no longer expecting to find a death instinct or death center, but looking at the problem in the opposite way. Instead, we are trying to identify a life instinct or life center which must be maintained, or else the animal will die. In fact, it will let itself die.

But let us come back to our most important question. What is the relationship between this death instinct, if we can assume that it exists, and the human phenomenon of war?

Freud:

The relation is not a simple one. Thus, when a nation is summoned to engage in war, a whole gamut of human motives may respond to this appeal--high and low motives, some openly admitted, others hidden. The lust for aggression and destruction, which I have sometimes called the death instinct, is certainly included; the innumerable cruelties of history and man's daily life confirm its prevalence and strength.

The question of war can be seen in the context of an even broader view of the evolution of culture. Aggression, as an innate, independent, instinctual disposition in man constitutes the most powerful obstacle to culture. The natural instinct of aggressiveness in man, the hostility of each one against all and of all against each other, opposes the program of civilization. This instinct of aggression is the derivative and main representative of the death instinct we have found alongside of Eros.

The meaning of the evolution of culture is no longer a riddle to us. It must present to us the struggle between Eros and Death, between the instincts of life and the instincts of destruction, as it works itself out in the human species. This struggle is what all life essentially consists of and so the evolution of civilization may be simply described as the struggle of the human species for existence.

White:

I am pleased, Dr Freud, that you have responded to our question by putting it in the context of the evolution of culture instead of biological evolution. This was our conclusion in Seville. In fact, my colleagues and I have been engaged in the study of the evolution of the culture of war, beginning in prehistory and continuing to the present day. As an alternative, we have begun to work on the development of a culture of peace that can replace it.

Freud:

I am pleased to hear this, no less because it was the conclusion of my response to Professor Einstein many years ago that whatever makes for cultural development is working also against war.

Persikov:

I think that we should allow you to rest, Dr Freud, and if you do no object we will return to see you later this morning.

Freud:

I will look forward to it.

As the spotlight dims on the sarcophagus room, it brightens in the room with control panels. Colonel Sokolov is dressed in full military uniform with medals across his chest. He is greeting Colonel Petrov who is dressed in a shabby suit and is not even well-shaved. Colonel Petrov is escorted in by another military man who then turns and exits.

Colonel Sokolov:

Zdrasvuitya, Thank you for coming today, Colonel Petrov.

Colonel Petrov:

Thank you. It's very pleasant for me to be able to get out.

Colonel Sokolov:

We have a high-level delegation from the United States with us today, and I would like you to meet with them. But first I will introduce you to Colonel Austin from the United States military.

The spot fades on the control room and opens stage right where three of the scientists are sitting with Persikov.

Persikov:

What do you think?

Finkelstein:

It seems to me that he supported our conclusions in Seville. But I must say that I was surprised not so much by what he said as by what you said, Rimsky. It seemed at first that you agreed with the idea of a death instinct, despite your insistence on the scientific method.

Rimsky:

Yes and no. For me the scientific method requires keeping an open mind. We should be open to the possibility that there is a death instinct, and we should continue investigating the question.

Finkelstein:

And I was also surprised by the extent to which you are investigating psychoanalytic concepts in your laboratory. Do you think we can find a basis in physiology for all these questions.

Rimsky:

When I first started my work as a scientist, I would have said yes. But now, I must say no. Science can study only what we can be repeated many

times. Science cannot understand rare events. But I have come to understand that it is often the rare event that is most important. Death is one such event. And now war. If we make the experiment of a nuclear war, we may never be able to understand it because it cannot be repeated.

Back to your question about the death instinct, I am doubtful about it, as I said, and I prefer to concentrate our scientific work on the search for a life instinct. We had no time to go into the question with Freud, and perhaps we can find the time later, to ask him to go into detail about what he means that the ego can just give up and let itself die.

Finkelstein:

We often see how elderly couples die one after the other, as if they simply give up living. My surgeon friends tell me that the most important factor in recovery is the patient's will to live.

White:

It all comes down to the question: Is there a collective will to live in the world? Or is possible that we could all simply give up and allow the world to be destroyed? We must agree with Freud that finally we are witnessing "the struggle of the human species for existence" Our two Presidents hold the future of our species in their hands. We must hope that they do not waste this opportunity.

The spotlight shifts slowly to the control panel room, where Colonels Sokolov and Petrov from the Soviet Union have now been joined by Colonel Austin from the USA, as well as Roshchina.

Colonel Austin:

I am very pleased to finally meet you, Colonel Petrov. I have to say that you have become something of a mythical hero to the men with whom I work. It is said that if you had not had the courage to refuse to launch your missiles, none of us would be alive today, and perhaps there would be no world at all.

Colonel Petrov:

Frankly, I do not consider myself a hero. I was simply doing my job, as I saw best.

Austin:

Yes, I understand. We are all doing our job, but if we do not think about what it means, there can be terrible consequences.

Persikov approaches them and addresses Roshchina:

Are you ready to come back in with us?

They rejoin Rimsky, White and Finkelstein, and Rimsky says:

We have been discussing our conversation with Doctor Freud and we think we should simply ask him "what is to be done?"

The scientists start going back together to the chamber where they must dress to enter the sarcophagus room. On the way, Rimsky addresses Persikov.

Do you mind if I look more closely at the machine you are using to contact the brain of the cadaver?

Persikov replies, visibly upset by the question:

No. This is not possible. I have to ask you please to keep your distance from the apparatus.

The spotlight shifts to stage left where Colonels Sokolov and Austin are speaking privately.

Sokolov:

I am shocked that you should consider Colonel Petrov a hero. Do you realize that he disobeyed orders?

Austin:

Yes, but if he had followed orders, we would not be here today. In fact, the whole world might not be.

Sokolov:

That's not true.

Austin:

What do you mean? If he had pushed the button, it would have launched a nuclear war.

Sokolov:

No. He did not have to push the button. He had other options. But when the alarm sounded, he panicked and did not follow proper procedures. If he had done so, he would have seen that there was a computer error. A good soldier remains calm in the face of battle, does not panic and follows procedures.

Austin:

I served two tours of duty in Vietnam, and I followed procedures. But last year I went back to visit Saigon and Hanoi and meet with people there. I saw the results of the procedures we followed, and I can no longer justify them. Do you realize that there are no songbirds in Vietnam any more. We killed them all with Agent Orange. Not to mention the terrible consequences for the people there, and our own soldiers as well.

Austin pauses, and then adds:

Can you justify what you are doing now in Afghanistan?

Sokolov:

Afghanistan is a mistake, but the mistake was not the fault of our military. It was a political decision, made against our advice. Our government is marching us towards disaster with its aid to other countries and failure to build socialism here at home. But we have no choice in the military. Contrary to your propaganda, we are a democracy, and we are under civilian control. We have no choice but to carry out the political decisions of the government.

Austin:

And now you are paying the price.

Sokolov:

Yes, in many ways. It is the first time in our history that we are not honored as veterans. Instead we are being blamed for the defeat in Afghanistan. No one wants to admit that it is just the first step in an even greater disaster.

Austin:

This happened with us in Vietnam. When we came home, we were ignored or even treated like dirt. It was very hard. Some of my comrades killed themselves or their wives or they now live in the VA mental hospitals as a result. In any case, we can no longer afford to make such mistakes. There is too much power in our hands.

Slowly the spot fades on the control room, leaving Austin's words in the air, and shifts to the sarcophagus room where the scientists are entering. The electroencephalogram of the apparatus behind the corpse shows steady slow waves.

Persikov:

Can you hear us Herr Professor Freud?

There is a long pause, and then Freud responds:

Yes, the sound is very clear today.

Persikov:

If you don't mind, we would like to resume our questioning of you.

Freud:

Yes, if you do not mind my asking questions as well.

Persikov:

Very well. Would you like to begin, Professor Rimsky?

Rimsky:

Dr. Freud, we would like your opinion about what can we do to counteract the death instinct and abolish war?

Freud:

I have been expecting this question, but my answer may surprise you.

Paradoxically, the solution may lie in the use of the destructive instinct. In the evolution of the individual, what happens to render the child's instincts for aggression? Something very curious, that we should never have guessed and that yet seems simple enough. The aggressiveness is introjected, 'internalized'; in fact, it is sent back where it came from, i.e. directed against the ego. It is there taken over by a part of the ego that distinguishes itself from the rest as a super-ego, and now, in the form of 'conscience', it exercises the same harsh aggressiveness against the ego that

the ego would have liked to enjoy against others. The tension between the strict super-ego and the subordinate ego is what we usually call the sense of guilt; it manifests itself as the need for punishment.

Now, we can make an analogy between the process of cultural evolution and the path of individual development. It can be maintained that the community, too, develops a super-ego, under whose influence cultural evolution proceeds. The super-ego of any given epoch of civilization originates in the same way as that of an individual; it is based on the impression left behind them by great leading personalities, men of outstanding force of mind, or men in whom some one human tendency has developed in unusual strength and purity.

Roshchina:

In fact that is the basis of our hopes for the meeting in Reykjavik today. Our President Gorbachev is an extraordinary leader, and we are hoping that he can inspire the American President to match his leadership at this crucial moment of history. We have arranged for them to meet without their military advisers, so there is some chance they could reach a personal agreement.

Freud:

It is certainly a good idea for them to have a personal meeting,, but I would worry about what happens after they make an agreement. No agreement is useful if it cannot be put it into practice.

Indeed, men have always been divided into the leaders and the led. But the kind of leadership you are seeking is not encouraged by the competing politicians and the masses of the people. Instead of being recognized, those whom we may consider the most promising leaders are more likely to be rejected by the masses, at least during their lifetimes. Often enough, if not always, such persons are ridiculed, ill-used, or even tortured and killed. The most striking example is the figure of Jesus Christ, if we can believe that such a person actually lived.

Roshchina:

In fact, we have exactly these concerns. Since Reagan's disarmament offer is opposed by his own military advisers, it will be difficult for him to put them into practice. The military controls the mass media in America and they have the ability to turn the masses of the American people against his proposals.

Freud:

What you are describing is a fascinating case. It would seem that the two Presidents are expressing their personal life instincts, while their advisers are caught up in the death instinct.

But if you allow me, I should like to pose some questions to you.

Roshchina:

We are at your service.

Freud:

First of all, I should like to know the present opinion about the life and death instincts.

Finkelstein:

Unfortunately, Dr Freud, with the exception of your own daughter, Anna, there are very few psychoanalysts who take seriously the question of the death instinct or to do any work on it.

Freud:

I was afraid that might happen. So, in that light, I should like to rephrase my question. What is the present state of scientific opinion concerning the division of the ego and superego.

Finkelstein:

You will be pleased to know that this distinction is now generally accepted, not only by the psychoanalytic specialists like me, but by the scientific community and the general public as well, even if it is not always well understood.

Rimsky:

You will be further pleased at experiments being undertaken now in the Vygotsky laboratory here in Moscow. I think you must of known about Vygotsky during the 1930's. In my opinion he was our greatest psychologist. He clearly demonstrated how thinking originates from the introjection of speech in early childhood. At first the child speaks out loud to himself, imitating his parents. Then he speaks to himself quietly. Then the speech becomes inaudible although we can still see the movements of the musculature. And finally the motor movements are completely suppressed while the brain pathways continue to operate in the form of thinking.

Freud:

I never had the pleasure to meet Vygotsky, but I was very impressed by his research findings at the time, and I always believed that they could be applied to the origin of the super-ego.

Rimsky:

Indeed, that is what is being done by his students today. I have seen films from their laboratory that show us clearly how the super-ego develops. One can see a small child of 4-5 years old who is about to strike another child who has taken away his toy. But at the moment that the right arm goes up to launch the strike, the head and eyes are turned to the right as the child looks back over his shoulder to see if an adult is watching and may stop the child from hitting his opponent. In the course of development, as in the case of thinking, the original actions are suppressed, but the brain pathways are retained. We may say that the brain pathways of the super-

ego correspond to those of neck and eye movements involved in looking over the shoulder.

Freud:

Have these discoveries led to new advances in psychotherapy?

Finkelstein:

Yes, it is now possible to use the analysis of eye movements to aid the process of therapy. This, of course, confirms your expectations. And you will be even more pleased, I believe, to know that we have confirmed the important role of the destructive instinct in the development, not only of the super-ego of the individual, but also the super-ego of the community.

Freud:

I find this confirmation particularly important!

Finkelstein:

Indeed. Studies of the consciousness development of peace activists, including winners of the Nobel Peace Prize, show that their peace activity first started as a result of their anger. Their anger against injustice became so strong that they could no longer remain silent. They were forced by the strength of their anger to take action against the injustice, and this launched their careers.

White:

This is ironic, because one usually thinks that soldiers are motivated by anger, rather than peace activists.

Finkelstein:

In fact, soldiers are not usually motivated by anger. Instead they are trained to follow orders without emotion. The dominant emotion is fear,

and this must be overcome if a soldier is to carry out his orders.

White:

Dr Freud. It would appear that modern science has confirmed most of your findings. But that is not our major concern. What we need, most of all, is your advice for our basic question: what is to be done for the abolition of war?

Freud:

I fear that I can only disappoint you in this regard. If we carry our analysis forward, assuming that the evolution of civilization has such a far-reaching similarity with the development of an individual, and if the same methods are employed in both, we are led to the conclusion that many systems of civilization – or epochs of it – possibly even the whole of humanity – have become 'neurotic?'

I suppose that this conclusion is not of much help to you. Although we may acknowledge the pathology of civilized communities, and we may wish to apply our therapeutic knowledge to society as a whole, this would seem to be impossible, since no one possesses power to compel the community to adopt the therapy. If the patient does not wish the therapy to be successful, there is no chance of success.

We come back to the case of suicidal patients where the instinct of self-preservation has been overcome by the destructive instinct turned inward. Such patients cannot tolerate the possibility of being cured by our treatment and fight against it with all their force.

No one responds, and Freud once again speaks:

Your silence suggests that I have disappointed you. Unfortunately, I sincerely regret that I cannot be of any further encouragement to you.

Again, no one speaks. Then Persikov says:

Thank you, Dr Freud. We will study your analysis, and I am sure it will be of great use in our task.

The scientists file slowly out of the room as the spotlight fades. One can dimly see them removing their anti-microbe suits and coming forward on the stage as the spotlight slowly illuminates the table where they are going to sit.

As they arrive at the table, Professor Roshchina is summoned to the radio room:

Roshchina:

My colleague, Dr Denisov, has called on the radio from Reykjavik, and so, if you will excuse me, I will learn what is happening.

After he leaves, Professor Rimsky is the first to speak.

Where are we?

Rimsky:

Unfortunately, we are back where we started. What is the use of developing men and women with leadership capacities, if they cannot put their ideas into practice because the society is not willing to follow their lead. ... what is the use of a therapeutic treatment if the patient wishes to die.

Finkelstein:

We return once again to the question: "is there a collective will to live in the world?"

Rimsky:

In some ways, I regret that Freud's theories are confirmed by our modern

science. I wish I could say that he was mistaken about the existence of a death instinct, but I am not so sure of this.

White:

In my opinion, it is a mistake to be guided by Freud's theories. It will be better to ignore them altogether and start from where we left off in Seville. What we need now is to analyze the culture of war and invent a culture of peace.

Colonel Austin had entered behind the group, listening to them:

I am sorry to interrupt your most interesting discussion, but we have been informed that Colonel Petrov has arrived and is waiting to meet with us in the control room. As you know, Colonel Petrov was the one who refused to push the button to fire the Soviet missile system when the computers told him that he had only a few minutes before incoming American missiles would destroy them. He was asked to come and speak with us in order to emphasize the seriousness of the task before us. Before we speak with him, however, I must warn you that he is under house arrest, because the Soviet government does not want to publicly discuss this episode. If we speak about it publicly after our return to the States, they will issue a formal denial.

White, visibly angered:

This is outrageous. The man is a hero, not a criminal! How can we accept this?

Persikov:

We should not keep him waiting.

Slowly the scientists rise from the table and follow Colonel Austin into the darkness. The spotlight shifts and illuminates the control room where they are headed.

Colonel Petrov is seated in front of a console, with Colonel Austin behind him. The console is oriented so that its back is turned partly toward the audience, and so that the audience can see the faces of those seated in front of it.

Three of the scientists, along with Colonel Sokolov, join Petrov and Austin in front of the console. In addition to Colonel Petrov who is seated, there are now five people standing in a semi-circle behind him and the console, all of them visible to the audience. Persikov and Roshchina are not among them.

Colonel Sokolov:

Thank you for coming today, Colonel Petrov. I'd like to introduce you to our visitors from the United States, in addition to Colonel Austin whom you have already met. This is Professor Lester White.

Petrov:

Very pleasant to meet you, Professor.

White:

It is a pleasure to meet you as well. Thank you for coming.

Colonel Sokolov:

And this is Doctor Bonnie Finkelstein.

Petrov:

Very pleasant.

Sokolov:

And this is Professor Rimsky, our colleague from the Academy of

Sciences.

Rimsky:

Zdrasvytya!

Sokolov:

Our scientific colleagues are preparing a report on the possibilities of peace, in the light of psychological principles. They were among the authors of a very important scientific document published earlier this year under the auspices of the United Nations that came to the conclusion that war is a cultural rather than biological behavior, and therefore peace is possible. We have invited you to join us in order to underline the great urgency of this project.

Petrov:

I suppose you would like to me explain what happened on September 26, 1983?

Sokolov:

I think it would be very useful to us.

Petrov:

It was after midnight, turning from September 25 to 26. I remember the date especially because the next day would be the birthday of my youngest daughter, and I was worried about whether she would like the present that we had bought for her.

As you see, *[the audience cannot see as they are behind the console]* there is a computerized map of the United States on the screen here showing all US missile bases as seen from our spy satellites. They can detect missile launches from the heat that they produce. Suddenly the base here *[he points to the console]* lit up brightly to indicate missile launchings, and

then there were lights here and here [*he points elsewhere*] to show more missiles being launched.

We have an alarm system that is triggered in this case, and it started to go off with flashing lights and alarms that sounded like terrible cries in the night!

I felt like someone had punched me in the groin!

The button for retaliation was there, [*he points to an area on the console*] and because of the alarm system, it was activated. All I had to do was to push it and it would launch a full-scale attack that would have destroyed your country completely, with unpredictable effects on the rest of the world. I tried to call on the hot line, but it was not working. I knew had only four minutes left to make the decision. In my left hand was the telephone, and my right hand was within reach of the launch button.

The minutes went by. Still no response on the hotline. I kept looking over here at the surface radar, waiting for it to pick up the missiles as they entered our territory. I waited. I waited past the four minutes. Now, if the missiles were picked up by the radar it would be too late for us to launch. It would all be over....

The spot dims slowly on the control room, leaving the last words of Petrov hanging in the air. Then slowly it brightens on the front of the stage where Colonels Austin and Sokolov have walked away together.

Sokolov:

My friend, we have just received bad news! Roshchina has just spoken with her psychologist colleague in Reykjavik, and it seems there will be no agreement. Reagan insists that any agreement must be based on the successful development of a Star Wars missile shield, and we know that this is ridiculous. It would simply increase the arms race because we will have to deploy more missiles to overcome the shield.

The curtain falls on Act One.

ACT TWO

The curtain opens revealing Dr. Roschina and Colonel Sokolov stage right, speaking privately.

Sokolov:

Captain Roshchina, I know that you have military training, so I would like to speak with you as one officer to another. I know you are working with the new GenSec. But how can you support his policies of glasnost and perestroika when you know they will destroy us more effectively than any enemy missiles?

Roshchina:

Perhaps you are right, but my concerns go beyond our country. I am worried about the entire planet. Since Yuri Gagarin saw the planet from space, we have come to realize how fragile it is. That is why I left the military and went back to study psychology.

Sokolov:

I fear it will take more than psychology to save us from Gorbachev's policies! We can't save all the peoples of Africa and Asia and the people in Central Europe that don't appreciate us anyway. Instead, if we are to survive, we must build socialism here at home.

Roshchina:

And what, I should like to ask you, can save us from the nuclear arms race?

Sokolov does not respond and Roshchina continues:

Colonel Sokolov, you must understand that I am not against our country or socialism. But we cannot build socialism without peace.

The spotlight shifts to Colonel Austin and Professor White stage left, speaking privately.

Austin:

Professor White, I have wanted to speak with you about what you called the culture of war and the culture of peace.

White:

Yes, I think you must know well the culture of war.

Austin:

I'm a veteran of Vietnam.

White:

Then you know very well.

Austin:

Yes. I went back last year to Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City and met with people there. You know, there are still no songbirds in Vietnam because they were all killed with Agent Orange.

White:

Not to mention the effects on the people.

Austin:

And our own men as well.

White:

I call it the culture of death.

Austin:

I know what you mean.

White:

But, of course, this culture is not new. It goes back before the dawn of civilization.

Austin:

But can we escape it?

White:

That is our greatest question. Can we strengthen the culture of life to such a point that it replaces the culture of death? One thing is in our favor, that it is not an instinct but a culture. We should not call it the instinct of death, but rather the culture of death. Unlike instincts that can only change through evolution over millions of years, cultures are different. They are inventions and we can change them very rapidly.

Austin:

... but how?

White:

To start with, we must recognize the depth of the culture of war. War has always been the principal business of the state. A state that cannot defend itself militarily is called a "failed state." But war is only the tip of an iceberg. The policy of the state has always been supported by the entire culture of our families, our schools and our religions. The student who does

not follow orders is a failed student. The citizen who tries to speak with the enemy is a traitor.

Austin:

I can assure you that from a military standpoint, we are all very aware of this. But it has become more and more difficult for us to maintain it. People no longer believe in war. It has become harder and harder for us to justify it. We return from wars not as heroes, but as embarrassments, or even as villains.

White:

Yes, there is the birth of a global culture of peace, but it is not well recognized. Obviously, it is not going to be admitted by governments, but it is also not considered newsworthy by the media. After all, they have become the most essential aspect of the culture of war, the control of information.

Austin:

Dr. White, please give me your contact numbers in the States. I am planning to take early retirement and perhaps I can do some work with you on this.

The curtain shifts to stage right and the empty table where the scientists were sitting in the previous acts. Persikov and Finkelstein emerge from the darkness and sit down.

Finkelstein:

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me privately. I have a request that I hope you will agree with.

Persikov:

Tell me.

Finkelstein:

I would like to meet privately with Dr Freud.

Persikov is so surprised he does not speak for a moment. Then he says angrily:

Not only are you the first woman ever to enter the room, but now you want to meet with him privately. There is no possibility of this.

Finkelstein:

I understand your resistance, but I have a good reason for this.

Persikov:

What is your reason?

Finkelstein:

As you may know, Freud's youngest daughter, Anna, became a psychoanalyst. In fact, she was very well known and became a leader in the psychoanalysis of children. But what is important for my request, she was my teacher and friend. If we are truly communicating with Freud, I feel certain that he will want to speak to me about this. But I don't think he will want others listening to the conversation. That is why I wish to speak with him alone.

Persikov:

I am sorry, but this is not possible.

Finkelstein, her turn to be angry:

Perhaps it is because this is not really Freud, but rather a trick that you are playing on us.

Persikov, his voice raised:

This is outrageous! You cannot force me in this way to endanger this delicate and valuable communication! And I resent your insinuation that this is a trick!

Finkelstein:

Then, I ask you, in that case, to put the question to Freud himself and ask him what he wishes.

Persikov:

I suppose that I can do that, if it will satisfy your demands.

Finkelstein begs him:

Please.

Persikov:

OK. I will do so.

Persikov leaves and the spotlight shifts to stage left where White and Rimsky are standing and talking privately.

White:

Do you think this is all a trick?

Rimsky:

I suppose so. There is nothing that has been said from our Dr Freud that we cannot find in his books, as far as I know. However, it is very cleverly done.

White:

I continue to think that we should consider whether our task is helped or hurt by concentrating on his theories.

Rimsky:

I agree, and I will be pleased to take this into consideration. In any case, our task is seems more important than ever now that we have heard from Petrov and the news from Reykjavik.

The spotlight again fades and re-focuses on the table where Persikov is coming back to speak with Finkelstein.

Persikov:

I have spoken with Freud about your request.

Finkelstein:

Yes?

Persikov:

And he wishes to meet with you alone.

Finkelstein.

Thank you.

Persikov:

But that does not mean that it can be allowed.

Finkelstein:

Why not?

Persikov:

Freud is my responsibility. Do you realize what will happen to me if something goes wrong?

Finkelstein:

What can happen to you?

Persikov:

Did you notice the state of Colonel Petrov yesterday? He has been under house arrest for two years now, and he has suffered a severe mental breakdown during this time.

Finkelstein, her voice rising in anger:

But do you not have a responsibility to Dr Freud as well as for him?

Persikov:

That is what makes my decision so difficult.

Finkelstein:

I can assure you that I will not touch anything. I will simply speak into the microphone.

Persikov:

I should not do this.

The two of them stand up and go to the room to get into their anti-microbe suits. The spot shifts back to White and Rimsky speaking stage left.

White:

Assuming that this is all a trick, what is the purpose of it?

Rimsky:

Difficult to say. We are dealing with a system that is so full of secrets that the right hand does not know what the left is doing. The very fact that this initiative is secret already tells us something about it.

White:

I can understand the secrecy. If Freud has indeed been kept alive, Persikov is correct to say that the knowledge of this by the general public could have disastrously unpredictable effects. And if it is a trick, as we suspect, they need to keep it secret in order not to be discovered in their trickery.

Rimsky:

Usually, secrecy serves to hide incompetence, although I have yet to see how it operates in this case....

The spotlight returns to the sarcophagus room where Perskov enters with Finkelstein.

Persikov:

Dr Freud, I have brought Dr. Finkelstein with me as you requested.

Freud:

Thank you, Persikov. You can leave us alone now.

Persikov:

I yield to your wishes.

Persikov leaves.

Freud:

I understand that you knew my Anna.

Finkelstein:

Yes, she was my teacher and my friend when we were both at Yale in the early 60's.

Freud:

Please tell me about her. I agreed to continue living these many years in the hopes that I would hear about her, but I have heard very little. I was told that she died four years ago, but I don't know much more than that.

As Finkelstein starts to recount her recollections of Anna Freud, the spotlight fades and shifts to the radio room where Colonel Austin is speaking with Professor Roshchina.

Austin:

I understand that the news is not good from Reykjavik.

Roshchina.

No. The news is not good. Unfortunately, your President is insisting that there can be no agreement unless we accept his idea of a universal system of missile defense, and we know that is impossible. Ironically, our idea of setting up their meeting without advisers has backfired on us. If Reagan's advisers had been there, they would have told him how ridiculous this is.

Austin:

What can we do? How can we afford to miss this opportunity?

Roshchina.

That is the question that we must ask ourselves. Is this our last chance to meet without military advisers? Will we now return to the endless debate of military superiority? Instinct or not, have we made a deal with death?

The spotlight fades and returns to Finkelstein and Freud in the Sarcophagus room. The scene resembles the classic mode of psychoanalysis, with Finkelstein seated near the head of Freud who is reclining in his sarcophagus as if lying on a psychoanalytic couch.

Yes, I knew her friend Dorothy quite well. They seemed very happy together, but I don't think they were a couple as I know it

Freud:

Then she never developed a true sexual partnership?

Finkelstein:

Not unless we count her relationship to you. If you don't mind my saying so, I think that you were always the sexual partner in her fantasies, from the time of your analysis with her. You must admit that it was very incestuous for you to analyze your own daughter!

Freud hesitates in replying.

Yes, I would have to admit that. But there is something that I would never say in print, but I can tell you if you will not repeat it. In some way, incest is the purest of sexual relations. It is the primeval tie or, if you prefer, the original sin.

Finkelstein laughs lightly:

Few people would agree with you, but I may be one of them. My lover now could be my daughter, in fact even younger. As you put it, she is beautiful and pure. You see, she is a professional cellist and she makes

love with me like she makes love with her cello on stage.

Anna once showed me a photo of her when she was about 10 years old, holding your hand at the edge of a precipice somewhere high in the Alps, and it seemed to symbolize the very deep love that she always had for you.

Freud:

Yes, I remember that day as if it were yesterday. It was one of those days in the mountains when the air is completely clean and crisp and the combination of sun and snow, hot and cold, is extremely invigorating. And did she tell you about the little teddy bear? I bought one of the first such toys to be put on the market, in those days it was called a "Roosevelt bear" and I gave it to her as a memento of our trip to the mountains. She used to carry it around with her everywhere.

Anna:

She also never forgot that, because she had kept the teddy bear with her over the years, and the photo of her with you was held in the paws of that toy.

Freud:

You cannot know what happiness that brings to me!

Finkelstein:

Anna told me once how she brought the teddy bear with her to the hospital when you were convalescing from the surgery for your cancer, and it was then that you first began talking about the existence of death and life instincts. It seems that it came out of your own experience of facing death and choosing life.

Freud does not reply at first, as if he is reflecting on this. During this time, the waves on the electroencephalogram behind the cadaver flicker and flatten several times.

Freud finally replies defensively, his voice broken and distorted by static, as if the computer was having problems:

I fear that you have led me into matters that I should not have discussed with you. There is too much pain mixed in with my pleasure. And as for the death instinct, there is no reason, as it seems to me, why the emotional factors should be allowed to enter into this question at all. It is simply a scientific question.

Freud continues, his voice somewhat stronger:

At times I was more open and frank with others about my feelings – much more so than the others, if I may say. I had small thanks for it, and from my experience, I could never recommend anyone to follow my example. In fact, I must ask you not to speak to anyone else about our conversation. The public has no claim to learn any more of my emotional life – of my struggles, my disappointments, and my successes.

Please do not misinterpret my remarks. I do thank you for coming to see me now and for allowing me to recall those times, when Anna brought the Teddy Bear and gave it to me in the hospital. As you have correctly surmised, it became a symbol of my decision to continue living.

He pauses, and when he speaks again, the words are broken and faint, and he is forced to repeat them in order to be understood:

But . . . now . . . the Teddy . . . Bear . . . is gone . . . it is gone . . .
the teddy . . . bear

The electroencephalogram has gone flat.

Finkelstein:

Dr Freud!

The voice does not return.

Finkelstein stands and speaks more loudly:

Dr. Freud, are you there?

Silence

Suddenly an alarm goes off and lights start flashing in every room, including the control room and the radio room as well as the sarcophagus room

Spotlights slowly illuminate all of the rooms, and we see people frantically rushing around in every room as the alarm continues to go off loudly and lights are flashing everywhere. There is general panic!

Colonel Sokolov and Colonel Austin are left front stage.

Austin:

What are we supposed to do? Are we safe here?

Sokolov, leaving to go into the control room:

We should be safe here, but there is no procedure for us. I'll go see what I can find out . . .

At stage right, Rimsky is leaving White at the table, saying as he leaves:

I'll go to the control room to see what is happening. You stay here.

White starts pacing back and forth.

Lights dim slightly and we see Rimsky, as well as Sokolov, in the control room, speaking to the people there inaudibly, while White remains stage right, pacing back and forth. Stage left, Austin has also begun to pace back and forth.

The panic becomes louder and louder and we begin to hear people screaming in Russian and racing in and out of the rooms. The alarms, if anything become louder and more numerous, with lights flashing, especially in the cadaver room.

Persikov bursts into the cadaver room to find Finkelstein bending over the inert body of Freud. He screams at her, initially in Russian and then in English, as he starts turning dials and looking at the instruments frantically.

What have you done?

Finkelstein, also with panic in her voice::

Nothing. Nothing We were speaking and suddenly he stopped speaking.

Persikov screams at her:

He's dead! How could this happen on my watch? Don't you see? I am responsible. No one else has this responsibility because it is top secret. It is all because of me! I should never have let you in here alone.

Finkelstein:

Are you sure you can no longer have contact?

Persikov points to the flat line of the electroencephalogram.

Don't you see. The brain is now dead. There is nothing to be done! I should kill you!

He picks up a chair and rushes towards her as if to crush her with it. Finkelstein, panicked, races out the door with Persikov chasing her, both of them still in their 'space uniforms". They run through what is now a general pandemonium on stage with people rushing everywhere shouting.

They rush around the stage and then back into the cadaver room, Persikov

chasing Finkelstein with the chair. They are followed by White and Roshchina who tackle Persikov, throw the chair to the side and pin him to the floor.

As suddenly as it began, the alarms stop and everyone stops, as if in slow motion.

Finkelstein comes over to where Persikov is pinned to the floor, and motion the others to let him go. She leans over and puts her hands on him, saying:

It is not your fault! There is nothing we have done. Surely, you did not believe that this could continue forever.

Persikov shakes and mumbles incoherently.

Finkelstein holds him at arms length and slowly, as he shakes, she puts her arms around him and we see him sobbing in her arms.

The lights slowly go out in the rest of the set, lingering on the cadaver room, and then limited to the lights on the scientific apparatus behind the cadaver which have changed from green to red..

Slowly the lights brighten once more on the front stage right where Rimsky and White sit down at the table

Rimsky:

They don't know what happened.. They don't recognize the alarm and it seems that there is nothing on the radar. They are checking all their systems one at a time. But at least the alarm has stopped now..

White:

This is very troubling. What if this was another computer error and it risked launching the missiles again?

Rimsky:

It is hard to say what is happening, but I have a feeling that something is very wrong!

White:

I feel like we have seen what the end of the world will be like.

*Finkelstein arrives, still removing her anti-microbe suit, visibly shaken.
Her words are sputtered:*

Freud... Freud ... is .. dead!

White:

What happened?

Finkelstein:

His brain went dead, and it set of the alarm.

Rimsky:

How did it happen?

Finkelstein, still having a hard time to talk:

We were talking and at a certain point his words were broken up and then there was silence. The brain waves flattened out, and the alarm went off. Persikov is continuing to try to reconnect, but it seems impossible. It seems he has really died!

Rimsky:

I'm not surprised. At a certain point, they had to put an end to the show. You cannot continue such a thing forever.

Finkelstein:

What do you mean by the show?

Rimsky:

Don't you realize that this has been a Potemkin Village, an elaborate trick constructed for us. Not that I object, since it is for a good purpose, and we will make a good report as a result. I see you are skeptical.

Finkelstein hesitates, and then replies slowly, as if her thoughts are far away:

No. No. I don't know.

White:

In any case, we have a proposal to make, and finally it may be for the best that the show is over. Finally, it is up to us to make the proposal and no trick can write it for us.

Rimsky:

I assume we begin with the Seville Statement on Violence as a base and go from there.

White:

Should we invite the colonels to join us. It's true that they did not take part in writing the Seville Statement with us, but perhaps it will help us to include a military perspective. And where is Roshchina?

Finkelstein.

I will look for them.

Once Finkelstein has left, White turns to Rimsky:

Did you have the same impression as I that Dr. Finkelstein did not agree with us that this was a show about Freud?

Rimsky:

Now that I think about it, I believe you are right.

White:

I wonder why.

The two of them are silent, as if thinking. After a short time, Finkelstein returns with Colonel Austin and Colonel Sokolov.

Gentlemen, our friends, the colonels, are pleased to join us, but I didn't see Roshchina.

Rimsky addresses the two colonels:

We have decided to start from the basis of the Seville Statement on Violence. Are you familiar with it?

Colonel Austin:

Not very much.

Rimsky:

The three of us were among 20 scientists from around the world who wrote the statement earlier this year in Seville, Spain. The other scientists were anthropologists, neuropsychologists and psychologists like us, as well as experts in animal behavior, genetics and sociology. We addressed the question of whether war is part of human nature and therefore inevitable. One by one we considered the best data available about genetics, brain, instincts, evolution and animal behavior, and rejected each of these as

explanations for war. In conclusion, we stated that the same species that invented war is capable of inventing peace.

White:

We said in Seville what war is not, but now we must go further. We must now say what war really is, and how it can be abolished.

Finkelstein:

What about the death instinct? What should we say about it

Rimsky:

I don't think we can deal with it. Personally, I do not believe that there is such an instinct, and in any case it will not help us with the task.

White:

We must start from the standpoint of inventing peace. It is a question of culture, not of instinct. Instead of an instinct of death, there is a culture of death, the culture of war.

Colonel Sokolov, defensively:

It is one thing to talk about a culture of war, but to call it a culture of death is going too far!

Colonel Austin, addressing Colonel Sokolov:

Are you sure it is going too far? How many people have died from war in the course of history? Can this be counted?

Colonel Sokolov does not have an answer, and does not reply.

Instead, White speaks:

We need a global movement similar to the movement that we see

developing to save the environment. We need as much mobilization to save mankind as we have already seen to save the whales, the polar bears and the forests of the Amazon.

Finkelstein:

I'll look again for Roshchina.

Colonel Sokolov:

Look in the radio room.

Finkelstein leaves to look for her.

Colonel Austin:

What role do you see for the military?

White:

It is important that the military gets involved in this movement. The message that you have just given us is an essential component. You must convince everyone that war has become so destructive, we can no longer afford it.

Colonel Austin:

You are right, and I will work with you on this.

Finkelstein return with Roschina, who addresses the others:

Comrades, I guess you know that the news is not good. As we had hoped, the relationship between Reagan and Gorbachev was excellent, especially, it seems, when they were off camera. I think each of them respects the great responsibility that is in their hands. But there is no agreement. Ironically, it is because Reagan has gone far beyond his previous position for eliminating nuclear weapons, even beyond the level that we have

proposed. Instead, he insists on establishing a universal missile shield before there can be any disarmament.

Sokolov:

That's ridiculous. There is no shield that cannot be overcome by sending more missiles!

Roshchina:

Precisely. That is what is so ironic. Since we set up the meeting without advisers, there was no one like yourself to set him straight! In fact, Reagan told our President that he would share the technology for Star Wars with us. Our President's response would have been amusing, if it were not so tragic! He told Reagan, "you will not even share with us the technology for milking machines, so why should we expect you to share the technology for an anti-missile defense."

Colonel Austin:

I was afraid of this. We have no time to lose. We cannot afford to continue long with the nuclear arsenals on five-minute alert. We must work urgently.

Rimsky:

I will include this in our proposal, and we shall submit it this evening. What should be our concluding words?

Persikov, rejoining the group and speaking slowly with deep emotion:

I would like to give the last word to Freud

Finkelstein:

I agree. Let us end with his words that we are engaged in the struggle between life and death, the struggle of the human species for existence.

The lights slowly illuminate the control room and the radio room where men are working. As they slowly dim, Colonel Sokolov and Colonel Austin walk with the spotlight to center stage. They are still in full military uniform.

Colonel Sokolov begins, speaking into a hand-held microphone.

Because of technical problems, we no longer have Freud's letter to Einstein in his own voice, so I have been asked to read the remaining three paragraphs to you:

"In any case, we may deduce a formula for an indirect method of eliminating war If the propensity for war be due to the destructive instinct, we have always its counter-agent, Eros, to our hand. All that produces ties of sentiment between man and man must serve us as war's antidote. . .

The cultural development of mankind (some, I know, prefer to call it civilization) has been in progress since immemorial antiquity. To this process we owe all that is best in our composition On the psychological side two of the most important phenomena of culture are, firstly, a strengthening of the intellect, which tends to master our instinctive life, and, secondly, an introversion of the aggressive impulse, with all its consequent benefits and perils. Now war runs against the growth of culture; pacifists like us are therefore bound to resent war, to find it utterly intolerable. . .

How long have we to wait before the rest of men turn pacifist? Impossible to say, and yet perhaps our hope that these two factors--man's cultural disposition and a well-founded dread of the form that future wars will take--may serve to put an end to war in the near future, is not chimerical. But by what ways or byways this will come about, we cannot guess. Meanwhile we may rest on the assurance that whatever makes for cultural development is working also against war.

With kindest regards and, should this expose prove a disappointment to

you, my sincere regrets,

Yours, Sigmund Freud"

Colonel Sokolov hands the microphone to Colonel Austin and leaves the stage.:

The Hofdi House set descends with its desolate lonely image of a single building in the middle of the tundra. This set now hides the bunker set. Gradually it is illuminated with the colonel in front.

Colonel Austin:

Decades have now passed since Reagan and Gorbachev met in Iceland. The Hofdi House is empty now, and there are only a few tourists to read the small plaque that recalls their meeting. In the first few years after the Reykjavik Summit, there seemed to be progress. One year after Reykjavik, the INF treaty for nuclear disarmament that was signed by Reagan and Gorbachev, thanks to the personal trust they had established at Hofdi House. The Soviets had been right when they hoped that Nancy Reagan would accompany her husband to Reykjavik, since, in the end, she was the one who convinced President Reagan to sign the treaty. At Reykjavik, President Gorbachev had warned President Reagan that he would weaken the American culture of war by depriving it of an enemy, but little did he realize that two years later, the Berlin Wall would come down and the Soviet empire would collapse.

Meanwhile, the Seville Statement on Violence, written by scientists in 1986 was adopted by UNESCO in 1989 and distributed throughout the world in many languages. Ten years later, in 1999, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Declaration and Program of Action for a Culture of Peace, with a blueprint for the development of a new culture to replace the culture of war. Unfortunately, very few people know about this decision of the United Nations, and the initial disarmament agreements have been overcome by a new arms race. There are now over 30,000 nuclear weapons under the control of nine states, with other states planning to manufacture them. A global nuclear war would still risk the destruction

of all life on the planet. And as for the death instinct, scientists still do not know if it exists or not..

*The lights slowly fade except for one spot on the empty Hofdi House.
Then, that, too, fades to darkness.*

The end.

Note: When the actors come on stage to acknowledge applause, Dr. Finkelstein may carry a Teddy Bear.