

Human Nature: The Future of the Individual

Hochwalder's disquiet at the future direction of society becomes particularly pronounced in three of his later plays, *Donnerstag, 1003*, and *Lazaretti oder Der Sabeltiger*. These dramas show the playwright's concern that individuals are becoming increasingly submerged in the masses of modern society, a development accentuated by technology, and furthermore that they may be ready to sacrifice their autonomy for a comfortable, trouble-free existence. This, for a dramatist who places such store on individual conscience and responsibility, amounts to nothing short than the total surrender of humanity. Such developments also raise issues, most clearly explored in *Lazaretti oder Der Sabeltiger*, about human nature per se, and it is asked whether humanity is fatally flawed and destined for extinction.

An examination of Hochwalder's 1976 essay, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?"¹ does much to illuminate the author's thinking on such matters. This essay, which partly outlines a drama Hochwalder was working on at the time², explores what the dramatist sees as a major threat to individual freedom in modern society: the philosophical juxtaposition of the incompatible concepts of freedom and equality. He sees Rousseau, with the publication of his "contrat social", as the founding father of the school of political thought which attempts just that, and which was nurtured by the French Revolution and carried into the twentieth century by Marxism. Quoting authorities as diverse as Herbert Luthy³, Alexis de Tocqueville⁴ and Goethe⁵, he argues that the perceived desirability of these two incompatible ideals has so pervaded modern thinking that their pursuit may lead to the subservience of individual freedom to the dictates of the majority and the anonymous masses:

Bei solchen uberlegungen entsinne ich mich der lang zuruckliegenden Lekture eines biologischen Werkes, das sich mit der Erforschung der Ameisenwelt befate. [...] Da hie es namlich: nicht der Termit, die Ameise, sei das eigentliche Lebewesen, sondern der Termitenhugel, der Bau, der Staat. Bei Verletzung beziehungsweise Teilzerstorung des Hugels reagieren Ameisen nicht wie Einzeltiere, sondern wie Blutkorperchen im menschlichen Organismus: in Scharen eilen sie herbei, um die Einbruchsstelle abzuschirmen und zur Heilung zu bringen. Konklusion: die Ameise

¹ Fritz Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 103-131.

² This drama, given the title in the essay, "Die Kanonade von Valmy", was not completed but a fragment of the work does exist in the *Nachla*, under the title "Der Feldzug".

³ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 106.

⁴ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 116-119.

⁵ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 108.

als Einzeltier gibt es gar nicht; was lebt und zählt, ist der Gesamtkörper, der Staat, die Gemeinschaft, der Allgemeine Wille. - Da wären wir wieder bei Rousseau! - Und weiter: Wie kann Freiheit überleben in einer Welt, die allem Anschein nach zur fortschreitenden Termitisierung bestimmt ist?⁶

He recognizes the appeal of equality over freedom, but emphasizes the value of individual freedom:

[...] Wäre ich ein persischer Schafhirte, ein ägyptischer Fellache, ein brasilianischer Caboclo oder sonst einer der Verdammten dieser Erde, ich scherte mich keinen Pfifferling um den Begriff "Freiheit", der mir so unvorstellbar wäre wie etwa dem Karpfen der Himalaja, und kämpfte bis zum letzten Atemzug für jene Gleichheit, die im achtzehnten Jahrhundert entdeckt und in unserer Zeit verwirklicht wurde. Aber ich bin nun einmal - und wäre ich selbst bettelarm - kein Verdammter, kein Kuli und kein Analphabet, vielmehr ein simpler Mitteleuropäer in einem Sprachraum, in dem es von Privilegierten nur so wimmelt - auch die Arbeiterschaft, Gevatter Schneider und Schuster zählen dazu -; die Ich-Aussage ist demnach irreführend, korrekt müßte es heißen: Wir alle, die wir das unverdiente Glück freier Meinungsäußerung, demokratischer Staats- und Lebensform genießen, sind grundsätzlich privilegiert, selbst im Unrecht, im Mißbrauch, in Empörung und Verzweiflung. Unser höchstes Gut stellt nicht die Gleichheit, sondern die Freiheit dar [...].⁷

Yet he is all too well aware that even the privilege of having tasted freedom may not stop a society from sacrificing it, as the events in democratic Germany in 1932 demonstrated⁸. To illustrate this point further Hochwälder recounts Dostoevsky's story "The Grand Inquisitor" from *The Brothers Karamazov*: Christ returns to fifteenth century Europe only to be banished by the Grand Inquisitor, because the gift of freedom, for which he died, has proved to be an unwelcome burden for humanity; one which it has gladly sacrificed to the tyranny of the church rather than accept the personal responsibility that is inherent in true freedom⁹.

If Dostoevsky proved to be a prophet of the present mass age, then so too was the nineteenth century French aristocrat, Alexis de Tocqueville, who in his study of American democracy saw, like Hochwälder, the danger posed to the individual by the desire for equality as well as freedom:

⁶ Hochwälder, "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", 125-126.

⁷ Hochwälder, "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", 121.

⁸ Hochwälder, "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", 130.

⁹ "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", 125-128. Cf. Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov. A Novel in Four Parts with Epilogue*, Trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, (London: Vintage, 1990), 246-262.

There is indeed a manly and legitimate passion for equality which rouses in all men a desire to be strong and respected. This passion tends to elevate the little man to the rank of great. But the human heart also nourishes a debased taste for equality, which leads the weak to want to drag the strong down to their level and which induces men to prefer equality in servitude to inequality in freedom. It is not that peoples with a democratic social state naturally scorn freedom; on the contrary, they have an instinctive taste for it. But freedom is not the chief and continual object of their desires; it is equality for which they feel an eternal love; they rush on freedom with quick and sudden impulses, but if they miss their mark they resign themselves to their disappointment; but nothing will satisfy them without equality, and they would rather die than lose it¹⁰.

Tocqueville saw in the drive to equality, which was destroying the old forms of government and modes of belief, the danger of a new tyranny of the majority: "the nearer men are to a common level of uniformity, the less are they inclined to believe any man or any class. But they are readier to trust the mass, and public opinion becomes more and more mistress of the world"¹¹. Furthermore:

The citizen of democracy comparing himself with the others feels proud of his equality with each. But when he compares himself with all his fellows and measures himself against this vast entity, he is overwhelmed by a sense of insignificance and weakness.

The same equality which makes him independent of each separate citizen leaves him isolated and defenseless in the face of the majority¹².

The Frenchman evokes a depressing image of the future in which individuals are isolated within the masses, with no real connection with the wider community outside their family and friends, content to be: "constantly circling around in pursuit of the petty and banal pleasures with which they glut their souls. Each one of them, withdrawn into himself [...]"¹³. Given such developments, the importance of the individual declines in direct proportion to the growing role of the state, which not only assumes increasing power and control over the direction of society, but is expected to by its individual members¹⁴. Indeed, this and the loss of religious belief lead to a decline in intellectual thought and increased dependency on the state to solve all matters of importance:

¹⁰ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America, 1835-1840*, Trans. George Lawrence, ed. Eds. J.P. Mayer and Max Lerner, (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 49.

¹¹ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 125-126.

¹² Tocqueville, 400.

¹³ Tocqueville, 666.

¹⁴ Tocqueville, 645.

Each man gets into the way of having nothing but confused and changing notions about the matters of greatest importance to himself and his fellows. Opinions are ill-defended or abandoned, and in despair of solving unaided the greatest problems of human destiny, men ignobly give up thinking about them.

Such a state inevitably enervates the soul, and relaxing the will, prepares people for bondage.

Then not only will they let their freedom be taken from them, but often they actually hand it over themselves [...]¹⁵.

The similarity to Dostoevsky's story is striking and, like Hochwalder, Tocqueville feared that growing equality, encouraged by democracy, would reduce the individual to an anonymous and powerless member of society, at the mercy of the desires and moods of the "tyranny of the majority".

However, as Hochwalder, writing in the twentieth century, points out, Tocqueville's experiences in America led him to sway between scepticism and amazement¹⁶, for despite the threat of equality, democracy seemed able to preserve freedom. Indeed, it is in democracy that Hochwalder sees the grounds for tentative optimism about the future survival of freedom¹⁷, and in the United States, despite all its flaws, the proof that democracy can guarantee freedom on a large scale¹⁸. Here, his thinking has much in common with that of Karl Popper, who in his treatise on freedom, *The Open Society and its Enemies*¹⁹ advocates democracy as the best means of protecting individual autonomy, and who, sharing Hochwalder's deep distrust of ideological and revolutionary movements, is quoted approvingly: "Der Versuch, den Himmel auf Erden zu verwirklichen, produzierte stets die Holle"²⁰.

Although Popper's concern with freedom is not shaped by a fear of equality, a term he uses only in the limited, and wholly positive sense of universal democratic rights, he nevertheless attacks many of the same ideological creeds which Hochwalder sees as endangering the individual. Popper sees a general historical trend from what he calls the "closed society", a world governed by primitive taboos, rituals and unquestioned rules and hierarchies, toward "the open society", which emphasizes individual freedom and personal

¹⁵ Tocqueville, 409.

¹⁶ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 117.

¹⁷ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 129-131.

¹⁸ Cf. Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 118-119, 130-131.

¹⁹ K. R. Popper, *The Spell of Plato*, 1945, Vol. I of *The Open Society and its Enemies*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977), K. R. Popper, *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*, Vol. II of *The Open Society and its Enemies*, II vols. (London: George Routledge, 1945).

²⁰ "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 121. Cf. Popper, *The Spell of Plato*, 168; *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*, 223; and Rene Freund, "Es geht sowieso schlecht aus", *Wiener Zeitung*, 23. Mai 1986, 4.

responsibility. However, such progress is, according to Popper, constantly threatened by the adherents of what he terms "Historicism": the belief that through a science of history the future direction of society may be ascertained and a correct code of ethics and behaviour determined. Such philosophies may be fundamentally pessimistic, looking back to a golden age long past, of which the present corrupt society is but a decaying shadow (e.g. Plato, Spengler); or optimistic, looking toward a future utopia (Marx). However, both are equally dangerous for aside from being fundamentally flawed from a scientific viewpoint, they provide the impetus for totalitarianism, forming the basis for beliefs in the historic destiny of a chosen race (fascism) or class (communism), and making the individual subservient to the collective whole: a victim of overwhelming historical forces beyond his control. He traces this trend to totalitarianism further back than Hochwalder; Rousseau and others such as Hegel, are merely steps on the way from the teachings of Plato to Marx. The teachings of such philosophers are seen as the products of difficult times where instability and change make the appeal of historical necessity all the stronger:

If you know that things are bound to happen whatever you do, then you may feel free to give up the fight against them. You may, more especially, give up the attempt to control those things which most people agree to be social evils, such as war; or to mention a smaller but nevertheless important thing, the tyranny of the petty official²¹.

Popper counters such views by examining the works of individual philosophers and denouncing the unscientific and fundamental illogicality of such theories²², insisting that: "the future depends on ourselves, and we do not depend on any historical necessity"²³. In this he rejects any utopian social engineering, arguing that the best approach to combating the problems and difficulties of modern life is a piecemeal approach to social issues as they arise, instead of any attempt to transform society radically as a whole²⁴. For Popper, as for Hochwalder²⁵, democracy seems "the only known device by which we can protect ourselves against the misuse of political power; it is the control of the rulers by the ruled"²⁶. This, however, should not be the rule of

²¹ Popper, *The Spell of Plato*, 4.

²² See in particular: Chapter 25, "Conclusion. Has History any Meaning?", in *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*.

²³ Popper, *The Spell of Plato*, 3.

²⁴ See in particular: Chapter 9, "Aestheticism, Perfectionism, Utopianism" in *The Spell of Plato*.

²⁵ Hochwalder stated in an interview in 1975 that he felt a solution to Europe's problems might be found in a Swiss-style democracy which encouraged its citizens to take an active part in the running of society (Peter Vujica, "Fritz Hochwalder wortlich", *Neue Vorarlberger Tageszeitung* [Bregenz], 29. Juli 1975).

²⁶ Popper, *The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*, 119.

the majority over the minority, or a suggestion of Rousseau's "General Will", rather the best system, if not a foolproof one, by which individual freedom may be safeguarded:

[...] we can [...] describe, as the principle of a democratic policy, the proposal to create, develop, and protect political institutions for the avoidance of tyranny. This principle does not imply that we can ever develop institutions of this kind which are faultless or foolproof, or which ensure that the policies adopted by a democratic government will be right or good or wise - or even necessarily better or wiser than the policies adopted by a benevolent tyrant [...]. What may be said, however, to be implied in the adoption of the democratic principle is the conviction that the acceptance of even a bad policy in a democracy (so long as we can work for a peaceful change) is preferable to the submission to a tyranny, however wise or benevolent. Seen in this light, the theory of democracy is not based upon the principle that the majority should rule; rather, the various equalitarian methods of democratic control, such as general elections and representative government, are to be considered as no more than well-tried and, in the presence of a widespread traditional distrust of tyranny, reasonable effective institutional safeguards against tyranny, always open to improvement, and even providing for their own improvement. He who accepts the principle of democracy in this sense is therefore not bound to look upon the result of a democratic vote as an authoritative expression of what is right. Although he will accept a decision of the majority, for the sake of making the democratic institutions work, he will feel free to combat it by democratic means and to work for its revision. And should he live to see the day when the majority vote destroys the democratic institutions then this sad experience will tell him only that there does not exist a foolproof method of avoiding tyranny. But it need not weaken his decision to fight tyranny nor will it expose his theory as inconsistent²⁷.

In what seems to be a veiled reference to the demise of the Weimar Republic, there is more than a passing similarity to the closing pages of Hochwalder's essay, with the recognition that democracy is not a panacea, but has the vital strength of allowing change from within²⁸.

The position Hochwalder takes in the essay written in 1976, with its strong anti-utopian, indeed anti-leftist views, is one that, based on an analysis of his dramas, developed over a considerable time. Indeed, in *Esther* and *Das heilige Experiment* liberal sympathies are very apparent and perhaps understandable given Hochwalder's admission [see Chapter 1] that at the time he wrote the earlier play he considered himself a Marxist²⁹, a position which he can

²⁷ Popper, *The Spell of Plato*, 125.

²⁸ Cf. Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 129-131.

still be assumed to hold when writing his Jesuit drama a year later³⁰.

The portrayal of the corrupt, unjust society in *Esther* clearly shows the left-wing sympathies of the author, as do the portrayal of the radical, Benjamin, and Esther's closing words, decrying a world based on greed [see Chapter 4]. Yet, as the events of 1940 made all too clear, fascism just as much as communism can exploit such social injustice; the nihilistic, Hitler-like figure of Haman, with his dismissive view of a humanity based on "Niedertracht" (I, 38), knows only too well how to exploit dissatisfaction amongst the population by fostering anti-Semitism. Yet just how far Hochwalder's thinking was to change before writing "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?" is indicated by the fact that Haman advocates the destruction of both freedom and equality, which offer the Jews some protection before the law, suggesting that at this stage the author saw both as worthy values:

Wenn ich, der Fuhrer des Volkes, in den Dienst Eurer Majestat trete und meine Unterlaufel in den Staatsapparat einfuge - wenn ferner immer der richtige Betrieb herrscht, um die Masse in Aufregung zu halten, und wenn endlich Schlu gemacht wird mit den lachlichen Vorstellungen von Freiheit und Gleichheit vor dem Gesetz - dann sollte ein Herr Soundso kommen und mich daran erinnern, was ich ihm versprochen habe... Ich mocht' es jedenfalls niemandem raten! (I, 47)

Freedom and equality, admittedly under the firm guidance of the Jesuit priests, do seem to have been achieved in Hochwalder's next play, *Das heilige Experiment*, and the religious state is shown as a humane and laudable work [see Chapter 4]; there is no irony intended in descriptions of it as both "eine Utopia" (I, 105) and "Ein Reich der Liebe und Gerechtigkeit" (I, 116). If an echo of Popper's warning about the dangers of attempting to establish heaven on earth can be found in the words of the machiavellian Querini: "*Diese Welt aber ist ungeeignet zur Verwirklichung von Gottes Reich*" (I, 122), its destruction does not arise from flawed utopianism but rather from the actions of the Provincial and Miura, who both choose to obey orders they know to be wrong. Indeed, the idealism of the Jesuit state is not challenged, rather the corrupt world in which such dreams are put into practice.

Nor can any evidence of the ideas Hochwalder held in 1976 be found in the first of his published plays concerning the French Revolution, *Der offentliche Anklager*, a period of history which shaped his later views³¹. Set just after the fall of Robespierre, the play concerns itself with the effect of totalitarian terror, rather than its causes, and explores how fear pervades the entire population: "[...] seit die Konige sturzten und die Menschheit im Sturmschritt verbessert wird, ist die Grausamkeit kommun geworden. Fruher war sie Pri-

²⁹ Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 28.

³⁰ He had been interested in the material for *Das heilige Experiment* since 1936 (cf. *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 84).

³¹ Hochwalder, "Kann die Freiheit uberleben?", 103.

vileg - von Gottes Gnaden" (I, 305). Aside from Fouquier's attempt at self-justification: "Klage die Zeit an und die Ideen, die sich der Menschen bemächtigen [...]" (I, 266), the play concentrates on the desperate attempts by individuals to survive terrible times [see Chapter 3] instead of exploring the philosophical ideas of the period.

A distrust of ideology is more explicit in *Donadieu*. It is perhaps not insignificant that the play was written in 1953, just as the full extent of the Cold War was becoming apparent and while Austria's fate, caught between East and West, hung still very much in the balance. As Hochwälder makes clear in "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", he sees more than a passing resemblance in the philosophy of Marxism to the determinism of Calvinism, and, although the protagonist of his play is a persecuted Protestant, there are still some sharp barbs aimed at his faith. Significantly, Hochwälder quotes his Huguenot poet, Escambarlat, in his essay, when likening the dictates of Marxism with the predestination of Calvinism:

In meiner Jugend hab ich an Gottes reines Wort geglaubt, das läßt mich nicht los. Ich kann nicht aufhören zu träumen vom Reich der Gerechten, auch wider besseres Wissen nicht. Nur eins bitt ich mir aus: daß die Gerechtigkeit nicht siegt! - Wenn sie siegt, wenn wir unter ihrer Herrschaft leben müßten, dann - gute Nacht! Ich hab es ausprobiert. Nicht auszuhalten. Unerträglich. Lieber gleich ins Grab. (II, 30)³²

This wayward character has had his freedom curtailed by both Catholic and Protestant dictates and is astute enough to realize that the same must happen wherever a given ideology triumphs. Lavalette later supports Escambarlat's views in his castigation of Calvinist Geneva, where, in the name of God, a totalitarian regime has been established:

Betrachtet Genf! - Wie armselig habt ihr euch eingerichtet in eurem Reich! - Die Kirche allen Trostes und Glanzes entkleidet, der Alltag verdüstert, Reichtum filzig aufgehäuft, Nahrung, Kleidung, Schmuck, Haushalt, Dienerschaft vorgeschrieben, jeder Schritt von Pfaffenpolizei überwacht, ausspioniert von zelotischen Sittenrichtern, Tanz und Kartenspiel mit Pranger und Rute bestraft, die Kinder Denunzianten ihrer Eltern - so habt ihr die Welt verbessert zur täglichen Hölle. (II, 48-49)

Once more, Popper's warning of the dangers of attempting to create heaven on earth is applicable.

Despite such passages in *Donadieu*, it is not until his very late plays that Hochwälder gives full voice to the distrust of ideology and revolution expressed in "Kann die Freiheit überleben?" Idealism is openly questioned by Valprès in Hochwälder's return to the events of the French Revolution, *Die Prinzes-*

³² This is quoted in "Kann die Freiheit überleben?" [129] without the sentence: "Ich hab es ausprobiert".

sin von Chimay (IV, 26), and the dangers of pursuing utopian dreams are made abundantly clear by Maergesse: “[...] wer das Wort Blut nicht vertragen kann, läßt besser die Hände von Revolutionen. Keine soziale Revolution ohne Schreckensherrschaft!” (IV, 35). The instigator of the Terror, Robespierre, is portrayed as a misguided idealist, an “öde[r] Nachbeter Rousseaus” (IV, 39), who “träumte von einem Idealstaat, einem souveränen Gemeinwesen freier und gleicher Bürger [...]” (IV, 33-34), but who ultimately became disillusioned when he realised that people were not good enough for his ideals:

Ein Pessimist, jawohl. Zwar predigte er unablässig die Idee des menschlichen Fortschrittes, was auf einen Optimisten schließen läßt, aber offenbar muß er sehr bald erkannt haben, daß diese Idee falsch war. Niemand hatte bessere Gelegenheit als er, einzusehen, daß jeder Optimismus ein Irrglaube ist, und als er dies erkannt hatte, beschloß er, jeden in seiner Reichweite kurzerhand umbringen zu lassen, weil er die menschliche Natur offenbar für so miserabel hielt, daß es für ihn keine andere Möglichkeit gab, die Dinge zu regeln. (IV, 41)³³

Nowhere is Hochwälder's late attitude to revolutionary ideals more openly expressed in dramatic form than in his political satire, *Die Bürgerschaft*, on which he began work not long after writing “Kann die Freiheit überleben?” The misguided notions of the play's two central characters, Agathon and Heloris, both of whom seek a revolution, albeit in quite different forms, have been examined earlier [see Chapter 4]. Their demise results from the success of the “Partei der Gleichen”, whose ascendancy to power is assisted by the stupidity of the philosophers and their desire for “Freiheit und Gerechtigkeit.” Hochwälder's interpretation of Rousseau and Marx can be detected in the manifesto announced to the people by Damon and Moerus:

Wir bringen euch mit der Freiheit die lang ersehnte Gleichheit, die Herrschaft jener ewigen Gerechtigkeit, deren Gesetze nicht in Marmor und Stein eingegraben sind, sondern ins Herz aller Menschen. Wir erstreben eine Ordnung der Dinge, in der alle niedrigen und grausamen Leidenschaften durch die Gesetze gefesselt werden, in der aller Ehrgeiz dahin geht, sich um das Gemeinwohl verdient zu machen, in der Auszeichnungen keine andere Quelle haben als die Gleichheit selbst. - Dies unser Ziel: Tod der Tyrannei! - Freiheit und Gleichheit! (IV, 126-127)

Hochwälder lays it on even thicker a few lines later when he has Damon paraphrase Marx: “Bisher waren wir Objekt der Geschichte, von nun an

³³ Hochwälder borrowed this passage from an observation about another dictator, Stalin. While preaching the doctrine of human progress, the Soviet dictator did not believe it possible and chose to control society through murder, which he saw as the only possibility to regulate the state (“Kahnweiler über Stalin”, typed quotations, undated, Hochwälder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien).

verändern wir sie. - Tod jeder Tyrannei - Freiheit, Gleichheit!" (IV, 130)³⁴. Certainly, these new dictators are aware of how to manipulate the masses, who are far less interested in freedom than Heloris imagined, and they quickly instigate moves to win themselves popularity with a variation on the bread and circuses routine: here bread and Burenwurst (IV, 129) and a decent execution of one of their own, quite in the spirit of the French Revolution. This portrayal of revolution coincides with notes made by Hochwälder under the title "Ursachen der Revolution" and found in the Nachlaß with material for and the typescript of the unpublished play, "Der Feldzug":

Genesis der Revolution.

Eine führende Schicht resigniert, dankt ab.

Die Gebildeten, die Idealisten machen sich über die sterbende Despotie lustig, werfen ihr Unterdrückungssucht vor, alles verkehrt.

Eine kleine Gruppe von Kriminellen versucht - grösstenteils vergeblich - Einfluss auf die "Masse" auszuüben, um die Revolution zu entfachen. Diese Gruppe kommt erst vorwärts, als die Idealisten ihr - unbewusst - Schützenhilfe leisten.

Summa summarum: die Revolution wird nicht gemacht, die abdankende führende Schicht lässt sie einfach zu. Gemacht wird sie sodann vom unheiligen Bündnis der Idealisten mit den Kriminellen³⁵.

Such a view, so apt in regard to his satire, is consistent with Hochwälder's description of Lenin as one of the greatest criminals in history³⁶, and the opinion expressed by Valprès in the earlier comedy, *Die Prinzessin von Chimay*, that the French Revolution was prepared for in advance by philosophers and intellectuals (IV, 26)³⁷.

³⁴ Cf. Hochwälder, "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", 119.

³⁵ Fritz Hochwälder, "Ursachen der Revolution", typed notes, Hochwälder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien.

³⁶ Hochwälder, "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", 122.

³⁷ It is of interest, considering the anti-utopian stance of both writers, to note the similarity between the above notes on revolution and the description provided in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* [originally published 1949] in which society is seen as divided into three competitive groups or classes, the high, the middle and the low:

The aims of these three groups are entirely irreconcilable. The aim of the High is to remain where they are. The aim of the Middle is to change places with the High. The aim of the Low, when they have an aim - for it is an abiding characteristic of the Low that they are too much crushed by drudgery to be more than intermittently conscious of anything outside their daily lives - is to abolish all distinctions and create a society in which all men shall be equal. Thus throughout history a struggle which is the same in its main outlines recurs over and over again. For long periods the High seem to be securely in power, but sooner or later there always comes a moment when they lose either their belief in themselves or their capacity to govern efficiently, or both. They are then overthrown by the Middle, who enlist the Low on their side by pretending to them that they are fighting for liberty and justice. As soon as they have reached their objective the Middle thrust the Low back into their old position of servitude and themselves become the High [...].

- George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), 175.

It is quite clear at the end of *Die Bürgerschaft* that the population which supports the revolution

The notion that the ruling class might abdicate to an ambitious, self-serving group of revolutionaries is also carried into Hochwalder's unfinished drama, "Der Feldzug. Schauspiel in drei Akten,"³⁸ in the portrayal of the defender of the old order, Karl Wilhelm von Braunschweig-Luneburg, and his opposite number, the revolutionary General Charles-Franois Dumouriez. Set after the surprising victory of the revolutionary forces at Valmy, and against a background of intrigue and deception, both men struggle against forces beyond their control to try to find a peaceful resolution to the conflict. As the action switches between one camp and the other it becomes apparent that it is, in fact, Braunschweig who has the better grasp and sympathy for the events unfolding around them. Indeed, it is the leader of the forces of reaction who does most to further the Revolution through his famous directive at Valmy: "Hier schlagen wir nicht!" ("Der Feldzug," 15). He explains his actions thus:

Erst vor Valmy gingen mir die Augen auf. - Ich sah durchs Perspektiv rings um den Windmuhlenhugel ein Volksheer, wie es noch keines in Europa gab: Pygmaen dem Aeussern nach, als Masse unuberwindlich gleich dem Herkules. - Die kleingewachsenen, sonnverbrannten Kerle in ihren Blaurocken, duchsetzt mit schreckerregenden Gestalten, pikenbewehrt, in Lumpen und Holzschuhen, der besten Armee der Welt furchtlos die Stirn bietend, das morderische "a ira!" auf den Lippen [...] wir stehen einer Idee gegenuber, an der jeder Sturmangriff zerschellen muss.

("Der Feldzug", 16)

In effect he abdicates a position of military advantage because he believes the Revolution cannot be turned back, and hopes to save the French throne through negotiation ("Der Feldzug", 16-17), unaware that it has already been abolished ("Der Feldzug", 4)³⁹.

Dumouriez, ironically, has a far less idealistic view of events than his opponent, seeing it as a means of satisfying his own ambition:

Wer war ich, wer bin ich? Sohn eines burgerlichen Steuerpachters, von Jugend an gedemutigt und zuruckgesetzt. - Ich habe noch nicht gelebt, ich will im Grossen wirken, seit der Revolutionstanz anfang, habe ich mir geschworen, zum Ballmeister der Veranstaltung zu werden [...]

("Der Feldzug", 26-27)

He is not interested in either the old order or the radicalism sweeping Paris:

will see no tangible change, save in the name of their oppressors.

³⁸ Fritz Hochwalder, "Der Feldzug. Schauspiel in drei Akten", undated typescript, Hochwalder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien. The typescript is undated but the dates 1974-1986 have been suggested [Cf. Hermann Bohm, 71]. However, Hochwalder mentioned the play in an interview as early as 1970 [Cf. Wolfgang Arnold, "Der Mann, der es schwer macht", *Sudost Tagespost* [Graz], 20. Aug. 1970].

³⁹ The letter which brings this news to Dumouriez is significantly dated: "Paris, im vierten Jahr der Freiheit und im ersten der Gleichheit". Cf. Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 109.

“Hätte ich hundert Leben, ich würde sie opfern, um Frankreich von der Jakobinerherrschaft zu bewahren, aber tausend um den Sieg der Prinzen und des Auslands zu verhindern” (“Der Feldzug,” 26). Once he has persuaded Prussia, through diplomatic means, to break with its allies who wish to destroy the new government, he fully intends to return at the head of a triumphant army to free the nation (“Der Feldzug,” 27).

While the play remained incomplete, Hochwälder’s intentions and views on the events he portrays are made clear in an interview given as early as 1970:

[Die französische Revolution] wollte Freiheit, Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit bringen und wurde die Mutter der Diktaturen des XX. Jahrhunderts... Von dem Augenblick an, da den Revolutionären die Gleichheit wichtiger war als die Freiheit, war der Umschlag da... 1792 war die Wende von der Revolution zum Imperialismus...⁴⁰.

Yet for all his distrust of revolution and the devastation he saw it could bring, Hochwälder took solace from the self-destructive nature of such movements: “Das Glück für uns ist nur die historische Gerechtigkeit in der Geschichte aller Revolutionen: Die fressen sich alle selber auf...”⁴¹. Significantly, Haman, Fouquier-Tinville, Heloris, Agathon and even the Provincial and his Jesuits, are all destroyed because of the radical movements they serve. The past even catches up with Teresa, who has been haunted for years by nightmares about the Revolution, and Maergesse, who must eventually face up to his role in those terrible years.

But the danger of revolution is not the only threat to freedom perceived by Hochwälder, and with the Dostoevsky story he touches on another, perhaps even greater danger: the potential voluntary abdication of individual autonomy. This Hochwälder links closely to technological progress, describing a world, “die allem Anschein nach zur fortschreitenden Termitisierung bestimmt ist”⁴², inhabited by a “durchtechnisierte[n] Hominide[n]”⁴³ who demonstrates the “Phänomen des unbewußten Gewissensschwundes”⁴⁴. This process, as much as any totalitarian insistence on equality, ultimately denies individual existence and is seen as: “[...] die Erlösung des abendländischen Menschen vom Individualismus, was nicht viel anderes bedeutet als den Einmarsch in die keimfreie Hölle des Konformismus [...]”⁴⁵. Such fears have their dramatic reflection in

⁴⁰ Wolfgang Arnold, “Der Mann, der es schwer macht”, *Südost Tagespost* [Graz], 20. Aug. 1970.

⁴¹ Wolfgang Arnold, “Der Mann, der es schwer macht”. This faith in some sort of historical or divine justice eventually catching up with crimes will be returned to in regard to *Die Prinzessin von Chimay*.

⁴² Hochwälder, “Kann die Freiheit überleben?”, 125.

⁴³ Fritz Hochwälder, “Vom Versagen des Dramas in unserer Zeit”, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 68; “Über mein Theater”, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 98.

⁴⁴ Hochwälder, “Vom Versagen des Dramas in unserer Zeit”, 68.

⁴⁵ Fritz Hochwälder, Brief an Ernst Waldinger, 16. Nov. 1962, Dokumentationsstelle für neu-

two Hochwalder plays: "In *Donnerstag* wird die bangliche Frage nach dem Wohin des denaturierten Homo sapiens gestellt, im nachsten Stuck 1003 erfolgt die mivergnugliche Antwort"⁴⁶.

This concern with the direction of modern society, its increasing materialistic characteristics, dependency on technological advances, and mass production and organisation, and the subsequent effects on the individual, was widely held in the 1950s and 1960s⁴⁷. Likewise, in his rejection of utopian social engineering and the submersion of the individual in the masses, Hochwalder is following an established anti-utopian tradition reflected in Aldous Huxley's vision of a genetically and drug-controlled conformist society, *Brave New World*⁴⁸, in which the only true individual, the "savage" John, is driven to suicide, and Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*⁴⁹, in which Winston Smith is destroyed by a totalitarian society which brutally enforces conformity.

While the authors of such anti-utopian literature and others feared the impact technology might have on the future, another school of thought pinned great hopes on progress and technological advance, a faith made all the more convincing by the post-war boom years of rapid economic expansion. Such views were perhaps expressed most strongly and controversially by the psychologist, B. F. Skinner, who advocated the use of science to control human behaviour:

As more and more causal relations are demonstrated, a practical corollary becomes difficult to resist: it should be possible to produce behavior according to plan simply by arranging the proper conditions [...] Let men be happy, informed, skilful, well behaved and productive⁵⁰.

He most vividly paints the picture of his ideal, engineered world in his novel, *Walden Two*⁵¹, in which a Professor Burris⁵², along with two young men, searching for meaning to their lives, their fiancees and a sceptical Professor of

ere osterreichische Literatur, Wien.

⁴⁶ Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 97.

⁴⁷ Cf. amongst others: Arthur Koestler, *The Trail of the Dinosaur and other essays*, (London: Collins, 1955); William H. Whyte Jr., *The Organization Man*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956); Vance Packard, *The Status Seekers. An Exploration of Class Behaviour in America*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961), originally published 1959; Bruno Bettelheim, *The Informed Heart. Anatomy in a Mass Age*, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960); Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), originally published 1964.

⁴⁸ Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World. A Novel*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), originally published 1932.

⁴⁹ George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), originally published 1949.

⁵⁰ B. F. Skinner, "Freedom and the Control of Men", *The American Scholar*, XXV, Winter (1955-1956), 47.

⁵¹ B. F. Skinner, *Walden Two*, 1948, (New York: Macmillan, 1962).

⁵² Skinner's first name was Burrhus.

Philosophy visit the behaviourally engineered community of Walden Two, the brainchild of a T. E. Frazier. During the course of the book, Frazier explains in great detail the workings of the community, persuading the narrator Burris that genuine happiness for its members has been achieved and convincing him of the merits of a life organized on the basis of behavioural science.

The arguments against such a society are represented, rather ineffectually, by the philosopher, Professor Castle, who objects that: "Walden Two is a marvel of efficient coordination - as efficient as an anthill [...] Intellectually Walden Two is as incapable of a spontaneous change of course as the life within the beehive"⁵³. However, his complaints, which are presented as fuzzy, idealistic nonsense with little empirical backing, are discounted one by one, as Frazier, an advocate of determinism who can state: "I deny that freedom exists at all"⁵⁴, conducts an extensive critique of modern society, which is seen as plagued by war, poverty, and destructive competition, all of which suppress the individual: "Each of us [...] is engaged in a pitched battle with the rest of mankind"⁵⁵. The Walden Two alternative seeks a "government based upon a science of human behavior", and is one which clearly puts the needs of the collective above the needs of the individual, while at the same time making all happy and productive: "We can *make* men adequate for group living - to the satisfaction of everybody"⁵⁶. Old modes of government based on domination or personal reward are no longer needed because the emphasis is always on "the whole group"⁵⁷. Indeed, such is the domination of the group over the individual that Frazier can boast in terms that had quite different connotations in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: "When I die [...] I shall cease to exist in every sense of the word"⁵⁸. This messianic figure⁵⁹ even goes so far as to proclaim that Walden Two has achieved: "Liberté! Egalité! Fraternité!"⁶⁰.

At the end of the novel, Castle stubbornly and, in the context of the book's general thrust, illogically, rejects the world of Walden Two. The narrator Burris, however, after much thought decides to reject modern society and return to help in the further development of the community; intrigued by the possibilities for the future suggested by Frazier:

⁵³ *Walden Two*, 253. The insect similes used by Castle (his very name is suggestive of a siege mentality of the unenlightened) are strikingly similar to the metaphors used by Hochwälder in *Donnerstag* [see below].

⁵⁴ *Walden Two*, 257.

⁵⁵ *Walden Two*, 104.

⁵⁶ *Walden Two*, 196.

⁵⁷ *Walden Two*, 112, 189.

⁵⁸ *Walden Two*, 240.

⁵⁹ Frazier even adopts at one stage, while overlooking the community, the position of Christ on the cross (295) and goes on to liken himself to God (297-300). This might be interpreted as an indication of megalomania and madness, were it not for the fact that the novel makes it clear that Frazier is on the right path.

⁶⁰ *Walden Two*, 92.

What remains to be done? [...] Well, what do you say to the design of personalities? [...] The control of temperament? [...] What do you say to the control of motivation, building the interests which will make men most productive and most successful?⁶¹

Hochwalder's answer to such alarming questions can be found in *Donnerstag*. In this drama the loss of individuality, indeed its voluntary surrender, is at the heart of the action. In the words of Elisabeth and Felix Auer:

[The play] faces us, the audience, with the most important and most urgent dilemma of the twentieth century: will the man of the future be submerged in the mass? Will the powers up there force his welfare on him and dictate to him, when and how he ought to be happy and what he ought to do, thus liberating him from the burden of his conscience, his soul and his will? - - Or will man continue as an individual, free to choose between good and evil, between grace and sin, Heaven and Hell?⁶²

Pomfrit's problems [see Chapter 1] stem from his feelings of isolation and of being lost in an increasing technological society, which provoke him to use Hochwalderian images from the insect world to describe his plight: "In den ameisenhaften Stadten trieb ich mich herum wie ein Nashorn in der Steppe, einsam wie ein Bandwurm im stinkenden Gedarm der Welt" (III, 128). Later he recognises that the solution offered by Belial is nothing short of being absorbed by this alienating world: "Fort! Ins Gewuhl, in den wimmelnden Ameisenhaufen, den dichtgedrangten Heringschwarm - der einzelne, der nach Bewahrung strebt, ist dort in guter Hut, blo anonyme Masse verleiht Schutz und Schirm!" (III, 195). Indeed, Wondrak professes his favourable view of the ant world, in comparison with that of humanity, at the outset:

Skandalos was die Leut fur einen Wirbel machen, man versteht sein eigenes Wort nicht, in einem Ameisenhaufen geht's vernunftiger zu, ich hab ein Buch daruber gelesen, da ist alles geordnet, keine Spur von Unrast und Durcheinander, dagegen der Mensch - seit einer Ewigkeit befa ich mich mit ihm und kenn mich noch immer nicht aus, es hangt angeblich mit dem Gehirn zusammen, ein Konstruktionsfehler⁶³ (*Donnerstag*, 123)

Zoological metaphors are also adopted by both the lonely Estrella: "[...] wer was Liebenswertes an mir fand, mut ein Narr sein, so einen gibt's nicht, und wenn es ihn gabe, wo sollt ich ihn finden, mitten in der Nacht unter lauter

⁶¹ *Walden Two*, 292.

⁶² Elisabeth Auer, and Felix L. Auer, "Translators' Preface", *Thursday. A Modern Mystery Play*, by Fritz Hochwalder, Trans. Elisabeth Auer and Felix L. Auer, Unpublished trans. Hochwalder Nachla, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien, 1967), 1.

⁶³ Hochwalder will return to this idea that the human make-up is fundamentally flawed in *Lazaretti oder Der Sabeltiger*.

wimmelnden Ameisen?" (III, 168), and even Frater Thomas wonders if this apparent development toward a collective, rather than individualistic, existence is not part of some greater plan: "Warum nicht Massensiedlungen, weshalb nicht Wohltat mit der Peitsche, und überhaupt: wer weiß, ob's nicht im höhern Sinn liegt, das Termitentum zu fördern [...]" (III, 190).

This concern about the increasing alienation of the individual in modern society is shared by other authors. Popper, while optimistically viewing the development toward an open society, sees the problems this can pose:

There are many people living in modern society who have no or extremely few, intimate personal contacts, who live in anonymity and isolation, and consequently in unhappiness. For although society has become abstract, the biological make-up of man has not changed much; men have social needs which they cannot satisfy in an abstract society⁶⁴.

It is even more striking just how well Bruno Bettelheim's concerns on modern society encapsulates the situation Pomfrit finds himself in:

[...] now that we are freer to enjoy life, we are deeply frustrated in our disappointment that the freedom and comfort, sought with such deep desire, do not give meaning and purpose to our lives [...] The tedium and dissatisfaction with life are becoming so great that many are getting ready to let freedom slip out of their hands. They feel it is all too complicated, too difficult to hold on to it, and to themselves. If meaning has gone out of their lives, then at least they wish not to be responsible for it, to let society carry the burden of failure and guilt⁶⁵.

The protagonist of *Donnerstag* identifies freedom as the root of his problems:

Vor allem: Freiheit! Staunen Sie nicht, Unterdrückung ist nicht das Schlimmste, sie schweißt die Menschen zusammen, eine gewisse Art von Freiheit ist gefährlicher, ich kann ein Lied davon singen, mein Beispiel ist signifikant [...] Wie sah meine Freiheit aus? - In einem freien Beruf, einer

⁶⁴ Popper, *The Spell of Plato*, 174-175. The notion that human biological development has not kept pace with technological and social advance is particularly important in *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*. Cf. Konrad Lorenz, *Das sogenannte Böse. Zur Naturgeschichte der Aggression*, 1963, (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1974).

⁶⁵ Bruno Bettelheim, *The Informed Heart. Anatomy in a Mass Age*, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960), vii-viii. It is certainly not beyond the realm of possibilities that Hochwälder was familiar with Bettelheim's work in this area, since much of the material contained in this book had been earlier published as articles, prior to the completion of *Donnerstag* (cf. Bettelheim, vi). Certainly, their ideas have much in common. Bettelheim uses his personal experiences in the concentration camps at Dachau and Buchenwald to explore the all pervasive ideology employed by the Nazis, which affected the behaviour of both persecutors and persecuted alike to suggest the dangers prevalent in modern mass society. Hochwälder notes the same when quoting from J. C. B. Mohr's account of life in Theresienstadt (*Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 68) to illustrate the "Phänomen des unbewußten Gewissenschwundes". Bettelheim even has a chapter entitled "Men Are Not Ants".

freien Welt, war ich frei von allem und jedem, frei bis zum Exzeß, frei bis zur Langweile [...]

(III, 127)

Later he wonders, full of despair: "Bin ich hoffnungslos zu lebenslänglicher Einzelhaft verurteilt, verschärft durch grenzenlose Freiheit?" (III, 153).

Bettelheim's analysis of the totalitarian solution to such problems also seems highly appropriate to *Donnerstag*:

During the transition from the relative freedom of late capitalism to an oppressive mass state, the central problem is one of inducing citizens, if necessary of forcing them, into conformity. Once created, the existence of such a state depends on citizens who are willing to give up personal identity and individualized ways of life and let themselves be managed [...]. The only way to guarantee such conformity at all times is to make sure that subjects conform of their own free will⁶⁶.

Maskeron emphasizes the importance of Pomfrit voluntarily choosing Belial, stressing to Wondrak that the architect is free to choose right up to the last minute (III, 150, 185); such a choice is vital for Belial, for the true conquest of humanity can only be achieved through its voluntary surrender:

Gewiß, wir könnten ihm die Rechnung präsentieren, ihn auslöschen, vernichten, doch hieße das nichts anderes, als unsere Ohnmacht eingestehn... Ich will ihn nicht als Märtyrer, ich will ihn lebend: seelenlos, genormt, prosperierend, vegetierend!

(III, 150)

Pomfrit's treatment is designed to serve as an example for others to seek "Heilung" from Belial (III, 137).

If Hochwälder's concerns have much in common with the fears about the direction of society expressed by others at the time, by far the biggest influence on his thinking and the play can be found in William H. Whyte's *The Organization Man*⁶⁷, a book which Hochwälder saw as ably describing the process of the sublimation of the individual into the masses⁶⁸. In this detailed study of American society, Whyte examines the growth of corporate and bureaucratic structures in the modern world and the effect of this on the individual. He sees the new demands of the workplace, with its emphasis on company loyalty and belonging to part of a wider team, as leading to a fundamental shift not just in the work ethic but social values in general: while lip service is still paid to the "American Dream" and notions of individual self-determination, increasingly community and group interests take precedence⁶⁹.

⁶⁶ Bettelheim, 103.

⁶⁷ William H. Whyte Jr., *The Organization Man*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956).

⁶⁸ Fritz Hochwälder, Brief an Ernst Waldinger, 16. Nov. 1962, Dokumentationsstelle für neuere österreichische Literatur, Wien.

⁶⁹ Vance Packard, in his study originally published in 1959, also expressed deep concern at

This is, according to Whyte, nothing less than the move from the Protestant Work Ethic, which so shaped early capitalist development, to the "Social Ethic", which he defines as follows:

Its major propositions are three: a belief in the group as the source of creativity; a belief in "belongingness" as the ultimate need of the individual; and a belief in the application of science to achieve the belongingness. [...] the gist can be paraphrased thus: Man exists as a unit of society. Of himself, he is isolated, meaningless; only as he collaborates with others does he become worth while, for by sublimating himself in the group, he helps produce a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts⁷⁰.

The latter two propositions are at the heart of *Donnerstag*: the belief in the need for belongingness, which is seen as the answer to Pomfrit's feelings of isolation; and the faith that through science and technology, as represented by Maskeron, this problem can be resolved.

Whyte further expands on this emphasis on belongingness:

Many a contemporary prescription for utopia can be summarized if you cross out the name of one group and substitute another in the following charge: Society has broken down; the family, the church, the community, the schools, business - each has failed to give the individual the belongingness he needs and thus it is now the task of _____ group to do the job. It is fortunate that there are so many groups; with such competition for the individual psyche it is difficult for any one of them to land the franchise.

But ideologically these pleas do not cancel each other out. For there is always the common thread that a man must belong and that he must be unhappy if he does not belong rather completely [...] for the people who must endure the tensions of independence there is no condolence; only the message that the tensions are sickness - either in themselves or in society. It does not make any difference whether the Good Society is to be represented by a union or by a corporation or by a church; it is to be a society unified and purged of conflict⁷¹.

The situation Whyte portrays of an individual desperately seeking belongingness is apt for Pomfrit, for whom the Protestant work ethic no longer seems appropriate (III, 127), and who provides a list of all the different groups and

how the "American Dream" and individual ambition and desires for self-determination were more and more being thwarted by a society becoming increasingly rigid and conformist within clearly defined social strata, cf. Vance Packard, *The Status Seekers. An Exploration of Class Behaviour in America*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961).

⁷⁰ Whyte, 7.

⁷¹ Whyte, 45-46.

lifestyles that have failed to provide meaning to his existence: "[...] was war ich nicht alles: Freimaurer, Sozialist, Antialkoholiker, Vegetarier, Methodist, Reaktionär, Whiskysäufer, Europäer, Weltbürger, Nihilist, Existenzialist, zuletzt gar nichts [...]" (III, 125).

Yet, as Whyte documents, many seem happy to adjust to modern social dictates and sacrifice personal autonomy for a trouble-free life, which is bureaucratically organized both in the workplace and at home, and which increasingly means a life in new comfortable satellite suburbs, filled with similarly designed homes, are populated by families of similar backgrounds, similar incomes and similar values and ideas. In short, it is a picture of organized and welcomed conformity.

Where there are conflicts between individuals and the wider community, Whyte notes the prevalence of the disturbing belief that these may be resolved by what he terms "Scientism": social engineering based on a precise science of man. He sums up this utopian faith in terms reminiscent of both Popper's sentiments in *The Open Society and its Enemies* and the concerns expressed in "Kann die Freiheit überleben?":

What kind of society is to be engineered? Some critics of social engineering are sure that what is being cooked up for us is a socialistic paradise, a radically new, if not brave, world, alien to every tradition of man. This is wrong. Lump together the social engineers' prescriptions for the new society and you find they are anything but radical. Boiled down, what they ask for is an environment in which everyone is tightly knit into a belongingness with one another; one in which there is no restless wandering but rather the deep emotional security that comes from total integration with the group. Radical? It is like nothing so much as the Middle Ages. [...] The job, to paraphrase, is to re-create the belongingness of the Middle Ages. What with the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, and other calamities, the job is immensely more difficult than it was in those simpler days. But with the new scientific techniques we can solve the problem. What we must do is to learn consciously to achieve what once came naturally. We must form an elite of skilled leaders who will guide men back, benevolently, to group belongingness⁷².

He goes on to further define this "administrative elite":

[...] people trained to recognize that what man really wants most is group solidarity even if he does not realize it himself. They won't push him around; they won't even argue with him - unfettered as they will be of "prejudice and emotion", they won't have any philosophy, other than co-operation, to argue about. They will adjust him. Through the scientific application of human relations, these neutralist technicians will guide him into satisfying solidarity with the group so skilfully and unobtrusively

⁷² Whyte, 32-33.

that he will scarcely realize how the benefaction has been accomplished⁷³.

While Whyte does not believe that such social engineering will ever be able to deliver what it sets out to achieve, he still sees it as posing a very grave threat: "What I am arguing is that the real impact of scientism is upon our values. The danger, to put it another way, is not man being dominated but man surrendering"⁷⁴. He paints a picture of a society in which the individual happily abdicates more and more personal autonomy in return for a secure and affluent lifestyle⁷⁵ in a world where conformity and normalcy are desirable and the individual becomes victim of the "tyranny of the majority". It is not surprising, given Whyte's concerns about the direction of society that he, like Hochwalder, finds confirmation in Tocqueville's nineteenth century work on the United States⁷⁶, for like Tocqueville he sees a danger in the apparent benevolent treatment the new leadership of society bestows on the individual:

Held up as the end-all of organization leadership, the skills of human relations easily tempt the new administrator into the practice of a tyranny more subtle and more pervasive than that which he means to supplant. No one wants to see the old authoritarian return, but at least it could be said of him that what he wanted primarily from you was your sweat. The new man wants your soul⁷⁷.

The similarities with what Whyte describes and the position of Maskeron in *Donnerstag* are evident. This modern Grand Inquisitor⁷⁸, who in keeping with modern society is no longer a religious representative but a "Groingenieur" for the corporation Belial Inc., "halb Techniker, halb Psychiater" (III, 135) promises: "Wir werden Sie [Pomfrit] wunschgema binnen drei Tagen zu einem gesunden, frohen und nutzlichen Mitglied der Gesellschaft machen" (III, 137). As Whyte suggests, Pomfrit's problems are to be treated as a sickness. Just what the cure entails is made quite clear and is nothing less than the destruction of the human soul, which is seen as the cause of all unhappiness (III, 138). Maskeron is striving for the: "Erlosung des Menschen vom Menschen" (III, 138). What is offered in return for the voluntary sacrifice of Pomfrit's soul is an organized happiness, which will be an example to encourage

⁷³ Whyte, 36.

⁷⁴ Whyte, 32.

⁷⁵ Similar concerns were later expressed by Herbert Marcuse "[...] there is no reason to insist on self-determinism if the administered life is the comfortable and even the 'good' life" (*One Dimensional Man*, 49).

⁷⁶ Whyte, 5; 395-396.

⁷⁷ Whyte, 397.

⁷⁸ Hochwalder does indeed describe him as "eine Art von modernem Grossinquisitor" (Fritz Hochwalder, "Donnerstag. Ein modernes Mysterienspiel von Fritz Hochwalder", ts. with hand corrections, Hochwalder Nachla, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien).

others to surrender their anachronistic individuality, this "im wohlverstandenen Interesse der gesamten zivilisierten Menschheit!" (III, 139). So close is Maskeron's approach to that described by Whyte that he even uses the examples of personality tests provided in *The Organization Man* (III, 140-141)⁷⁹.

Pomfrit, then, should enjoy the well-organized, surprise-free life of conformity which so appeals to the young corporate men of Whyte's study. Kormoran elaborates on the vision offered: "Der noch nie dagewesene Traum vom höchsten Durchschnitt, die Zeit des Individuums ist vorbei [...] die Menschheit fordert von uns Mittelmaß, entseligendes Mittelmaß! - will heißen: Eines für alle!" (III, 154). It is a trade that has considerable attraction to Pomfrit, who is tempted by the material offerings of Belial, themselves a reflection of the mass production of the modern age: the cover-girl Amalie, "*ein Traum und Zauberweib, wie einem Titelblatt des 'Esquire' entstieg*" (III, 141), whose charms are limited to the external image; the mass-produced house and modern conveniences offered by Kormoran, reflecting Pomfrit's position in society and identical in every way to Persenbeug's home (III, 156); and the promise of space travel and exploration as a means of escaping "vom inhaltsleer gewordenen Erdendasein" (III, 157). Taken in by the images presented by Maskeron, and without probing their substance, Pomfrit, at least initially, seems prepared to accept the premise that "Norm ist unsere Rettung" (III, 144). However, despite the obvious appeal of Belial's offer, he still has the choice to refuse it. This is again in accord with Whyte, who maintains that the future still lies in individuals' hands:

The organization man is not in the grip of vast social forces about which it is impossible for him to do anything; the options are there, and with wisdom and foresight he can turn the future away from the dehumanized collective that so haunts our thoughts. He may not. But he can. He must fight The Organization [...] for the demands for his surrender are constant and powerful, and the more he has come to like the life of organization the more difficult does he find it to resist these demands, or even to recognize them. It is wretched, dispiriting advice to hold before him the dream that ideally there need be no conflict between him and society. There always is; there always must be. Ideology cannot wish it away; the peace of mind offered by organization remains a surrender, and no less so for being offered in benevolence. That is the problem⁸⁰.

The choice for Pomfrit is simple: he can choose the genuine love offered by another human being, in the shape of Estrella, the antithesis of the cover-girl, Amalie; the promise of faith that comes from within rather than that imposed from without, as advocated by Kapora; and, as championed by Thomas, the belief in the importance of the individual instead of the collective. The contrast

⁷⁹ Whyte, 180-181.

⁸⁰ Whyte, 404.

between this latter position and that espoused by Belial is nowhere made clearer than when Maskeron tries to divert Thomas from helping Pomfrit with instructions to serve the wider good:

MASKERON: [...] Von heut an dienen Sie der Gemeinschaft, errichten im höchsten Auftrag, versehn mit unbeschränkter Vollmacht, ein gigantisches Sozialwerk, Konzentration subversiver Elemente alle Art in modernsten Massensiedlungen, vorbildlich gelenkt und betreut von einer Caritas, vor der die Menschheit erzittern soll!

FRATER THOMAS: Gemeinschaft? Masse? - Mein Glaube, meine Kraft gehört dem einzelnen -

MASKERON *schneidend*: Mir wohlbekannt! - Dem nichtswürdigen, überspannten, bei lebendigem Leib verfaulten Individuum, das nicht anderes ersehnt, als von der Last seines verfluchten "Ich" befreit zu werden! Hände weg, Frater! Der Mensch gehört uns - wir dulden keinen Eingriff in unsere Mission!
(III, 182)

Hope for Pomfrit comes not only from this external opposition to Belial, but also from the internal difficulties which suggest that the road to social engineering is not as smooth as Maskeron would like: there is the chaotic appearance of Kormoran's fantastic, but alas very noisy modern appliances (III, 146); Persenbeug, despite all his talk of solving mankind's problems, cannot escape the common cold (III, 158); and Wondrak, himself hardly an exemplary employee forced to supplement his income by working in a circus, must battle to keep Amalie in line (III, 147; 186).

It is also revealed that Belial has failed in previous attempts to destroy humanity with its involvement in the Holocaust (III, 175), and while that dark chapter of history came close to destroying Frater Thomas' faith in people it could not crush it completely. Even Maskeron cannot suppress a grudging admiration for the humanity he hopes to destroy:

Was ahnen Sie [Wondrak] in Ihrer Niedrigkeit von des Menschen unermeßlicher Größe? Nichts ist ihm vorbestimmt, nichts kann seinen Willen auslöschen, er ist frei in seiner Wahl, frei bis zum letzten Atemzug [...]
(III, 185)

Nevertheless, while there are grounds for hope, the question whether Pomfrit, representative for the wider society, can be saved remains unanswered. During the closing scenes he remains unwilling to take responsibility for himself, first hoping he may avoid making a decision at all (III, 194) and then as the curtain falls praying for guidance to a god in whom he does not believe. Just what an individual who opts for Belial may become is demonstrated in the sequel to *Donnerstag, 1003*.

In examining *1003* it is interesting to compare the published and performed play with its "vorläufige Fassung", "Tausendunddrei. Schauspiel in drei Ak-

ten”⁸¹, written in 1962. With some justification, Bortenschlager has likened the development between this earlier version and the final product to Hochwalder’s earlier play, *Das heilige Experiment*, which evolved considerably from the earlier typescript, “Die Jesuiten in Paraguay”⁸². Certainly, the transformation between the two is quite marked, nevertheless, a brief examination of “Tausendunddrei” helps illuminate some of the ideas behind the completed play.

The most striking difference between “Tausendunddrei” and *1003* is the realistic setting of the former play. Its protagonist, Dr. Dolus, is a notorious womaniser, famous for his monthly sex parties, and who is surrounded by other characters who have succumbed to his soulless world of self-gratification. From a newspaper cutting found in the *Nachlaß* it appears that this character, and by extension the character of Bloner in *1003*, was based in part on a Berlin psychiatrist, who was tried for immoral behaviour when it became known that he organised orgies at his home and encouraged female patients to attend, supposedly to help cure their feelings of inadequacy⁸³.

Dolus is aptly described by the drunken and cynical poet Fenigl who sees him as the prototype of the new man: “Dr. Franz Dolus - unangreifbar, unüberwindlich; ein Mensch, der keiner mehr ist, ein Mensch ohne Gewissen; Dolus unter Dolussen” (“Tausendunddrei”, 6). Yet Fenigl is honest enough to admit: “am liebsten war ich wie Sie: Millionschwer und federleicht in einem: Amusement und Gleichgultigkeit; Gleichgultigkeit und Amusement, alles andere steht fur Dreck!” (“Tausendunddrei”, 6)⁸⁴. Dolus later confirms this point to Florence, who is intrigued at how a man who is “keineswegs seduisant” (“Tausendunddrei”, 15), can have such success with women: “Antwort: vermoge ungeheuchelter, tiefinnerster Gleichgultigkeit” (“Tausendunddrei”, 16). Just how effective this proves to be is shown when he can seduce her, despite her initial hostility toward him (“Tausendunddrei”, 50).

His appeal can also be found in the isolation and emptiness in which individuals find themselves in the modern world. Florence finds little comfort in her marriage to a diplomat:

Mein Herz birst vor Einsamkeit - ich liebe nichts und niemanden [...]
Kein lebendes Wesen um mich: kein Freund, keine Freundin, kein
Geschopf [...] ich hab lang genug verzichtet - ich begehre Umarmung und

⁸¹ Fritz Hochwalder, “Tausendunddrei. Schauspiel in drei Akten”, ts., 1962, Hochwalder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien. A typescript of *1003* with hand annotations can also be found in the *Nachlaß*, but it contains no significant differences from the published version.

⁸² Bortenschlager, *Der Dramatiker Fritz Hochwalder*, 137.

⁸³ Anonym, “Berliner Sittenprozeß: Der schone ‘Dr. Till’ und die Frauen”, date and newspaper unknown, Hochwalder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien.

⁸⁴ This description is similar to that used by Valmont in *1003* to describe his creation: “Amusement und Gleichgultigkeit, Gleichgultigkeit und Amusement, nichts anderes zahlt” (III, 207), and likewise Valmont is somewhat envious of Bloner [see below].

Karl Muselmann also seems unable to establish relationships, drifts from one woman to another⁸⁵, and is even unable to remember with whom he has slept previously ("Tausendunddrei", 3-4; 70). He relies on Dolus to satisfy at least his carnal desires by providing him with different women. Even Horacek, who despite his association with Dolus still shows some scruples, is nevertheless frightened of what life would be without him: "Was fang ich an, ohne dich, wohin soll ich... ich bin draussen, draussen... Kein Glaube, kein Ideal, kein Beruf, nichts, woran ich mich halten könnt [...]" ("Tausendunddrei", 21). All three turn to the doctor to fill voids in their lives, in much the same way as Pomfrit turns to Belial.

Yet succumbing to the pleasures Dolus offers can be self-destructive, particularly for women. His *modus operandi* is quite simple: he seduces a female, reveals himself to be a rogue but invites her to one of his parties, where at the stroke of midnight an orgy begins, reducing her, in the words of Fenigl "zur perfekten Hur" ("Tausendunddrei", 7). This corruption is evident in Dolus' two female helpers, Puppi and Pippi, who are indistinguishable from one another except for hair colour, and who were introduced to his parties in exactly the same way ("Tausendunddrei", 1-2), and in the woman who rejects Muselmann because of her experiences at such parties: "Sie ist den Massenbetrieb bereits so gewöhnt, dass sie es mit einem Einzelnen nicht mehr kann - sie sagt: zu zweit findet sie es geradezu unsittlich" ("Tausendunddrei", 35).

The only check to Dolus' decadence and corrupting influence is the law, which he is very careful not to break. As Fenigl observes: "[...] dabei nie und nirgends die geringste juristische Blösse - gelernt ist gelernt! -: keine Sanktion ohne Gesetz: kein Tatbestand, keine Strafe [...]" ("Tausendunddrei", 7), for any legal compromise would be a sign of human nature: "[...] wer sich straffällig macht, erweist sich eo ipso als anständiger Mensch, will heissen: als Trottel!" ("Tausendunddrei", 6); an idea later to be taken up by Valmont in *1003*⁸⁶. This does not mean that Dolus will not contemplate crime, but rather that he gets others, particularly Kallinger, to do his dirty work. Indeed, with the prophetic insight so often favoured by Hochwälder, he tells Horacek how he would deal with any woman who refused his brush-off and tried to ensnare him: "[...] ins Nichts mit ihr, noch am gleichen Tag, ohne Tatbestand" ("Tausendunddrei", 8).

Herein, however, lies a major variation from *1003*, for whereas Bloner does seem invincible, an absolute, amoral "Nichtmensch", Dolus is initially thrown off balance by Sonja's attempt to defeat him ("Tausendunddrei", 26-28). As a result, he is surprisingly sharp with Puppi and Pippi ("Tausendunddrei", 31), shows no interest in the latest female victim Horacek has discovered for him, broods, and even, although having earlier claimed not to drink ("Tausendund-

⁸⁵ This is a similar complaint to that made by Pomfrit, who was likewise successful in the professional sphere but a miserable failure in his private life (III, 127).

⁸⁶ Cf. III, 207; 211.

drei", 22), does so with Fenigl ("Tausendunddrei", 33).

It is the resulting conversation which is crucial to Dolus' decision to have Sonja killed, for in explaining why he does not write, despite his talent, Fenigl paints a bleak picture of life in mass society, in the "Termitenschwarm" ("Tausendunddrei", 34), and affirms that Dolus' approach to the modern world is the only appropriate one:

DOLUS: Wie ist das mit dem Menschen?

FENIGL (das Glas in der Hand): So einfach, dass es die Mehrzahl der Bildungsideoten nicht begreift: Geist ist gleich Wort, das Wort ist menschlich, der Mensch stirbt aus - nein, er wird umgebracht: erstickt, erdrückt, zermalmt, zerstampft [...] zivilisierte Ungeheuer zertrampeln ungestraft das Menschenbild - der Rest wird unkenntlich: ekles Gemengsel aus Blut und Dreck - und dafür schreiben? [...] Wer sich auf Seite des Menschen stellt, ergreift Partei für den Verlierer. - - Keine Lust, Doktor. Andere vielleicht - ich nicht [...]

DOLUS: Mensch sein, heisst: verlieren?

FENIGL: Hoffnungslos, Herr, bis auf die Unterhosen! - - Seit uns beigebracht wurde, dass alles erlaubt ist, schlechthin alles - zu gewissen Zeiten, unter gewissen Umständen! - seither scheint sonnenklar, dass diese Welt zufällig existiert: keine Vorsehung, kein Plan, nichts, purer Zufall! - Sogar das Urverbrechen verliert an Bedeutung - nur zu, ihr Luftküsse! ohne Gewissen kein echter Mord; und Gewissen - was ist das? - Hauptsache, man respektiert die Satzungen des jeweiligen code pénal, Buchstaben für Buchstaben. - Das ist die zeitgemässe Kunst, die Sie [Hochwälder's emphasis] beherrschen, Meister Dolus - [...] ich resigniere.

DOLUS (schiebt sein Glas weg): Sie haben recht.

("Tausendunddrei", 34-35)

In agreeing with Fenigl and significantly pushing away his glass, Dolus confirms his earlier approach to life, and returns to his old self ("Tausendunddrei", 35). Clearly he has no intention of being a loser for as he told Sonja earlier: "Gewinne ich, gewinne ich alles; verliere ich, verliere ich nichts" ("Tausendunddrei", 27).

With his resolve stiffened, Dolus puts into place an elaborate plan to rid himself of Sonja, which involves having her trampled by elephants, framing Kallinger for her murder, and providing himself with an alibi through his liaison with Florence. As in the later version [see below], even the attempt by her grandfather to seek revenge and make him repent must fail ("Tausendunddrei", 74-75), and answers in the negative the old man's earlier question: "Gibts keine Ordnung mehr, die den Schwachen schützt?" ("Tausendunddrei", 42).

Although the closing events are enough to reform Horacek: "ich stell mich auf die Seite der Verlierer", Dolus is triumphant and remorseless as he hurries off to his next sexual conquest ("Tausendunddrei", 76).

Although at the end Dolus can be seen as the victorious *Nichtmensch*, for most of the play he still appears decidedly human, if very immoral (as opposed to amoral like Bloner), and nowhere more so than in his confrontation with Sonja. In the manner in which he deals with this crisis “Tausendunddrei” is more similar to *Donnerstag* than to *1003*, in that it shows the path to becoming a *Nichtmensch* rather than the finished result in action.

The difficulty that needed to be overcome in *1003* was how to bring a *Nichtmensch* to life on stage, when the theatre traditionally needs characters with which the audience can identify. It is a dilemma with which the dramatist Valmont grapples at the start of the play:

VALMONT *auf dem Tonband*: Wäre er doch wie die alten Bühnenhelden
- ein Schurke, Mörder, Schuft... Frevler, Unentschlossener,
Verblendeter - sowas stirbt pflichtgemäß im letzten Akt, Apotheose,
Vorhang, Ende.

VALMONT: Bedauere: nicht im Repertoire.

VALMONT *auf dem Tonband*: Im Leben freilich treibt er's ungeniert...
Im Leben, ja... aber auf der Bühne... (Leise:) ... der Nichtmensch...
auf der Bühne... schwer... schwierig... Unnütze Bedenken, fort damit!
- Der Nichtmensch muß erscheinen - hier im Atelier! [...] Leg dich
hin und träum! - Nur zwischen Traum und Wachen wird die Figur
lebendig, vor dem Verstand nimmt sie Reißaus... (III, 203)

Hochwälder's solution is a return to the night world of his *Herberge* and *Der verschwundene Mond* to create a partly surreal atmosphere in which the improbable and unreal can unfold, illuminating a reality that may be obscured by the cold light of day. In this enclosed world between reality and imagination the *Nichtmensch* can appear before Valmont.

Following on from *Donnerstag, 1003* is a striking departure from the stylistically conservative, traditional, well-made plays for which Hochwälder was known. Nevertheless, as he emphasized regarding the earlier drama, it too draws on several literary and dramatic models. For the first time in a published play, although elements can be found in the earlier dramas, “Jehr” and “Der Prozess”, Hochwälder uses the Jekyll and Hyde motif, to which he later returns in the television version of *Befehl*; Bloner is Valmont's alter ego, his dark side let loose: “Der Nichtmensch: Projektion der eignen Niedertracht!” (III, 245). Several theatrical precedents are also evident, indeed one critic has complained that the play is overloaded with symbolism and allusions⁸⁷. The use by Valmont of tape recordings to converse with himself has led several commentators⁸⁸ to draw comparisons with Beckett's *Krapp's Last Tape*⁸⁹,

⁸⁷ Hermann Dannecker, “Österreich in vielen Farben”, *Mannheimer Morgen*, 19. März 1970.

⁸⁸ A point noted by: Rudolf U. Klaus, “Hochwälder und sein ‘Nicht-Mensch’ (Zur Uraufführung von 1003)”, Programmheft des Theaters in der Josefstadt [1003] Wien. Nr. 8,

a fact acknowledged in correspondence by the author, who considered his use of hi-fidelity the more dramatic⁹⁰. The appearance of Bloner, Valmont's creation also suggests Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*⁹¹, in which the characters of a play that was never written take independent action to seek their moment on the stage. The comments of one of these characters, the father, aptly describe what occurs in *1003*:

When a character is born he immediately assumes such an independence even of his own author that everyone can imagine him in scores of situations that his author hadn't even thought of putting him in, and he sometimes acquires a meaning that his author never dreamed of giving him⁹².

Others have seen the influence of *Faust* in the play and the relationship between Valmont and Bloner as analogous to that between Dr. Faust and Mephistopheles⁹³. Certainly, Bloner appears Mephisto-like at Valmont's request and the duel that develops between the two takes on all the elements of a struggle for Valmont's very soul, as was the case in *Donnerstag*, also influenced by the Faustian tradition [see Chapter 1].

The most obvious allusion is to the Don Juan legend⁹⁴: the title of the play is the number of lovers Don Juan was reputed to have had in Spain⁹⁵. The

1963/64 and Harper, "Tradition and Experiment in the Drama of Fritz Hochwalder", 48.

⁸⁹ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp's Last Tape*. In: The Complete Dramatic Works, (London: Faber and Faber, 1986), 213-223 [originally published in 1958].

⁹⁰ Fritz Hochwalder, Brief an Hugo [?], 15. Okt. 1963, Hochwalder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien.

⁹¹ Cf. Klaus, "Hochwalder und sein 'Nicht-Mensch' (Zur Urauffuhrung von 1003)"; Dannecker, "osterreich in vielen Farben"; and Paul Blaha, "Rein dramaturgisch eine Niete", *Kurier* [Wien], 10. Jan. 1964, Bortenschlager, *Der Dramatiker Fritz Hochwalder*, 143.

⁹² Luigi Pirandello, *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, 1921, Trans. John Linstrum, (London: Eyre Methuen, 1979), 54. Hochwalder's attitude to his own work would seem to have much in common with these sentiments: "Bestehen bleibt die Zeugenschaft der Stucke, die sich im naturlichen Prozeß vom Autor losgelost haben und - wie weibliche Kinder - entweder ein gluckhaftes oder mißratenes Eigenleben fuhren" - *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 99. Likewise, Bloner asks Valmont: "Was willst du: die Geschopfe entziehn sich dem Erfinder, drehn ihm 'ne Nase, so auch hier..." (III, 224).

⁹³ Cf. Klaus, "Hochwalder und sein 'Nicht-Mensch'"; Dannecker, "osterreich in vielen Farben"; Bortenschlager, *Der Dramatiker Fritz Hochwalder*, 143.

⁹⁴ Cf. Klaus, "Hochwalder und sein 'Nicht-Mensch'"; Blaha, "Rein dramaturgisch eine Niete"; Bortenschlager, *Der Dramatiker Fritz Hochwalder*, 134-136; Murphy, 203; Brigitte Wittmann, "Tausendunddrei", *Don Juan. Darstellung und Deutung*, Hrsg. Wittmann, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976), 394-395.

⁹⁵ The fascination with the Don Juan story, shared, of course by others such as Horvath and Frisch, persisted up until the time of Hochwalder's death in 1986 when he was working on an uncompleted comedy entitled: "Leporello sucht einen besseren Herrn. Ein dramatischer Jux in drei Akten". Only the first two acts were completed in which Leporello starts out from the lines given him by Da Ponte: "Einen besseren Herrn zu suchen/ will ich ins Wirtshaus gehn". After recounting the story of Don Giovanni's demise to the patrons of the tavern he does indeed find a better master, the librettist, Graf Alfonso Minato. However, if Don Giovanni was guilty of being

fact that this symbolic figure, representing Don Juan's long list of crimes, has been reduced to a material possession is a point not lost on Brigitte Wittmann:

Hochwalder hat die auch von ihm selbst als magisch empfundene Zahl im gewissen Sinne profaniert, weil er sie zu einem polizeilichen Kennzeichen degradierte. Die Erfolgsziffer wurde zum Etikett eines Statussymbols, aber sie hat dadurch kaum etwas von ihrem Nimbus verloren, denn sie ist, "dem Sterblichen sonst unerreichbar", hier "durch Beziehung acquiriert"⁹⁶.

The name given to the car, Cerberus, that of the mythical three-headed dog that guarded Hades, and the reference to it as a "veritable Hollenmaschine" (III, 212; 240) suggest Don Juan's famous "Hollenfahrt", an allusion which is reinforced by the efforts of Valmont to use the machine to trap Bloner in a crime, thereby re-humanizing him (III, 215; 239-242). In choosing a car to represent the lack of moral scruples of his modern Don Juan, Hochwalder was probably influenced by a newspaper article published in 1962⁹⁷, which examined the increasing role in daily life of motorized transport and the psychological effect this was having on individuals. It was noted with concern that while the car gave people greater freedom and strength, criminal offences committed in vehicles, even those that resulted in death were not viewed as seriously as other crimes such as theft and murder. The article concluded: "Wir stehen vor dem erschutternden Ergebnis, da maschinelle Krafte, die dem Menschen von auen zu wachsen, seine angeborenen menschlichen Krafte zu uberdecken scheinen". With the sporty, modern, but potentially murderous Cerberus, Hochwalder would seem to have found an ideal symbol for his "durchtechnisierte[n] Hominide[n]"⁹⁸.

Valmont's adversary, whom Hochwalder described as "die Erscheinungsform des barocken Don Juan"⁹⁹, like his literary model proves to have no feelings of guilt or remorse for his actions, refusing to repent when confronted by the great-grandfather of the dead Sonja, played by Valmont, even when apparently fatally wounded (III, 232-233). As Bortenschlager has noted¹⁰⁰, the old man,

obsessed by the opposite sex, Graf Alfonso goes to the other extreme, burying himself in his work to the exclusion of female companionship. Leporello quickly attributes his master's poor health to this unnatural state of affairs and sets about arousing the Graf's desires, albeit with no success by the end of the second act. From what can be gleaned from the uncompleted typescript it would seem that the play is thematically more closely linked to "Die verschleierte Frau" rather than *1003* in its portrayal of the two extremes in Leporello's masters: the base desire of Don Giovanni and the idealised, unrealistic notions of love represented in Graf Alfonso's poetry.

⁹⁶ Wittmann, "Tausendunddrei", 395. Cf. III, 247.

⁹⁷ Ernst Hornickel, "Auto und Mensch. Alles im Leben hat einen Preis - auch die Motorisierung", *Die Presse* [Wien], 12. Mai 1962. This was found in the *Nachla* together with the material on the play.

⁹⁸ *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 68; 98.

⁹⁹ Fritz Hochwalder, Brief an Hug [?], 15. Okt. 1963, Hochwalder Nachla, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien.

¹⁰⁰ Bortenschlager, *Der Dramatiker Fritz Hochwalder*, 136.

whose name von Stein is surely chosen deliberately, equates to the "steinernen Gast", the "man of stone" of the legend, but, unlike his literary precedent, when he intercedes at the end he no longer has the power to condemn this modern Juan to hell¹⁰¹. In the modern world, which the *Nichtmensch* is in danger of dominating, the old faith in divine judgment is no longer valid. Dostoevsky's influence, already noted in regard to *Donnerstag* and referred to in "Kann die Freiheit überleben?", is also evident in *1003*, for there is some similarity between the play and the chapter from *The Brothers Karamazov*, in which Ivan hallucinates that he is visited by the devil¹⁰². As in Hochwälder's play, Dostoevsky's character is visited in his room at night by an adversary that is nothing more than a creation of his own fantasy, representing his dark side: "You are the embodiment of myself, but of just one side of me... of my thoughts and feelings, but only the most loathsome and stupid of them"¹⁰³. Yet having appeared as a product of the imagination, this apparition is capable of original behaviour not anticipated by his creator¹⁰⁴. Dostoevsky's devil prophesies a world in which the old morality will be destroyed:

In my opinion, there is no need to destroy anything, one need only destroy the idea of God in mankind, that's where the business should start! [...] Once man has renounced God, one and all [...] then the entire old world view will fall of itself [...], and, above all, the entire former morality, and everything will be new. People will come together in order to take from life all that it can give, but, of course, for happiness and joy in this world only. Man will be exalted with the spirit of divine, titanic pride, and the man-god will appear. Man, his will and his science no longer limited, conquering nature every hour, will thereby every hour experience such lofty delight as will replace for him all his former hopes of heavenly delight¹⁰⁵.

This vision of the future is very similar to that offered by Maskeron and Per-senbeug to Pomfrit (Cf. III, 138; 158), and represented by Bloner, the *Nicht-mensch*. The view expressed by Dostoevsky's devil on conscience is that it serves merely to make decent people suffer while the unscrupulous escape¹⁰⁶.

¹⁰¹ In "Tausendunddrei" the plot sticks even closer to the parameters of the Don Juan legend, with the telling conversation occurring at the party to which von Stein is indeed a guest, cf. "Tausendunddrei", 68-69; 72-75.

¹⁰² Dostoevsky, "The Devil. Ivan Fyodorovich's Nightmare", *The Brothers Karamazov*, 634-650.

¹⁰³ Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, 637.

¹⁰⁴ Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, 639.

¹⁰⁵ Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, 648-649.

¹⁰⁶ Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, 643.

The devil disappears when Ivan's younger brother knocks at the door, but has succeeded in making Ivan believe in his existence¹⁰⁷, just as in *1003* the appearance of Valmont's new neighbour at the door would seem to confirm the truth of his active imagination (III, 245-247).

1003 is, as Hochwalder makes clear in his essay "Über mein Theater", intended as a sequel to *Donnerstag*, and Bloner is none other than Pomfrit after he has accepted Belial's offer¹⁰⁸; it is no accident that he is referred to as a former architect (III, 203). In another essay, "Vom Versagen des Dramas in unserer Zeit", Hochwalder describes his *Nichtmensch*:

[...] Der zeitgemae Prototyp, Reprasentant der gegenwartigen, post-nihilistischen Epoche, seines Zeichens durchtechnisierter Hominide, ist kaum als Mensch ansprechbar, dazu fehlen ihm vor allem Fehler, er ist kein blutrunstiger Mordgeselle, wie es vermutlich sein vor zehn Millionen Jahren lebender Artgenosse, der Oreopithecus, war; dafur ist ihm alles erlaubt, was keinen juristischen Tatbestand schafft, das Sittengesetz ist eine alte Masche, Glaube so gleichgultig wie Unglauben, Gott und das Nichts einerlei, die letzten Glaubigen, die Nihilisten, belachelt er mild - altvaterische Herren, Rauschebarte¹⁰⁹.

His creator in *1003* is better able to describe him by what he is not, rather than what he is: "Sehr einfach: kein Unmensch. Kein Bosewicht. Kein Anti-Mensch. Kein Sadist, kein ubler Psychopath [...] vielmehr: unbelastet, unbeschwert... gebildet, wohlgezogen... geistvoll, charmant... erfolgreich, arriert..." (III, 203). He is no monster, capable of immoral acts, rather a cold, calculating amoral creature, able to protect his own interests by whatever expedient measures necessary, bound only by the restrictions placed on him by the law.

However, the full ramifications of this fact escape Valmont, who hopes to return Bloner to humanity by ensnaring him with a crime: "Wer ein Verbrechen setzt, erweist sich eo ipso als Mensch, Ur-Mensch, heilbar, rettbar" (III, 207). This point is acknowledged by Bloner, who at the same time sees no reason necessary for committing any felony: "Wer heutzutage ein Verbrechen setzt, handelt hoffnungslos anstandig - total veraltete Moralgesinnung so etwas, nur ein Idiot uberliefert sich der Strafjustiz, haben wir das notig?" (III, 211). Such a mentality is clearly what Hochwalder felt to be at the core of the atrocities committed under the Nazis¹¹⁰, for a soulless individual with no conscience to guide his actions need only be guided by personal desires and judicial dictates, and would have no compunction in

¹⁰⁷ Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, 650.

¹⁰⁸ Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 97-98. Mention of this choice is quite explicit in the play (III, 204).

¹⁰⁹ Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 68-69. Hochwalder quotes from this in his later essay, "Über mein Theater", *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 98.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 65-69.

contributing to the Holocaust, as Bloner readily admits:

VALMONT: [...] Nehmen wir eine Million - nein, nicht die Summe, den Betrag - vielmehr: die Menschenziffer.

BLONER: Menschenziffer?

VALMONT: Statistische Zahl, minderes Gesindel, Lebendgewicht mit Haut und Haar... Kein Gesetz, das die Horde schützt; und wenn sie dir im Weg ist, wenn Lebenlassen Unannehmlichkeit, Extermination Vorteil bedeutet, dann - ins Nichts mit der Million?

BLONER: Selbstredend.

VALMONT: Ohne Federlesen?

BLONER: Klar.

VALMONT: Nichts danach, kein Katzenjammer?

BLONER: Wozu?

VALMONT: Nichts, wirklich nichts?

BLONER: Auf Ehre.

(III, 211-212)

The implication, emphasized by Bloner's appearance in the flesh at the end of the play, is that, since such actions have indeed been carried out, without any noticeable outpouring of remorse and troubled consciences, the *Nichtmensch* is already part of society.

Nevertheless, Valmont, who has summoned Bloner to a duel (III, 206), continues in his attempt to trap Bloner in the belief that some vestige of conscience must remain. However, in pursuing this course of action he only succeeds in revealing the dark recesses of his own mind, for all Bloner is, in fact, is a projection of himself without the safeguard of a conscience (Cf. III, 244-245). As Andreas Weigel has observed¹¹¹, the dramatist's name itself is a pun, combining the French for valley and mountain, reflecting the two extremes of human nature revealed in the play¹¹². While at the outset Valmont can confidently issue the statement: "Hans Bloner ändert sich" and sees himself as "Der Gegenspieler, der ihn durchschaut, bekämpft, besiegt, erbarmungslos zurückvermenschlicht!" (III, 206), Bloner shows himself to be superior to the challenge and issues his own imperative back to Valmont: "Ändre dich, Mensch. - Ändre dich radikal" (III, 209). He easily repels the attacks of his maker.

The language spoken by the characters, mistakenly criticised for being expressionistic¹¹³, also indicates the growing influence Bloner gains over Valmont,

¹¹¹ Andreas Weigel, "Projektion der eigenen Niedertracht", *Standard* [Wien], 20. Jan. 1989, 9.

¹¹² Rudolf Klaus has seen this duality in Faustian terms: "die Zwiegespräche, also die Handlung, sind schizophren gespaltene Monologe, sind eine Erscheinungsform der Vertauschung von creator und creatum, von Macher und Gemachtem, und nichts als die Auseinandersetzung der zwei Seelen, ach, in einer Brust." ("Hochwälder und sein 'Nicht-Mensch'"). A French pun is also used in a similar fashion with the name Valprès in the comedy, *Die Prinzessin von Chimay*.

as Hochwalder makes clear in “Über mein Theater”:

Wie die Korperform das Kleid, so fordert der Stoff vom Autor die jeweilige Diktion, hier herrscht keine Freiheit, der Sprachstil ergibt sich zwangslaufig. Folgerichtig artikuliert der Nicht-Mensch Bloner - und, von ihm angesteckt, sein Widerpart, der Schriftsteller - in einem schnoddrigen Sensationsblatt-Zeitungsdeutsch¹¹⁴.

As Valmont’s various attempts to re-humanize Bloner fail, it becomes ever more apparent who is really influencing whom.

Valmont’s first attempt to trap Bloner, by blackmailing him as his accountant, Solkofsky, fails miserably, precisely because of the financial adviser’s human weaknesses. Rather than forcing Bloner to kill Solkofsky through the flawed car, Cerberus, Valmont finds the boot on the other foot when Bloner threatens to reveal Solkofsky’s participation in the sex parties he organised (III, 213-216).

After this failure Valmont introduces the character of Sonja von Stein, hoping to defeat Bloner through love: “Reinheit, Naivitat wird dich andern; Ur-Gefuhl, schlummernd auch in dir” (III, 218). However, while this may have come close to defeating the far more human Dolus in “Tausendunddrei”, it will prove futile in *1003*. In fact, it is Bloner himself who first raises the possibility of an “unberuhrtes Madchen, leidlich hubsch” (III, 209) as “Gegenleistung” for helping Valmont’s writing career. Her introduction is a dangerous move by the dramatist, whose human nature Bloner views, like Maskeron before him, as something in need of cure: “Ja, also zum Patienten... Erklarung uberflussig, Krankengeschichte an der Nase ablesbar: konfus, nervos, uberarbeitet, ratlos, hilflos” (III, 208).

At the start of Act II it becomes apparent just how risky Valmont’s strategy is, when he wakes from a nightmare in which he has murdered Sonja (II, 220). Shaken by this, Valmont must now confront his own dark side, and this can be seen to be the turning point in the drama, for attention now switches from efforts to changing Bloner to a concern with Valmont’s human weaknesses. An earlier facetious remark that Bloner’s acceptance of total freedom was the correct one for this world (III, 204), now begins to seem quite reasonable: “Wenn Mensch sein heit, von dergleichen auch nur zu traumen, dann war’s hochste Zeit, sich radikal zu andern...” (III, 220). Valmont is now plagued by what Bloner dismisses as “Gewissenskrebs” (III, 222): “Mir ist... als war ich fur alles verantwortlich, fur alles, wohlgemerkt - auch fur das, was ich nicht selbst verube, nicht veruben kann!” (III, 221), and the appeal of being relieved of such feelings becomes apparent:

Die Wollust, der Genu, von einem Mord zu lesen... Von einer Bluttat,

¹¹³ Ernst Lothar, “Nichtmensch und Untermensch - oder: Unbewaltigte Gegenwart”, *Expre* [Wien], 10. Jan. 1964; Heinz Mudrich, “Dein Ich, das unbekanntes Wesen”, *Saarbrucker Zeitung*, 18. Marz 1970.

¹¹⁴ Hochwalder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 98.

Notzucht, unausdenkbar viehisch... Im Wäldchen, am Feldweg, im Gebüsch... und - ja! - die Befreiung, die Erlösung, wenn man den Unbekannten faßt, anklagt und zum Tod verurteilt... Und immerzu die Lust, als ob... als ob sich endlich ein Beherzter gefunden hätt, der mir die Schuld abnimmt... der Stellvertreter... der Geheimkumpan... der... Bruder...¹¹⁵

(III, 222)

Such is the strength of Valmont's feelings that he now demands, echoing Pomfrit, that he be rid of his burden:

Die Last muß weg, gleichviel, was folgt! - Nichts Schlimmeres, als vom Leben ausgestoßen, verdammt, vereinsamt durch Gewissen, hoffnungslos [...] Ich mag nicht mehr! Ich mag nicht, hörst du! - Ich ändere mich noch heut, oder [...] ich geh zum Teufel!

(III, 222)

It is with this determination that Valmont insists that he attend the party organized by Bloner. Here, the sight of Sonja demonstrates that she too has been corrupted effortlessly by Bloner, and serves to bring Valmont back to his adversarial position (III, 224-225). He now recognises he has underestimated Bloner and sees what his creation seeks is nothing less than the destruction of the last remnants of humanity:

Der Feind - ist letzter, schäbiger Menschenrest: - Form, die vernichtet werden muß, um jeden Preis! - bestünde sie, wo bliebe die verkorkste Kanaille? - Simple Parole: Was noch nicht Dreck ist, wird zu Dreck gemacht! [...] Du bist entlarvt! - Auf, wehr dich - präpöntenter Impotenter!

(III, 228)

But, as Bloner explains, it seems unlikely that Valmont can stop him: "Weil du mich im Grund [...] beneidest!" (III, 228).

The announcement by Bloner that Sonja is dead leads to the final confrontation in the third act, with Valmont firmly on the defensive. His efforts to pin the murder on Bloner while acting as a police inspector fail, for his opponent, like Dolus in "Tausendunddrei", has an alibi, and the supposed murder weapon, his car, is still parked outside (III, 239-242). Bloner, the man without conscience, can never be found guilty, as he makes clear to the audience: "Und mag es tausendfältig geschehn sein, millionenfach - schuldig ist stets der andere!" (III, 242). He has achieved that which Valmont sought earlier after his nightmare: the complete removal of any personal responsibility.

That bad dream now comes back to haunt Valmont, as Bloner turns the tables on his creator and describes how the dramatist killed Sonja (III, 243-244). His triumph is now complete, but he prevents Valmont committing suicide by holding out the solution that the entire night has just been a product of the

¹¹⁵ This is an allusion to Bloner's earlier assertion: "[...] gewissermaßen sind wir Brüder" (III, 209). [See below regarding *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*].

imagination:

Simple Lösung: Was aus dem Hirn ist; muß ins Hirn zurück! [...] Schloß, Sportwagen, Party? - frei erfunden, gibt es nicht! - Mord, Mädchen? - Chimäre, Alptraum, gibt es nicht! - Hans Bloner? - ja, was noch... Gaukelspiel, von dir zum Spaß ersonnen... Rauch... Schornstein...blauer Dunst... (III. 244-245)

This is small comfort to Valmont, who has had his dark side fully exposed and his self-confidence shattered:

Wenn alles Einbildung war... Halluzination... dann... ja: dann sitzt die Krankheit lediglich - (*schlägt sich an die Stirn*) hier, hier! [...] Der Nichtmensch: Projektion der eignen Niedertracht! Hans Bloner ein Phantom, das vor dem Frühlicht weicht! - Nicht die Welt - das Hirn ist krank -! (III, 245)

No sooner has he reached this conclusion than, in the final ironic twist of the play, his new neighbour appears at the door: Hans Bloner. As the two characters share a *Verbrüderungstrunk* at the end, Valmont's ability to avoid having his own humanity corrupted is clearly questionable. Maskeron's desire to create an example to lead others to Belial and a soulless existence would seem well served by Bloner.

Following *1003*, a considerable period elapsed before Hochwälder again dramatically explored the future of society and humanity in general, in the play that premièred at the Salzburger Festspiele in 1975: *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*. That is not to say that in the intervening years Hochwälder paid no attention to the issue, for the play had a particularly long gestation period, and was begun as early as 1968 (III, 249), and at least one major influence on the play, Konrad Lorenz's work on aggression¹¹⁶, had impressed Hochwälder as early as 1966¹¹⁷.

It is undoubtedly Hochwälder's most pessimistic work, and encompasses a wider critique of modern society than the previous plays, *Donnerstag* and *1003*. Not only does it explore what the author saw as the increasing readiness of individuals to ignore their consciences and commit criminal acts, but also raises the thesis that the human race is doomed to extinction, like the sabre-toothed tiger of the title, through the very attribute that has hitherto made it so successful as a species: the human brain. Aside from these themes, a wide-ranging exploration of terror is conducted: Hochwälder's earlier villain *Fouquier-Tinville* is honoured with a mention along with other historical

¹¹⁶ Konrad Lorenz, *Das sogenannte Böse. Zur Naturgeschichte der Aggression*, 1963, (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1974).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Fritz Hochwälder, Brief an Ernst Waldinger, 15. Aug. 1966, Dokumentationsstelle für neuere österreichische Literatur, Wien.

criminals (III, 262); a philosophical discussion on the problem of tragic guilt in Sophocles' *Oedipus* takes place (III, 272-273); Popper's work [see above] on totalitarianism and his attack on Hegel is mentioned approvingly (III, 297); and the political systems of both East and West are tersely rejected (III, 286). Such subject matter would prove a challenge for the most ably constructed *Ideendrama*, but not content with this, Hochwalder also introduces a love triangle with Fliess and Camenisch fighting for the affections of Rouzha, and the elements of a thriller, complete with stereotypical thug (Damboritz) and the brandishing of a revolver¹¹⁸. Unfortunately, the contrived plot is an inadequate vehicle for such a load, requiring considerable suspension of disbelief: the audience must not only accept that the respectable characters of the play are capable of plotting murder and intrigue as soon as the opportunity presents itself, but also that a noted intellectual could write a book so influential that society might be endangered, forcing his erstwhile employee to hatch a campaign of persecution so ingenious that it will drive Lazaretti into the arms of his old friend, Camenisch, who can be relied on to do the right thing. The weaknesses of the drama were mercilessly exposed by the critical reception of its premiere at Salzburg; an unfortunately high-profile venue for a poor play. A few selective headlines will suffice to indicate the general tenor of the reception it received: *Salzburger Volkszeitung* readers were informed "Von Unterhaltung keine Spur"¹¹⁹; Vienna's *Kurier* concluded it was a "Politkrimi zum Vergessen"¹²⁰; *Neue Zeit* told of an over-ambitious play in "Fritz Hochwalders Lazaretti. Uberstrapazierter Luftballon"¹²¹; Joachim Kaiser in Munich's *Suddeutsche Zeitung* summed the play up with the title "Ein Autor, ein Verfolgungswahn und kein Stuck"¹²²; while other journalists in the Bavarian capital disparaged the play while demonstrating their knowledge of things Austrian, be it Grillparzer or "das typisch osterreichische Lob" [!] with reviews entitled "Sabeltigers Gluck und Ende"¹²³ and "Der Hochwalder ist halt ein lieber Kerl"¹²⁴. Several critics felt that Hochwalder was attempting unsuccessfully to mimic Durrenmatt¹²⁵, while one rather flippantly saw it as a fine

¹¹⁸ It is tempting to wish that Hochwalder had paid more attention to the words he gave Fliess: "Mord heit nicht immer: Revolver, Dolch und Gift" (III, 255).

¹¹⁹ Hans Baumgartner, "Von Unterhaltung keine Spur", *Salzburger Volkszeitung*, 31. Juli 1975. [Also is: *Neue Tiroler Zeitung* [Innsbruck], 31. Juli 1975; und gekurzt als: "Von Unterhaltung leider keine Spur". In: *Volkszeitung* [Klagenfurt], 3. Aug. 1975].

¹²⁰ Paul Blaha, "Politkrimi zum Vergessen", *Kurier* [Wien], 31. Juli 1975.

¹²¹ Johannes Frankfurter, "Fritz Hochwalders Lazaretti. Uberstrapazierter Luftballon", *Neue Zeit* [Graz], 31. Juli 1975.

¹²² Joachim Kaiser, "Ein Autor, ein Verfolgungswahn und kein Stuck", *Suddeutsche Zeitung* [Munchen], 31. Juli 1975.

¹²³ Armin Eichholz, "Sabeltigers Gluck und Ende", *Munchner Merkur*, 31. Juli 1975.

¹²⁴ Maurus Pacher, "Der Hochwalder ist halt ein lieber Kerl", *tz* [Munchen], 31. Juli 1975.

¹²⁵ Paul Blaha, "Politkrimi zum Vergessen", *Kurier* [Wien], 31. Juli 1975; Hilde Spiel, "Ein Reier mit ungestilltem Ehrgeiz", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31. Juli 1975; Maurus

example of the importance of making copies of any manuscript upon which one was working, for the creation of a duplicate might have saved everyone (including the audience) much trouble¹²⁶.

Nevertheless, despite such bad press at Salzburg and a scarcely more enthusiastic response when the production moved to Vienna's *Theater in der Josefstadt*, the play did survive beyond its publication by Styria to be translated and published in Persian¹²⁷, translated into English by James Schmitt¹²⁸ and to be revived in 1986 for a production in Innsbruck, where it received positive reviews¹²⁹.

For all its faults, *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger* shows a further development of concerns expressed in earlier Hochwälder dramas. The potential for evil and violence in everyone is embodied by the two intellectuals at the heart of the play, Paul Camenisch and Victor Lazaretti. Both concern themselves professionally with the dark side of man, and the play opens with Camenisch suffering, in a similar fashion to Valmont in *1003*, from writer's block while working on his latest book "Diagnose der Krankheitserscheinung 'Mensch'" (III, 252); a title that would surely have interested Maskeron in *Donnerstag*. Indeed, the opening lines from the problematic text encapsulate the general thrust of the drama:

Wir sollten uns eingestehen, daß das Niedrige, Gemeine, schlechthin Böse in uns allen schläft und jederzeit zum Ausbruch kommen kann [...] Zwar können wir uns der Erkenntnis nicht verschließen, daß sich in dieser Welt Graueneregendes ereignet, was aber keineswegs heißen will, daß wir geneigt sind, unsern Anteil daran zu übernehmen [...] Daraus erhellt, daß wir unserer Natur nach allesamt potentielle Mörder sind. (III, 251)

In fact, given the opportunity, Camenisch goes on to demonstrate just how

Pacher, "Der Hochwälder ist halt ein lieber Kerl", *tz* [München], 31. Juli 1975. Cf. Daviau, "Der innere Konflikt [...]", 927; Gerlach, "Das Motiv des unterdrückten Gewissens in den Dramen Fritz Hochwälders", 70.

¹²⁶ Paul Blaha, "Politkrimi zum Vergessen", *Kurier* [Wien], 31. Juli 1975; Hilde Spiel, "Ein Reißer mit ungestilltem Ehrgeiz", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31. Juli 1975; Maurus Pacher, "Der Hochwälder ist halt ein lieber Kerl", *tz* [München], 31. Juli 1975. Cf. Daviau, "Der innere Konflikt [...]", 927; Gerlach, "Das Motiv des unterdrückten Gewissens in den Dramen Fritz Hochwälders", 70.

¹²⁷ As reported in the Austrian press: Anonym, "In Kürze", *Süd-Ost Tagespost* [Graz], 18. Okt. 1977; Anonym, "Teheran", *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 18. Okt. 1977; Anonym, "Neues aus der Theaterwelt", *Oberösterreichische Nachrichten* [Linz], 21. Okt. 1977; Hans Heinz Hahn, "Lazaretti oder die vergessene Kopie", *Arbeiter Zeitung* [Wien], 7. Sept. 1975. This was, in part, a response to a visit to Iran by Hochwälder the preceding year.

¹²⁸ Fritz Hochwälder, *Lazaretti, or The Saber-Toothed Tiger. A play in three acts*, trans. James Schmitt, in Fritz Hochwälder, *The Public Prosecutor and Other Plays* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980), 301-363.

¹²⁹ E. Senn, "Eindrucksvoller Erfolg von Hochwälders Stück Lazaretti in den Kammerspielen", *Tiroler Tageszeitung* [Innsbruck], 17. März 1986, 7; Johannes Hoffer, "Lazaretti sehenswert!", *Neue Tiroler Zeitung* [Innsbruck], 18. März 1986, 12.

willing he is to succumb to his murderous side. The arrival of his highly strung friend¹³⁰ provides him not only with the opportunity to be rid of his rival for the affections of Rouzha, by failing to warn the psychiatrist, Fliess, that Lazaretti is armed (III, 281), but also with the solution to his writing woes when he is able to appropriate his friend's manuscript and claim it as his own (III, 298). This solution clearly occurs to him very early in the piece, when he notes that the work might very well be his (III, 271) and makes arrangements to contact his impatient publisher, WeWeWe¹³¹ that evening (III, 269, 287). He does show some pangs of conscience when conspiring against his friend, admitting to Fliess: "Ich handle gegen mein Gewissen" (III, 282), and he briefly hesitates before finally ringing his publisher to claim Lazaretti's work as his own (III, 297-298), but, as with other Hochwalder characters, he eventually sacrifices morality to self-interest.

His friend from his student days shows a similar concern with violence, for the title of his last book was "Die totale Aggression" while his latest manuscript borrows the title from the religious writer Lactantius¹³²: "Vom Tod der Verfolger" (III, 261-262). Galgotzy praises an earlier work by Lazaretti on one of history's villains with revealing praise: "Kurzlich erst habe ich Ihre hervorragende Torquemada-Biographie gelesen¹³³ - erstaunlich wie Sie sich in dubiose Personlichkeit hineinversetzt haben, wie in einen leibhaftigen Bruder" (III, 258). This suggestion of brotherhood is extended when the two authors describe themselves as being like brothers (III, 265; 290), a description reminiscent of Bloner's statement to Valmont in *1003*.

The similarity of the two supposedly civilised academics¹³⁴ extends to their preparedness to make use of violence. Lazaretti's latest work advocates using terror itself as the only effective means to combat terrorism and calls for the youth of the world to form a secret organisation with just such aims (III, 262; 277). In defending his manuscript he is prepared to use violence himself and shoot to kill (III, 262), and he comes very close to murdering Camenisch (III, 294). The irony that Lazaretti's justification for violence in the name of his cause had a strong similarity to that used by terrorists who saw themselves in a battle with state-run terror was probably not lost on the 1975 audience, all too familiar with the exploits of the Baader-Meinhof Group.

But it is not just the academics who can quickly descend into violence and crime, most of the characters show this tendency. Damboritz, Camenisch's thuggish factotum, described by his employer in terms evocative of *1003* as

¹³⁰ Once again, Hochwalder uses an outsider to disrupt an apparently serene environment.

¹³¹ Gerlach has noted that the name suggests a "Weheruf" ["Das Motiv des unterdruckten Gewissens in den Dramen Fritz Hochwalders", 69], which, it is tempting to say, is appropriate not just to the thematic content but to the play as a whole!

¹³² Cf. Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, Trans. J. L. Creed, ed. Ed. Creed, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984).

¹³³ Once more the shadow of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor can be detected.

¹³⁴ Lazaretti is even referred to as "der letzte Humanist" (III, 258)!

“der perfekte Zerberus” (III, 260), openly welcomes the prospect of violence that Lazaretti’s arrival may bring (III, 268), and he certainly does not hold back when called on to disarm the misguided author (III, 294). Fliess shows subtlety more in keeping with Camenisch’s style when appropriating the manuscript in an effort to provoke Lazaretti to kill Camenisch, but his scheme is seen through by Rouzha (III, 289). It is highly ironic that Peltzer employs the tactics of using terror to combat terror advocated by Lazaretti in his rather incredible campaign of persecution against the writer to render the explosive manuscript harmless (III, 284-285). Even the less bloodthirsty Galgotzy proves to be unmoved by the modern horrors of Auschwitz, Dresden and Hiroshima seeing them as nothing more than an advance in human development: “Der Homo sapiens war früher noch nicht soweit, Ausrottung mußte die Natur besorgen, durch schwarze Pest und andere Epidemien” (III, 276).

It is left to Rouzha, another of Hochwälder’s exemplary, one-dimensional female characters, to defend common decency in the face of such inhumanity. She refuses to become embroiled in the men’s murderous intrigues (III, 289) and leaves them with the noble words: “Ich rette meinen Glauben an die Menschheit” (III, 296); a decidedly dubious undertaking given the general tenor of the play.

The murderous nature of humanity is constantly emphasized throughout the play from the opening lines [see above]; newspapers serve to reinforce the depressing fact that there is “Mord, überall” (III, 254) or provide the excuse for a discussion “von einem Phänomen unserer Zeit: von Terror, von Gewalt” (III, 277); characters casually drop suggestive words such as “Mordskerl” (III, 268) and “Mordshunger” (III, 275) into conversation, admit they are capable of anything (III, 252, 255) and refer to “Geheime Wünsche” and murderous desires (III, 252, 259)¹³⁵; and the audience is treated to profound insights such as: “Mörder, Krone der Schöpfung” (III, 257), “Wir entstammen einer Rotte von Mördern: neben Faustkeil und Feuerstelle die angerösteten Knochen des Bruders” (III, 260), and “Die meisten Prominenten sind nichts als verpatzte Kriminelle” (III, 270).

There is more than a little anti-intellectualism in Hochwälder’s portrayal of misguided academics and philosophers, and Wondrak’s disparaging description of Pomfrit might well be applied to several of the characters of *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*: “du g’scherter Intellektueller mit deinem Weltschmerz-Schmäh” (III, 192). Partly, this was a reflection of Hochwälder’s anger at what he saw as the hijacking of the German theatre by intellectual experimentalists with little understanding of drama, encouraged by generous state subsidies: “eine Mafia von verkrachten Soziologen bemüht sich mit Steuergeldern erfolgreich, ja, erfolgreich, das Publikum aus dem Theater zu treiben”¹³⁶. Such

¹³⁵ Hochwälder may be taking a shot at the school of psychoanalysis here, for as Friedrich Heer has pointed out (“Notiz zu Hochwälders Säbeltiger”, *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 26. Juli 1975) the real Robert Fliess, who was the son of Wilhelm Fliess was the trusted friend and confidant of Freud.

¹³⁶ Peter Vujica, “Fritz Hochwälder wörtlich”, *Neue Vorarlberger Tageszeitung* [Bregenz],

attacks on the eve of the first performance of *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger* were, as one German critic dryly observed¹³⁷, scarcely likely to earn him sympathy if he failed to deliver the goods himself.

However, given the theme of terrorism and revolt, Hochwälder's portrayal of misguided academics has a wider target than merely those he saw as detrimental to the theatre. Lazaretti's unpublished book, which for the purposes of the plot must be accepted as potentially explosive and influential and which is likened to Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (III, 280), is suggestive of intellectuals such as Herbert Marcuse and Jean-Paul Sartre whose ideas helped fuel, and who publicly supported, the student unrest of 1968¹³⁸. The latter visited the terrorist Andreas Baader in prison in 1974, much to Hochwälder's disgust:

[...] wenn ein so hochberühmter Philosoph wie Jean Paul Sartre Rat sucht bei einem Straßenräuber und Mordbanditen wie Andreas Baader, dann zeigt das einmal die Armseligkeit dieses Philosophen und andererseits den geistigen Zustand Europas¹³⁹.

Elsewhere he describes Sartre's adherence to Maoism as "blöd"¹⁴⁰. There is certainly more than a passing resemblance to the French philosopher's position on the use of violence in Lazaretti's advocacy of it as a means to further good, and when Peltzer reduces it to the maxim: "In dieser Welt ist Verbrechen nur durch Verbrechen zu bekämpfen" (III, 284-285), the similarity to the words of Sartre, printed in the *Theater in der Josefstadt* programme, is unmistakable: "[...] keine Sanftmut kann die Auswirkungen der Gewalt auslösen, nur die Gewalt selbst kann sie tilgen"¹⁴¹.

29. Juli 1975. Just how little Hochwälder's thinking on this matter had changed over well over a decade can be seen from an examination of his earlier essays: the 1959 version of "Über mein Theater" (*German Life and Letters*, 12 (1959), 102-114) and his 1961 address "Vom Versagen des Dramas in unserer Zeit" (*Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 57-80), both of which attack the loss of the theatrical on the modern German stage. The latter work, which has particular relevance to this chapter, and to which has already been referred, links the decline in the German theatre to a wider social malaise and the loss of conscience in society (Cf. 65-69), aided and abetted, apparently, by incomprehensible philosophers, "Sprachkünstler" (64) and the "Pseudoliteratur" which is anathema to both good drama, and, by inference, decent morals. Indeed in both *1003* and *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger* a distrust of language, perhaps reminiscent of Hofmannsthal, is evident, when Valmont observes: "Es heißt: Sprache ist uns verliehen, um die Gedanken zu verbergen" (III, 221) and Fliess declares: "Bekanntlich ist dem Menschen Sprache verliehen, um die Gedanken zu verbergen" (III, 266).

¹³⁷ Armin Eichholz, "Säbeltigers Glück und Ende", *Münchener Merkur*, 31. Juli 1975.

¹³⁸ Amongst the papers concerning *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger* in the *Nachlaß* are several newspaper articles concerning the student unrest in 1968 and the positions taken by intellectuals: Anonym, "Leben mit dem Hass. Ja zum Leben mit Konflikten", *Die Tat* [Zürich], 10. Feb. 1968; Paul Parin, "Psychologie des politischen Mordes", *Die Weltwoche* [Zürich], 14. Juni 1968; Hans Herbert Götz, "Die Hölle des Professor Marcuse", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 13. Juli 1968, 17.

¹³⁹ Alfred A. Häsler, "Aus einem Gespräch zwischen Fritz Hochwälder und der Züricher *Die Tat*", Programmheft des Theaters in der Josefstadt [*Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*] Wien. Nr. 1, 1975/76, 22.

¹⁴⁰ Peter Vujica, "Fritz Hochwälder wörtlich", *Neue Vorarlberger Tageszeitung* [Bregenz], 29. Juli 1975.

Peltzer remains an inadequate character, whose main dramatic function is to demonstrate that Lazaretti's apparent *Verfolgungswahn* is not mere paranoia but the product of genuine persecution. He follows illustrious predecessors in Hochwalder's *uvre* who have chosen to commit crimes for a greater cause [see Chapter 4], responding to Camenisch's question: "Warum haben Sie sich diese Last aufgeladen?" (III, 286) with an answer that suggests similar motivation to that of *Mr. Robert in "Holokaust"*, who likewise uses inherited money to pursue an ideal that he hopes will provide meaning to an empty existence¹⁴², and which is also a vehicle for Hochwalder's thoughts on the cold war¹⁴³:

Schwer zu erklaren... Eine Art innerer Auftrag... Engagement... Ein Rest von Menschheitsglauben, oder blo Flucht vor dem unertraglichen Lebensgahnen, dem Ennui... Ich kann nichts mit mir anfangen. Geld und Weiber bedeuten mir nichts, und was sich in der Welt vollzieht: der dumme Kampf eines idiotischen Systems gegen ein satanisches, ist auch nicht dazu angetan, die Zuversicht zu starken. (III, 286)

Peltzer is also used to explain how Lazaretti's humane ideals have been corrupted into advocacy of terrorism:

Der Verfechter von Recht und Menschlichkeit, der Gegner jeglicher Unterdruckung, hat sich im steigenden Ma mit dem Objekt seiner Forschung identifiziert: Terror und Gewalt, die er in seinen Buchern anprangert, sind als Bazillus in ihn eingedrungen. Alle Gewalttat - in Geschichte und Gegenwart - sitzt in ihm und sucht sich zu befreien - durch Mord. (III, 284)

Implausible though this may first seem, it is again in keeping with Hochwalder's view "vom Phanomen des unbewuten Gewissenschwundes" in which the victims of persecution take on aspects of the inhumanity practised upon them. He demonstrated this through the characters in *Holokaust*, and, in his essay "Vom Versagen des Dramas in unserer Zeit", he drew attention to the historical correlation in the behaviour of inmates in concentration camps,

¹⁴¹ Anonym, "Aggression - Gewalt - Terror", Programmheft des Theaters in der Josefstadt [*Lazaretti oder Der Sabeltiger*] Wien. Nr. 1, 1975/76, 4.

¹⁴² This may also be a barb aimed at the student generation which took to the streets and in some cases drifted into terrorist activities at the end of the 1960s. Hochwalder disparagingly dismisses such revolutionaries as "Millionarshne und Pastorentchter" [Vujica, "Fritz Hochwalder wrtlich"].

¹⁴³ Cf. Peter Vujica, "Fritz Hochwalder wrtlich", *Neue Vorarlberger Tageszeitung* [Brenz], 29. Juli 1975. Hochwalder toned down his views toward the West in his essay, "Kann die Freiheit berleben?" (1976), noting that, for all its problems, the resignation of Nixon proved the strength of U.S. democracy, but adding: "[...] gewi mchte ich in einem solchen Land nicht leben, zum Unterschied vom Osten, wo ich nicht einmal begraben sein mchte, weil ich vermutlich selbst im Tod das Maul nicht halten knnte" (*Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 130-131).

when quoting from H. G. Adler's work on Theresienstadt:

Der Ungeist der Verfolger ergriff nun auch viele Gefangene, sie ließen diesen bösen Geist, dem sie noch feind zu sein glaubten, in sich lebendig werden und wurden sich dessen nicht einmal bewußt. Hier steckt der tragische Kern des Verfalls, den der Nationalsozialismus über seine Anhänger und über seine Gegner gebracht hat. Es handelt sich, jenseits aller Ideologie, um kein politisches, sondern um ein allgemein menschliches Problem¹⁴⁴.

This explains how Lazaretti, an apparently civilised man, can write: "Nur wer in einem Meer von Blut schwimmt, erreicht die Insel des Ewigen Friedens!" (III, 268)¹⁴⁵.

It is in this respect that Hochwälder again returns to a favourite motif: Oedipus. In pursuing terror Lazaretti falls victim to terror, for he is, like Oedipus, Fouquier and Mittermayer, pursuing himself. From notes in the *Nachlaß*, it becomes apparent that Hochwälder intends the allusion to Sophocles to serve as a metaphor for mankind in general:

In *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger* wandelt sich die Selbstverfolgung des Individuums - seit *König Oedipus* ein bevorzugtes Thema des Welttheaters - in die kollektive Vernichtungsgefahr, mit der der Homo sapiens heutzutage sich selbst bedroht¹⁴⁶.

If this notion is to be accepted, however, the solution tentatively proffered seems hardly satisfactory, for as Fliess suggests, Oedipus' guilt stems from the fact that "er handelt" (III, 273)¹⁴⁷, implying that society should do nothing if it wishes to avert disaster¹⁴⁸. This sentiment is reaffirmed at the end by

¹⁴⁴ Quoted by Fritz Hochwälder in *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 68.

¹⁴⁵ It hardly needs to be emphasized that the pervasive nature of terror is a recurrent theme for Hochwälder, cf. *Der öffentliche Ankläger* and *Der Flüchtling*. In the later play, *Die Prinzessin von Chimay*, another apparently civilised man, Maergesse, can also get caught up in the righteousness of his cause and utter the chilling words: "[...] wer das Wort Blut nicht vertragen kann, läßt besser die Hände von Revolutionen. Keine soziale Revolution ohne Schreckensherrschaft!" (IV, 35).

¹⁴⁶ Fritz Hochwälder, "Anmerkungen zu meinem Schauspiel *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*", undated (possibly written for the Persian translation of the play - see above), Hochwälder Nachlaß, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien.

¹⁴⁷ This solution to the much discussed problem of the tragic guilt in Sophocles' tragedy is also used to have another swipe at intellectuals who, it seems, have failed to see the simple answer right under their academic noses!

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Klaus Gruber, "Lazaretti oder der Säbeltiger", *Allgemeine Zeitung. Mainzer Anzeiger*, 31. Juli 1975. [Also as: "Das gefährliche Gehirn". In: *Darmstädter Echo*, 31. Juli 1975; als: "Lazaretti - letztlich doch nur unverbindlich". *Generalanzeiger für Bonn*, 31. Juli 1975; als: "Unverbindliches Geplauder". In: *Neue OZ Osnabrücker Zeitung*, 31. Juli 1975; als: "Geplauder über Terror". *Rheinische Post* [Düsseldorf], 31. Juli 1975; als: "Neues Hochwälder-Stück". In: *Lübecker Nachrichten*, 31. Juli 1975; und gekürzt als: "Ein Säbeltiger mit

Galgotzy when he comments: "Will niemand einseh'n, daß die schlimmste Verfolgung in uns selbst ist?" (III, 298).

However, this position of passive resignation is quite appropriate to Lazaretti's revised *Weltanschauung*, which is introduced in the third act. Having set off a chain of events that seems to confirm Camenisch's pessimistic view of human nature, Lazaretti now wonders whether he has been correct in demanding that one fight against evil. Maybe, he muses, the problems facing humanity are simply the result of an evolutionary mistake and the human race is falling victim to its own over-developed brain just as the sabre-toothed tiger fell victim to the attribute that initially guaranteed its success: its over-enlarged fangs (III, 290-292). It is a theory which renders his manuscript obsolete as he tries to make clear to Camenisch:

Wenn [...] der Homo sapiens nichts anderes wär als ein genialer Schöpfungsirrtum, eine grandiose Mißgeburt, die früher oder später zurückgenommen wird, ins Nichts? [...] Wenn sich mein Axiom, daß der Mensch von Grund auf böse und verderbt ist, als falsch erweist, dann ist das neue Buch nutzlos, ja: gefährlich! - Gestützt auf solide Forschungsergebnisse beweise ich, daß wir im Geist und Fleisch nichtswürdig sind; nur Gewalt - einzig und allein - kann uns mores lehren. - Was aber, wenn von Gut und Böse nicht gesprochen werden kann, sondern von einem verkrachten Meisterwerk der Schöpfung, dazu bestimmt, jämmerlich unterzugehen, so wie der Säbeltiger? (III, 291-292)

Lazaretti still attempts to murder to protect his work and must endure a violent beating before fully recognizing the futility of violence (III, 294-295), but the change in his thinking, and his preparedness to be passively led off to the asylum at the end, has prompted at least one critic to see the biblical ramifications of his nickname: "Lazarus: der Name macht auf eine oft übersehene Möglichkeit des Menschen aufmerksam, aus dem Grabe der eigenen Schuld aufzuerstehen"¹⁴⁹; Lazaretti rises from the madness that has affected him to see his own foolishness.

With this suggestion of a biological flaw in the human make-up, Hochwälder, as he publicly acknowledged¹⁵⁰, was influenced by Konrad Lorenz's behavioural study on aggression, *Das sogenannte Böse. Zur Naturgeschichte der Aggression*, which he mentioned in correspondence as early as 1966:

[...] wie wärs wenn alles Böse, das wir Söhne des 19. Jhdts [sic] seit eh und je der Politik, den Parteien, dem Faschismus und Bolschwismus, und

stumpfen Zähnen". In: *Kölnische Rundschau*, 31. Juli 1975].

¹⁴⁹ Friedrich Heer, "Notiz zu Hochwälders Säbeltiger", *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 26. Juli 1975.

¹⁵⁰ haku, "Ein 'verdammter Moralist'", *Salzburger Volksblatt*, 30. Juli 1975; H.B., "... ein verdammter Moralist", *Salzburger Volkszeitung*, 30. Juli 1975. [Also in: *Volkszeitung Klagenfurt*, 30. Juli 1975; und als: "Bin ein verdammter Moralist". In: *Neue Tiroler Zeitung* [Innsbruck], 30. Juli 1975].

weiss Gott noch wen und was zuzuschreiben gelernt hatten, das eigentliche Natürliche, dem Menschen ureigene wäre? - Konrad Lorenz, der Verhaltensforscher, dessen Gänsebeobachtungen mich nun mässig interessieren, kommt in seinem Werk "Das sogenannte Böse" - obgleich grundsätzlich Optimist - zum andern Schluss: der Homo sapiens, dem sein Gehirn die Wasserstoffbombe schenkte, dessen Aggressionstrieb jedoch auf der Stufe des Neandertalers hält, geht einer überaus unsichern Zukunft entgegen¹⁵¹.

Lorenz's work argues that violence and aggression, while often seen as a great evil, are merely the products of a natural instinct which can serve three very important functions: the practical distribution of a species so that competition for food does not become too great; the protection of young; and the selection of suitable breeding partners¹⁵². An examination of species that do not display intra-specific aggression shows an absence of many characteristics prized by humanity such as individuality and love¹⁵³. Indeed, Lorenz emphasizes just how important aggression is to the human make-up, being responsible for love, friendship, aesthetic values, artistic creation and scientific advance: "Der alles sogenannten Tierischen entkleidete, des Drangs der Dunkelheit beraubte Mensch als reines Vernunftwesen wäre *keineswegs ein Engel: er wäre weit eher das Gegenteil!*"¹⁵⁴.

However, Lorenz makes it quite clear that human aggression poses a real threat to our future, for technological advance, the product of our advanced intelligence, has outstripped the ability of our instincts to adapt; armed with modern weapons the safety checks which prevented excesses when humans fought with just their bare fists are inadequate. Fortunately, Lorenz sees another human trait, that of recognizing responsibility and the ability to see the ramifications of one's actions, as so far having prevented humanity from wiping itself out. In itself, however, this does not guarantee the future of the species, for with the use of new technology individuals can become increasingly removed from the consequences of their actions:

Die tiefen gefühlsmäßigen Schichten unserer Seele nehmen es einfach nicht mehr zur Kenntnis, daß das Abkrümmen eines Zeigefingers zur Folge hat, daß unser Schuß einem anderen Menschen die Eingeweide zerreißt. Kein geistig gesunder Mensch würde auch nur auf die Hasenjagd gehen, müßte er das Wild mit Zähnen und Fingernägeln töten. Nur durch Abschirmung unserer Gefühle gegen alle sinnfälligen Folgen unseres Tuns wird es möglich, daß ein Mensch, der es kaum fertig brächte, einem

¹⁵¹ Fritz Hochwälder, Brief an Ernst Waldinger, 15. Aug. 1966, Dokumentationsstelle für neuere österreichische Literatur, Wien.

¹⁵² See especially chapter three, "Wozu das Böse gut ist".

¹⁵³ Chapters 8 and 9: "Die anonyme Schar" and "Gesellschaftsordnung ohne Liebe".

¹⁵⁴ Lorenz, *Das sogenannte Böse*, 240.

unartigen Kind eine verdiente Ohrfeige zu geben, es sehr wohl über sich bringen kann, den Auslöseknopf einer Raketenwaffe oder einer Bombenabwurf-Vorrichtung zu betätigen und damit Hunderte von liebenswerten Kindern einem gräßlichen Flammentod zu überantworten. Gute, brave, anständige Familienväter haben Bombenteppiche gelegt¹⁵⁵.

He is well aware how important it is, in the age of the hydrogen bomb and mass society with its increasingly crowded living conditions and fewer outlets for aggression, to find a means with which to cope with our natural instincts. Yet unlike Hochwälder, he remains optimistic that the human race will find a solution, without sacrificing an intrinsic part of what makes them human, for: "die natürlichen Neigungen des Menschen sind gar nicht so schlecht. Der Mensch ist gar nicht so böse von Jugend auf, er ist nur *nicht ganz gut genug* für die Anforderungen der modernen Gesellschaft"¹⁵⁶. Through understanding what motivates us, finding new outlets for aggression such as sport and the controlled competition between nations in such things as the space race, as well as encouraging individual friendships across racial and national divides, so that it becomes increasingly difficult for demagogues to foster hate between different people, Lorenz believes that "wahres Menschentum"¹⁵⁷ will be achieved.

Hochwälder, as the letter quoted above suggests, did not share Lorenz's optimism, and may also have been influenced by other, more pessimistic, views on the future of the human race, faced by over-population and a growing destructive capability¹⁵⁸. For whatever reason in *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger* the tentative faith in the conscience to hold the dark side of human nature in check, hitherto an important, if always fragile, indicator of hope in his plays, is all but absent. Hochwälder reduces Lorenz's work on aggression to the simple question of whether the human race is doomed to extinction, and without the belief that ways to control aggressive instincts will be found, Lazaretti's affirmative answer leaves little course of action but passive surrender, rather than active resistance. He demonstrates just such a course of action, or rather inaction, when he allows himself to be taken off to the asylum, and Rouzha's rejection of the men in her life is a passive response, which makes no effort to change their ways (III, 295). Such behaviour is also in accord with the Oedipus theory propounded by Fliess that guilt is acquired through action; a view that has been seen by some critics as part of an Austrian tradition encompassing Grillparzer and Raimund¹⁵⁹.

155 Lorenz, *Das sogenannte Böse*, 227-228.

156 Lorenz, *Das sogenannte Böse*, 234.

157 Lorenz, *Das sogenannte Böse*, 259.

158 Cf. Arthur Koestler, "Fertigmachen, die Welt geht unter", *Der Spiegel* [Hamburg], Nr. 36, 2. Sept. 1968, 118-133, which is also to be found in the *Nachlaß*.

159 Marlis Bergmann, "Nur ein kleineres Plastikbomber!", *Süd-ost Tagespost* [Graz], 31. Juli 1975; Lothar Sträter, "Kamingeplauder", *Weser Kurier - Bremer Tageszeitung* [Bremen], 1.

The introduction of Lazaretti's revised view of the world robs the play of any clear direction. For a considerable part of the action, events seem to bear out the opinion expressed by Camenisch that man¹⁶⁰ is capable of evil but can keep it in check if he is so inclined, but then, if Lazaretti's evolutionary theory holds true, he cannot be held accountable for actions which result from a biological flaw over which he has no control.

This apparent contradiction can also be detected in comments made by Hochwalder himself. Prior to the premire, he claimed to hold the view that the human race was destined for extinction¹⁶¹, a view he was to reiterate shortly before his death in 1986¹⁶². However, he also characterised himself as "ein verdammter Moralist"¹⁶³, a position difficult to reconcile with any deterministic fatalism. From the unpublished notes on *Lazaretti oder Der Sabeltiger* in the *Nachla* it is apparent that Hochwalder himself was aware of the impossibility of maintaining the latter position:

Der Gattung nach handelt es sich um eine Literaturkomdie¹⁶⁴, in welcher im Konversationston die Kardinalfrage unserer Zeit zur Diskussion gestellt wird: Ist der Homo sapiens wirklich dazu verurteilt, an seinem beispiellosen Vorzug, der berdimensionalen Gehirnmasse, jammerlich zugrunde zu gehen, wie dereinst in grauer Vorzeit der Sabeltiger an den gewaltigen Hauern, die groteskerweise sein berleben ermglichen und sichern sollten?

Eine derartige Frage bleibt natrlich unbeantwortbar, aber gerade deshalb darf und soll sie von der Bhne herab gestellt werden. - Denn aller Verstand, alles Gefhl mte zurckstehen hinter der Hoffnung, dass es nicht so sein mge. Denn wer so nachtschwarz pessimistisch zu denken vermag wie in meinem Stck der unselig-verwirrte Lazaretti, endet gleich ihm im Irrenhaus¹⁶⁵.

A similar insistence on hope is also found at the end of "Kann die Freiheit

Aug. 1975.

¹⁶⁰ The use of specific language seems highly appropriate in most cases with Hochwalder, particularly with this play, since it is men alone who demonstrate a dark side in contrast to the saint-like Rouzha.

¹⁶¹ Peter Vujica, "Fritz Hochwalder wrtlich", *Neue Vorarlberger Tageszeitung* [Bregenz], 29. Juli 1975.

¹⁶² Ren Freund, "Es geht sowieso schlecht aus", *Wiener Zeitung*, 23. Mai 1986, 4.

¹⁶³ E. C. M., "Ich bin ein verdammter Moralist", *Neue Tiroler Zeitung* [Innsbruck], 27. Okt. 1973; Anonym, "Von der Aktualitt eingeholt", *Salzburger Nachrichten*, 30. Juli 1975; haku, "Ein 'verdammter Moralist'", *Salzburger Volksblatt*, 30. Juli 1975; H.B., "... ein verdammter Moralist", *Salzburger Volkszeitung*, 30. Juli 1975. [Also in: *Volkszeitung Klagenfurt*, 30. Juli 1975; and as: "'Bin ein verdammter Moralist'". In: *Neue Tiroler Zeitung* [Innsbruck], 30. Juli 1975].

¹⁶⁴ It is difficult to escape the fact that the play shares with the later "comedy", *Die Prinzessin von Chimay*, a decided lack of comic elements.

¹⁶⁵ Fritz Hochwalder, "Anmerkungen zu meinem Schauspiel *Lazaretti oder Der Sabeltiger*", undated, Hochwalder Nachla, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Wien.

überleben?“¹⁶⁶

However, there is little hope to be found in *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*, by far the blackest play Hochwälder published, for be it a result of an inclination toward evil or a genetic mistake, the one conclusion that might be drawn at the end is, in the words of one critic: “Der Mensch ist schlecht, schlecht, schlecht”¹⁶⁷.

However, the last scenes of the play indicate that Hochwälder is not yet quite ready to abandon his insistence on individual responsibility, for the play does not close with Lazaretti’s doomsday prophesy. Camenisch, now deserted by Rouzha, feels alone and empty, and contemplates Lazaretti’s view of the folly of action: “Man soll nicht planen... Man soll nicht eingreifen...” (III, 297). His final action, the determination to plagiarize his friend’s work to further his own career, would seem to bear out his opening thesis about human nature, and demand moral condemnation, indicating that Hochwälder the moralist is not fully prepared to submit to Hochwälder the fatalist.

Indeed, this conclusion highlights the fact that, for all Hochwälder’s concerns with wider society and the direction humanity is taking, in each of the three plays, *Donnerstag, 1003* and *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*, he constantly returns to individual behaviour and individual decisions. Pomfrit may be a modern *Jedermann* confronted with the dilemma of whether to forgo his conscience for a trouble-free existence, but it is still his ego, his personality and problems which hold centre-stage. Likewise in *1003*, if Valmont does fall victim to the *Nichtmensch* and join his ranks, it will be because he cannot resist his own dark urges, which come to the fore in the battle played out on stage between creator and created. Finally, Camenisch, who really is the protagonist of *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*, is an individual who, for his own egotistical advantage chooses to act against his conscience, and plot against his rival in love and more successful colleague in work. Hochwälder is unable to remain true to the fatalism he introduces in the last play through Lazaretti, perhaps because to do so would, as he says, lead to the madhouse. It is also incompatible with the philosophical basis found throughout his work, which constantly emphasizes individual responsibility and the paramountcy of conscience; indeed it is against fatalism, in the guise of Marxism, that Hochwälder rails in “Kann die Freiheit überleben?“¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Hochwälder, *Im Wechsel der Zeit*, 131.

¹⁶⁷ Dietmar N. Schmidt, “Der Mensch ist schlecht, schlecht, schlecht”, *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 1. Aug. 1975.

¹⁶⁸ It is worth reiterating that Lorenz’s examination of aggression which sees it as simply a natural instinct, does not exclude personal responsibility, indeed it is seen as one of the ways of controlling aggression. This seems to have been lost in Hochwälder translation of the message, at least as regards its portrayal in *Lazaretti oder Der Säbeltiger*.