

Masculinity Staged: Gender in Fascist and Anti-Fascist German Theater

Susan Russell

Much has been written about the ways in which the Nazis recruited people to Nazi ideology. Most of these studies of "fascisization" have followed the lead of the Frankfurt School writers in borrowing from Freud and Marx.¹ This incorporation of critical theory with psychoanalysis generally concentrates on the development of the super-ego with the Führer as father figure. In his massive study, *Male Fantasies*, Klaus Theweleit made a significant contribution to the field by revealing how fascism also includes the fear of the "feminine."² Alice Kaplan, following Klein and Chodorow, has taken this analysis a step further by utilizing object relations theories to account for pre-Oedipal emotions within fascism. In this article, I will explore some of the intersections between theories of the post-Oedipal stage of super-ego development and the object relations theories of "mother-bound" desire.³ These fantasies, I will argue, are not only central to a fascist worldview, but also are easily molded to support other ideological agendas.

To illustrate this contention, I will analyze two German plays, both first performed in 1933, one fascist (*Schlageter*) and one anti-fascist (*The Races*).⁴ Both plays, though lacking in literary merit, deserve attention historically: *Schlageter* is considered the first successful fascist drama produced in the Third Reich; *The Races*, written in exile, was the first major literary work protesting fascism to be performed. Both plays demonstrate the means by which the individual is drawn into the fascist group; in the case of *The Races*, the protagonist eventually rejects this identity and is transformed into a committed anti-fascist. Crucial to the success of these opposite "conversions" in the plays is a commitment to traditional patriarchal gender roles and the designation of "proper" male or female behavior.

Based on a glorification of masculinity, German fascist culture embodied a psychological response on a societal level to traumatic historical conditions in post-World War I Germany. The "manliness" privileged by Nazi rhetoric can be detected in these two plays through metaphoric (definition through illustration)

Susan Russell is an Assistant Professor of Theatre Arts at Gettysburg College. She holds an M.A. in Theatre and Drama from the University of Wisconsin and a Ph.D. in Drama from the University of Washington. She has worked as a dramaturg and translator and assisted in new play development at the Empty Space Theatre in Seattle, the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, and the Utah Shakespearean Festival. She has previously published articles on the Holocaust plays of George Tabori and other aspects of German-language theater.

and metonymic (definition through association) constructions of "femininity" and rely on particular national myths and traditional patriarchal tropes for their resonance. In other words, "masculinity" is defined within these plays through the representation of proper "feminine" behavior (the Ideal Woman, or her opposite) and the representation of improper masculine behavior (the unmanly or womanly man). Often these "unmanly" characters are Jewish or foreign and/or associated with socialism/communism. Similar strategies are used in the anti-fascist play; only the examples of (positive) "manly" behavior differ. For example, in *Schlageter*, the German men ridicule the French, who are perceived as "feminine" because of their use of hair cream and jewelry. The Germans are considered more masculine (and therefore superior) because they fight against the French. In *The Races*, the anti-fascist hero eventually rejects the Nazis whom he considers "feminine," childish, and thus inferior because they have been "seduced" by Hitler and fail to think for themselves. Either way, the negative behavior is associated with femininity, a sort of disease that seems attractive in women but utterly repulsive in men.

The process of the creation of a fascist subject, including his rejection of what he perceives as "feminine," is illustrated in Hanns Johst's play *Schlageter*. Premiering on Hitler's birthday, April 20, 1933, at the Staatliches Schauspielhaus in Berlin, this play was considered the first official theatrical herald of the Third Reich.⁵ It was presented to a group of high-ranking Nazi officials, as well as to members of the new literary elite who had immediately replaced the former Weimar intellectuals. Johst had completed *Schlageter*, with its dedication to Hitler, "in loving homage and unswerving loyalty," in 1929, before the Nazis came to power, but his publishers advised against its publication during the Weimar Republic for fear it would be banned. Its main character was the real-life Freikorps member, Leo Schlageter, whom Hitler described as a hero in *Mein Kampf*, and who quickly became a favorite Nazi martyr.⁶ The play features the events leading up to Schlageter's decision to fight against the French in the Ruhr Valley in violation of government policy. Schlageter was captured and executed by the French in 1923.

Schlageter serves as a prime example of fascist attitudes about gender not only because of its symbolic status as the first successful fascist production, but also because it clearly illustrates three crucial motifs of fascist thought that Theweleit analyzed in the writings of Johst's Freikorps contemporaries.⁷ These motifs, grounded in German history, were crucial in the formation of a national consciousness and constituted the necessary bond Adorno claims is essential for the formation of a fascist group.⁸

The first motif Theweleit traces is the so-called "stab in the back theory" of World War I, which blamed the civilian socialist government for Germany's military defeat. According to this belief, the government capitulated before the soldiers actually lost the field; hence, the notion arose that the "bureaucrats" had betrayed the "true Germans," the fighters on the front. In reality, the combat situation

had grown so dire that the military had to surrender; still, the story of betrayal persisted. The fallen will return, the story went, to rejuvenate the Volk and wrest the nation from the Weimar Republicans, who compromised Germany's honor by agreeing to what were perceived as the atrociously unfair terms of the Versailles Treaty.⁹

The second motif Theweleit chronicled is intense German nationalism grounded in Prussian militarism.¹⁰ This glorification of the war experience provided an outlet for male camaraderie that supposedly transcended sexuality. The hero warrior's behavior was codified as the proper "masculine" exemplar for this generation of Germans—a sharp contrast to the weak and "effeminate" Weimar Republicans and their supposed allies: socialists, Jews, and all those perceived as the "Other," the enemy.

Theweleit's most original finding, the third motif, is integrally linked to the second: a defensive attitude towards women and female sexuality, which he ties to the fear of boundary dissolution, "of being swallowed, engulfed, annihilated," and to the related fear of the illegitimate usurpation of power.¹¹ This fear results in the construction of an "Other" as a mechanism of self-cohesion. Hence, the "soldier male" maintains a defensive stance against all he considers "feminine" in other men, in women, and especially in himself, including anything associated with weakness: the body, liberalism, internationalism (the dissolution of national boundaries), homosexuality (the dissolution of strictly defined gender boundaries), and communism (the dissolution of social/class boundaries).

The "cult of the fallen soldier," intensified nationalism, and a defensive attitude towards femininity all depended on tropes of a threatening "Other" for their force. Collapsing these enemies together was common practice: Weimar Republicans, Jews, socialists, communists were all denigrated through aligning them with weakness, effeminacy, and/or excessive sexuality. These traits were contrasted with the superior values of masculinity. Thus, masculinity was defined through its feminine (negative) counterpart, as well as through its positive characteristics. Femininity is defined metaphorically through the appearance of actual female characters in the text, and metonymically, through the association of "womanly traits" with certain (threatening) ideas and (male) individuals. A critique of these metonymic, or associative, tropes is what J.M. Ritchie's otherwise excellent analysis of *Schlageter* lacks.¹² Ritchie recognizes the positive types as revealed through the characters of Alexandra, Schlageter's love interest, the "ever-faithful German woman, smiling through her tears."¹³ He also describes Mrs. Thiemann as "the true German mother," another type of Ideal Woman. However, Ritchie fails to recognize those negative tropes of femininity that link the "external" (French) enemy with the "internal" (Republican) enemy in the soldiers' minds.

An examination of these motifs in *Schlageter* will reveal the inadequacies of psychoanalytic theories of fascism that rely merely on the development of the

super-ego as identification with the father (Führer) figure (either as positive “father-bound” emotions or negative fear of authority). The following examples from the play reveal that a more elaborate system of fears and desires seems to be at work and can be better explained through Theweleit’s version of fraternal (rather than paternal) identification and Kaplan’s notion of positive “mother-bound” emotions, alongside the negative fear and rejection of femininity Theweleit noted.

The negative associations of femininity and their conflation with other undesirable traits are obvious in the opening scene of *Schlageter*. Leo Schlageter, a 29-year-old returned soldier, is studying economic theory in the hope of making a name for himself in the newly established Weimar Republic. His friend Thiemann, a Freikorps soldier, tries to convince him to join in the fight against the French. Thiemann, who fought in World War I along with Schlageter, embodies the betrayed soldier who wants to return (in the spirit of his dead comrades) and take back Germany. Thiemann despises Schlageter’s efforts to educate himself for he considers book learning “feminine.” He encourages Schlageter to return to the “masculine” world of guns and comradeship they previously enjoyed. He considers himself a man of “action” and deems any kind of “theory” antithetical to the German spirit. By “theory,” he is referring specifically to (French and Weimar Republican) ideas like liberty, equality, democracy, i.e. the sort of modern “decadence” and weakness associated in his mind with the French, Jews, “back-stabbing” pacifist Republicans, the “feminine.” In fact, Thiemann is the one who utters the infamous line, often wrongly attributed to Goering: “When I hear the word ‘culture,’ I slip the safety catch on my Browning” (I. 1).

But Schlageter stands his ground against his friend, arguing that all those “fairy tales of the good old days in the world war” are history now. Pen and ink must replace weapons as the way to survive, he insists. Soldiering was his old job and bookkeeping his new one. Thiemann is deeply offended by Schlageter’s reasoning: for him, being a soldier is not simply a job. He compares being a soldier to entering the priesthood: it is a “post,” a calling. Schlageter’s response to this argument is a very curious remark, practically incomprehensible unless one realizes that what they are talking about is not so much the respective occupations of bookkeeper and soldier, but rather about their own sense of masculinity: “Achilles even wore women’s clothes—that’s definitely worse than civilian ones . . . and he was still—Achilles!” (I. 2).¹⁴

Thiemann retorts by lamenting his friend’s familiarity with Greek poetry (another jab at his masculinity). Schlageter then seeks an alternative representation of manhood; surely, he argues, the German man is not *only* a soldier. Thiemann disagrees, maintaining that it is precisely that which defines a German man: his struggle (sein Kampf). Schlageter laughs at his friend, exclaiming, “No Paradise can tempt you out of your barbed wire shack,” his soldierly life. Again the language here is rife with traditional tropes of masculinity (sacrifice, strength, a barbed wire

shack symbolizing the rugged life of a soldier) vs. femininity (Paradise, worldly comforts, pleasure, the temptation of Eve). Thiemann agrees: nothing could tempt him away and, at this point, he makes the famous remark about hearing "culture" and reaching for his gun. The association is completed within only a few pages—the Republican and French values have been firmly linked to that threatening femininity, against which Thiemann is content to ready his phallic pistol.

As the conversation continues, Schlageter begins to relent a bit, referring to a popular notion related to the "stab in the back theory": he lays the blame for their society's current predicament on their "failed father," the Kaiser, who abandoned the troops. He knows the present situation is intolerable, but he sees no other choice for Germany's abandoned sons. "This bookkeeping stuff isn't right," he admits to Thiemann. "But Her Majesty the majority believes in it, and you have to serve her. You must totally devilishly conscientiously be her senseless victim until catastrophe hits" (I. 2). The tyrannical masses are feminized in Schlageter's mind, signaling a horrible deterioration of order. Even though he labels the soldiers' blind obedience to the failed Kaiser "silly," Schlageter ultimately considers it superior to being the "senseless victim" of that feminized source of power, the masses. He believes the world is bound for catastrophe because she (the mass) rules instead of being ruled. This situation occurred because the Kaiser unmanfully abdicated his power and gave it up to the masses. Schlageter's disdain for the masses echoes Thiemann's revulsion for the libertarian ideals of the French Revolution. Democracy, or "mass rule," signifies the undesirable co-optation of the power of a single strong male leader. If the leader is worthy, then Schlageter doesn't seem to mind that soldier followers themselves become a kind of "mass," for their elite male "in-group" is far superior to "Her Majesty the majority." Schlageter concedes that he has been forced to desert the "manly" calling of a soldier and replace it with "feminine" servitude to mundane bureaucracy. But he insists that he can only return to soldiering if he receives some sort of command from someone and feels again the calling Thiemann describes. The rest of the play chronicles Schlageter's search for, and eventual reception of, this command and his subsequent return to battle.

The initial impetus for Schlageter to become "the first soldier of the Third Reich" issues from Thiemann's sister, Alexandra, whom Schlageter loves. Her scornful indictments of the "half heroes" of the Weimar Republic, their Jewishness and their "bureaucracy," coupled with Schlageter's attraction to her, inspire him to rescue her from the current political leaders. Theweleit notes the importance of the "sister" figure in Freikorps literature: in remarkably large numbers, "comrades" married their comrades' sisters, which Theweleit claims contains both an incestuous and homoerotic dynamic. Certainly these women constituted less of a threat to the soldier males than other women might.¹⁵ Schlageter depends on Alexandra for inspiration, but though he allows her to call herself a "comrade," he violently

opposes Thiemann's suggestion that she might assist them in their mission: "Skirts do not belong at the front" (III. 3). Schlageter confides in Alexandra his desire for a command and asks her where it might come from, but it is obvious it will not be from her. "I am a dumb little girl," she tells him. "You won't get clever by hanging around me. I wanted to ask *your* advice about what's to be done [about the French]" (I. 8). After Schlageter finally decides to fight, his old servant tells Alexandra he will report to his master how brave she was after her lover left for battle, how she smiled, "pretty as a model's head in a beauty shop window" (III. 10). Her ability to look pretty as an empty model's head is one of her most prized contributions to the fascist cause.

Ultimately, it is Schlageter's encounter with a former general who is now a Weimar Republican that provides the impetus for him to fight. He asks the General his opinion of the unlawful rebellion against the French in the Ruhr Valley, admonishing him to "search in the right place—your heart!" for his answer (II. 4). Though he is too cowardly to join them, the General finally admits that his sympathies lie with the rebels. Here, as elsewhere in the text, "manly" emotions are privileged over "feminine" intellectualizing. After the General convinces Schlageter that the cause against the French is just, the General's young son becomes Schlageter's admirer and disciple, "blush[ing] like a little girl" after professing his loyalty to Schlageter. Schlageter comments on the "manliness" of this encounter: "Such a handshake, from man to man. From comrade to comrade" is nothing to be embarrassed about, he assures his young devotee (III. 5).

The two scenes with the "fatherly" General and with his son, Schlageter's younger admirer, support Theweleit's contention that, in the case of German fascism, the leader serves as a big brother rather than a father figure to his followers. Theweleit argues that the Freikorps writings are a "literature of sons"—the "anti-Republican rebels" who, like Schlageter in the play, saw themselves as the worthy (true German) brothers fighting against the illegitimate, unworthy (traitors-to-Germany-and-manhood) brothers over the power abdicated by the failed father, Kaiser Wilhelm II.¹⁶ This notion directly contests the argument of the Frankfurt School theorists, who, borrowing from Freud, focused on the Führer solely as a figure of paternal authority and identification with Hitler as the ego's identification with the super-ego. Schlageter's disdain for the Kaiser and pity for the General, whose impotence prevents him from pursuing the morally correct course, illustrate his own disillusionment with these father figures. He also becomes an admirable "older brother" in the eyes of the General's son, replacing the boy's loyalty to his father, just as the Nazis turned to their peer, Hitler. However, paternal and fraternal authority both still rely on patriarchal configurations of power: the brother-sons are still defined by the father's phallic power, which they have assumed.

But the incident with the General's son also reveals another dimension of desire, described by Kaplan in her incisive analysis of fascism which includes a consideration of pre-Oedipal or what she calls "mother-bound" emotions: "[Within fascism], many ordinarily unacceptable activities (singing, loving, being together—and other activities from the realm of 'cuteness') are being done in the name of acceptable masculine ones: a lot of mother-bound pleasure is being 'snuck in' to the fascist state in the name of virility."¹⁷ The handshake, which makes the boy "blush like a little girl," becomes transformed into a manly and acceptable activity, as are many common fascist group activities, such as singing, hiking, and other boyhood favorites. Kaplan focuses on these so-called "mother-bound," rather than "father-bound" feelings in fascism, "not because the father-bound doesn't exist, but because mother-bound feelings do not, as I write, have an established place in political theory."¹⁸ A more complex theory of fascism could be developed by combining Freud and Adorno's work on the super-ego, Theweleit's notion of the fraternal, and Kaplan's work on object relations theories and pre-Oedipal desire.

Kaplan's inclusion of "mother-bound" emotions was not undertaken as a means "to condemn biological mothers instead of fathers as the disseminators of authoritarianism, but rather to show how extraordinarily flexible and varied is the reappearance of emotions about both parents (parental functions) in adult emotional life."¹⁹ Kaplan seems to be the only theorist of fascism who takes both pre- and post-Oedipal desire into account. She describes how previous theorists of fascism, following Freud, have ignored the pre-Oedipal: "One has the feeling that Freud simply can't keep track of the place of both parents at once. The result is uncannily faithful to Freud's real world: father-child relationship goes to work in the analogies between man and society, mother-child is left at home."²⁰ Kaplan's work is an extension of the work done by feminist and psychoanalytic theorists since Freud, including the work of Klein, Balint, Theweleit, Chodorow, and Flax, which Kaplan claims can be described in a shorthand way as "an effort to work through this one simple Freudian phrase: 'I cannot think of any need in childhood as strong as the need for the father's protection.'"²¹ Thus, feminist psychoanalytic work has been twofold: 1) to explain why the mother is absent from Freud's theories; and 2) to account for what Freud refers to as that "oceanic" feeling, what Margaret Mahler renamed "symbiosis" with specific reference to the mother as the first and primary caretaker. What Kaplan proposes is a rethinking of fascist fears and desires in terms of both mother- and father-bound emotions: "One can't 'decide' between the mother-bound and father-bound elements in fascism. They get bundled up in fascism's totalizing machinery and offered up in fascist language to appeal at different emotional registers at different moments of fascism's history."²²

The desire to belong, to be submerged in the group, which Kaplan claims resonates with the "oceanic," early feelings of complete oneness with the mother has been analyzed in a different way by previous theorists of mass psychology.

Freud, and following Freud, Adorno, argued that the desire to belong to the group can be attributed to two factors: 1) the individual's identification with the leader's authority (with the leader as ego ideal); and 2) the concomitant fear of that authority. One of the very first to theorize about German fascism was Herbert Marcuse in 1934. He saw authoritarian power as essentially negative and argued that all of fascism's concepts were counter-concepts (anti-Marxism, anti-liberalism), leaving only obedience to a feared authority.²³ Kaplan splits the two, designating the appeal of losing oneself in the crowd, a return to restored unity, the loss of boundaries, the closeness of comradeship, and the leader's promise of nourishment and protection, as all being tied to positive, "mother-bound" emotions, and the fear of authority as being "father-bound" emotion. I disagree with her splitting the two, using "mother-bound" to describe positive and "father-bound" to describe negative emotions. As Theweleit has shown, the fear of the dissolution of boundaries associated with the feminine is every bit as powerful, as if not more, than the desire for it. But Kaplan also concedes that it is not always possible to separate "mother-bound" and "father-bound" emotions since they are frequently tied together.

It seems that insofar as the leader becomes the strong, admired group ideal, then identification with that power seems to resonate with (positive) notions of the super-ego (father or brother). A negative element of fear seems intrinsic to this identification, which Freud described as sadomasochistic. Insofar as the individual feels the freedom of the dissolution of boundaries (in this safe male space) and comradeship, the resonance he feels may well be tied to the "oceanic" sense of oneness with the mother, back when she was the most powerful one in the child's universe. But how can Kaplan's idea of the appeal of the feminine be reconciled with the perceived threat of the feminine, which Theweleit chronicled?

Both "mother-bound" and "father-bound" emotions seem to have elements of what Klein named "splitting," that is, both positive and negative functions. Klein writes, "This fear of an object [i.e. primary love object, the mother] seems to have its earliest basis in external reality in the child's growing knowledge—a knowledge based on the development of his ego and a concomitant power of testing by reality—of his mother as someone who either gives or withholds gratification . . ."²⁴ The infant's growing knowledge that the mother can either give it or deny it what it wants leads to the view of the parent as either generous protectors or cruel persecutors.²⁵ "Splitting" accounts, I believe, for the dual notions of "father" and "mother" in both Theweleit's and the object relations theorists' accounts of fascism. But Chodorow and other object relations theorists have noted that the "splitting" is a more intense process for boys because of the situation in which women are primary caretakers. E. Anthony Rotundo, in *American Manhood*, explains it this way:

[V]irtually all children are nurtured in infancy by their mothers. When they begin to separate themselves from the primary unit of that nurturing bond, all children face the task of establishing an identity as an independent human. That task is doubly difficult for boys. They must not only separate themselves from their mothers individually, but as males from females, since virtually all known societies treat social maleness and femaleness as matters of importance. The desire felt by all children to return to primal unity with the mother is thus doubly threatening to boys because it represents not just a surrender of one's independent social identity but a surrender of one's sex-appropriate gender identity as well.²⁶

Rotundo concludes that, "one of the many consequences of this regressive threat to male identity is a devaluation of all things female in defense against earlier feminine attachment."²⁷

This early childhood resonance could play a large role in understanding Adorno's findings about fascists' creation of an "in-group" and an "out-group."²⁸ This desire for an "Other" results in the minimization of differences between members of the in-group, who consider themselves superior, purer, and manlier than the out-group. Such a process of group-formation, based on demonization of the enemy, is operative in *Schlageter* in the constant appeal for unity among different age groups and classes of men based on the idea of a common race and nation and the employment of the label of "feminine" for the "Others." For example, the effeminacy (and, therefore, moral laxity) of the French is underscored in several places in the play through references to their use of hair cream and jewelry; also the weak "effeminacy" of the democratic masses is often contrasted with the "manliness" of an elite group of soldiers dedicated to a single leader.

Leo Schlageter became the group "ideal" not only within the play itself, but also for the opening night audience in 1933. The last scene of the play shows Schlageter, captured by the French, his back to the audience, his hands bound behind him, "as if he carried the whole world" (IV. 6). This resemblance to Christ is reinforced by the French soldier's blow, which knocks him to his knees. Like a black wall facing the audience, the French firing squad looms before him. Schlageter utters his final injunction: "Germany! One last word! One wish! Command! Germany!!! Awaken!! Take fire! Burn! Burn furiously! And you—Fire away!" (IV. 6). This last, expressionistically-punctuated utterance is echoed by the French soldier's order to fire. Lights then emanate from the guns so that the shots are sent out into the dark mass of the audience. Schlageter passes on to the audience the "command" he was finally given himself. His "resurrection" can occur only through the arising, the "awakening" of the body of the Volk under the guidance of the

Fuehrer.²⁹ The gunfire is also threatening, underscoring the violent urgency of the situation. The premiere's conclusion elicited a spontaneous reaction from the crowd: the audience responded to the play's finish by rising "as one man" and singing "Deutsch-land, Deutschland über alles," followed by the first verse of the Horst Wessel song.³⁰ In the darkness of the auditorium, the crowd lost its individuality, just as the soldiers' individuality is negated through the wearing of uniforms, the cutting of hair (to distinguish them from females), the formation in lines, and the geometric regularities of the group's movements. The audience at the premiere of *Schlageter* incorporated themselves into the Nazi narrative, making a spectacle of themselves spontaneously, one that later became standardized in political rallies and Thingspiele.³¹

Like Schlageter, Hitler fought as a soldier in World War I. He was imprisoned by the government for the aborted Beerhall Putsch in 1923, the same year that Schlageter was executed. He too represented himself as an "average man" with a will to save his people from the evils of the Weimar Republic. By identifying with Schlageter (and with Hitler), Hitler's followers in the audience could gratify what Freud defined as the individual's twofold desire: to submit to authority and to *be* authority. By identifying with Schlageter, the men in the audience could simultaneously *be* the ideal (father/brother, ego identification) and experience the pleasure of submitting to a power larger than themselves individually (mother, symbiosis). Also Schlageter's flouting of the law and suggestion that he answers to a "higher calling" imply that Hitler, too, was justified in his totalitarian gestures, such as proclaiming a state of emergency and dissolving the Reichstag.

Similar dynamics occur during the "fascisization" of the protagonist of the landmark anti-fascist play, Ferdinand Bruckner's *Die Rassen* (The Races). In it, however, we see Karlanner's conversion to fascism and subsequent re-conversion as an anti-fascist; nevertheless, many similar assumptions about gender slide over to the service of the anti-fascist agenda as well. Again, a conjoining of Adorno, Theweleit, and Kaplan's theories can help illuminate some of the twists and turns of this double conversion story. *The Races* was written in the summer of 1933 and produced in November 1933 at the Zurich Schauspielhaus under the direction of Gustav Hartung. This production established the Zurich theater's reputation as the foremost bastion of anti-fascist theater during the war years. Ferdinand Bruckner (real name: Theodor Tagger), an Austrian Jew, had been one of the most successful dramatists of the Weimar Republic and enjoyed an international reputation, which he never regained after fleeing Germany in 1933. Bruckner's previous dramatic successes included two other *Zeitstücke* ("topical works"), which depicted social ills of the day, *Pains of Youth* (1926) and *The Criminals* (1927), and dealt with the education and criminal systems, respectively.

The Races was intended as "a cry from the heart of a deeply humanistic writer devastated by the havoc his own countrymen unleashed on his beloved

homeland.”³² Banned because of its anti-German politics in Vienna, Prague, and London, the play shocked its Swiss audience with its urgent and impassioned plea to heed the fate of the Jews in Germany. The playwright juxtaposed what he considered to be the childish mindlessness of the fascists with his hero, Karlanner, who, having first been seduced by Nazi ideology, rediscovers himself by the end of the play and becomes a fighter for the “other Germany,” in which many exiled writers believed: a secret, underground German spirit that rejected the madness of the fascists. However, Karlanner’s switch from Nazism to liberal individualism sometimes relies on assumptions almost indistinguishable from Nazi rhetoric vis-à-vis gender.

The story takes place in an unspecified German university town, in March and April of 1933, and traces the impact of Nazism on a group of young people’s lives. Four of the main characters of the play are male medical students. Rosloh, who has failed his exams many times, is a Nazi, and as his party rises to power, his status at the university improves. His classmates Karlanner (the protagonist) and Tessow used to be close friends with Siegelmann, who is Jewish, until Tessow joined the Nazi party and began to ignore him. Tessow eventually converts Karlanner to Nazism too and convinces him to break up with his Jewish girlfriend, Helene. She is the daughter of Mr. Max, a rich and greedy capitalist who is on good terms with the Nazis. He refuses to sympathize with his fellow Jews who are less wealthy. After joining the Nazi Party, Karlanner participates in a humiliating Nazi “punishment” of Siegelmann, but ultimately he refuses the order to arrest Helene. Sparked by a new desire to fight for individual freedom, Karlanner rescues Helene by warning her of the danger she is in, murders the Nazi Rosloh, and ultimately is arrested by the Nazis at the end of the play, a heroic martyr for the cause of anti-fascism.

The first scene of *The Races*, like the opening scene of *Schlageter*, features the proselytizing of a true believer, Karlanner’s best friend, the Nazi, Tessow. Like *Schlageter*’s friend Thiemann, Tessow attempts to convert Karlanner to his cause. Tessow’s conversion attempt is immediately and overtly associated with fear and hatred of Judaism and femininity, which are both embodied in the person of Karlanner’s Jewish girlfriend, Helene. The first line of the play is Karlanner’s: “You believe I shouldn’t marry her because she is a Jewess?” (I. 1).³³ Bruckner understood these associations well, and Tessow’s sexist and anti-Semitic rhetoric is foregrounded in this scene so that it might be contradicted later by the hero’s proper democratic convictions. Nonetheless, the morally superior role that Karlanner, the Christian hero, adopts later on still depends on certain sexist and anti-Semitic stereotypes.

Tessow first tries to convince Karlanner to free himself of “that brainy Jewess” by appealing to Karlanner’s manhood and Germanness against such evil influence. Tessow complains that Karlanner “used to be a German,” but now has

become, as has the German nation, just another “master eating out of the slave girl’s hand.” He believes that democracy has weakened Germany and made German men servants when they should be masters. Like Schlageter, Tessow feminizes the masses; they have become “the slave girl” who rules over the master instead of being ruled. In his mind, the “master culture” has lost its power over the base, “slave” culture (democracy, socialism, Judaism). Tessow does concede, however, that, because of their unfortunate political circumstances, Helene served a useful, if transitory, purpose in Karlanner’s life: “She suckled you like a bitch would a wolf pup when you needed it. She gave you something to hang onto in the senseless years that are behind us now. . . . All of us Germans were uprooted, misfits. We had no fathers. You happened to have Helene to help you out, but she never would have been necessary if you’d had a father” (I. 1).

But now, Tessow adds, they have a father to care for them and for all of Germany—Hitler—and therefore, Karlanner doesn’t need Helene (as mother) anymore. Karlanner and Tessow are literally fatherless: Karlanner’s father was killed in World War I; Tessow’s was so humiliated upon his return from battle that he killed himself. The Nazis viewed the entire nation as symbolically fatherless because of the abdication of the Kaiser. Helene was only a booby prize; she gave Karlanner temporary nurture because his needs, which could really only be met by a father, were so strong. These orphan sons dream of a glory they never had: Tessow confesses his desire to have fought and fallen on the battlefield in 1914. Thus, Tessow’s appeal to a nationalistic masculinity (in opposition to the internationalist femininity Helene embodies), coupled with Karlanner’s resentment against the current government, begins to draw Karlanner into the Nazi fold.

Another tactic Tessow uses is to denigrate intellectualism, also associated with Helene and with Judaism. He describes Jewish thinking in terms of a threat to manhood: it is a “winding and twisting and turning our minds inside out that has emasculated our brains” (I. 1). Book-learning and intellectualism are also maligned in a later scene when Karlanner complains that since the Nazis have taken over, it is more difficult to get a good education at the University. The Nazi leader, Rosloh, accuses him of being “Jewified” for saying such a thing and holds up their hero, Schlageter, as the ideal: “What is so great about book learning? When Schlageter, who was a student back then like we are now, came back from the war and when he should have been back at the books, he cried out: I will shit on my school desk as long as Germany is dying a wretched death, and he went off [to fight]!” (I. 3).

The turning point in Karlanner’s attitude towards the Nazis occurs when he finally decides to attend a rally, to experience firsthand what his friend has been raving about. Previously, the appeals to identify with Hitler as a father figure did not work on Karlanner. Criticizing his girlfriend did not seem to work either, for he loves Helene and refuses to objectify her the way his Nazi friends do. But the rally brings about his transformation, and the words he previously ignored begin

to sink in. Returning from the rally, he tells Helene that he had a revelation while singing patriotic songs there. Before the rally began, he and Tessow reminisced about the wonderful songs they had sung in their childhood, and Karlanner feels that he returned to that state of joyful belonging at the rally. When Helene seems more interested in telling him about her search for an apartment for them that day, he berates her. Submerged in the group, he has had a glimpse of Germany's bright future. He blames her for his previous blindness, accusing her of holding him down during this heroic epoch, "filling my head with tangible things, cufflinks, picnics, bathrooms. And all the while a tidal wave is sweeping over Germany, all of Germany. Today I went to just one meeting, and all the materialist soot was washed away" (I. 2). At the rally he realized that "to give yourself over to an emotion, no matter how meaningless it may seem, is better than to hang back like a coward, thinking." He experienced that oceanic feeling of belonging to something bigger than himself, something he considers lofty, heroic, emotional, clean, German and masculine, which he contrasts with the dirty, intellectual, cowardly, domestic, Jewish and feminine world she wants to confine him to. Karlanner tells Helene that he finally had a sense of belonging, "of no longer being a Jew," an outsider like she is. And he loves that feeling. After his experience at the rally, he leaves her because she does not belong in this shining new world he has discovered. His feelings of belonging caused him to submit to his "mother-bound" emotions, rejecting the "bad mother" (Helene) and embracing the "good mother" feelings he received from his brothers in the Nazi crowd. This conversion involves a rejection of reason and a complete surrender to emotion.³⁴ After he angrily breaks up with Helene, Karlanner heads off to a tavern, where a raucous group of Nazis spouts anti-Semitic "racial theory" and sings more songs. The group, including Karlanner, seems to grow more and more enthusiastic as they grow more and more inebriated until Karlanner declares that he cannot hold anymore and asks to be left alone, his head down on the table. The consumption of immense quantities of alcohol hastens the conversion process.

Karlanner's re-conversion to anti-fascist fighter is not so clearly delineated in the text as his conversion to Nazism. In attempting to show Karlanner's return to democratic convictions, Bruckner's play was a heroic gesture and was important in alerting audiences to the growing dangers in Nazi Germany and also to establish the notion of the "other Germany"—those who opposed the Nazis. Still, as Ritchie points out, the "rapidly changing moods" of the "impressionable youths," which Bruckner evoked so effectively, may have helped to "reinforce the illusion that if young men like Karlanner can change so rapidly from democrat to Nazi and back again, then there never was any firm foundation for belief in Hitler, and his followers would drop away from him as quickly."³⁵ It is also more difficult to pinpoint Karlanner's conversion to anti-fascism because this change happens to him alone (not in a rally or other group), internally, and off-stage. Karlanner's conversion

seems to rely heavily on the fact that he does not respect the local leader, Rosloh, and that their first "battle" is against people weaker than they are (Siegelmann, Helene, and Jewish shopkeepers).

After Karlanner participates in a group beating of his friend Siegelmann, he and Tessow, exhausted and frightened, discuss their fears and doubts about the Party. Tessow admits that he does not like to shoot—he does not like the blood. Karlanner describes his own state of mind as "dazed," "as if I'd drunk a magical potion," as a "sleepwalker" who will regret it "if he tries to understand why he is standing on the roof" (II. 5). Karlanner and Tessow both look down upon their leader, Rosloh, a petty thug. Tessow confesses that "his first disappointment" was that the Nazis met no resistance from them, that they simply surrendered themselves. Rosloh interrupts their ruminations with orders for their first big "action:" to keep shoppers from entering Jewish shops. Tessow is disappointed with Rosloh because he maintains that certain Jews are acceptable to the Nazis, like Helene's father, Max, for example, who helped the Nazi cause by writing to foreign newspapers about how good the Jews' situation is in Germany. When Rosloh argues that these Jews are a kind of separate race from the others, Tessow becomes angry. Rosloh, who himself is not a respectable leader, is now breaking down the delineation between the in-group and out-group that Tessow relied on. Rosloh also insists that Karlanner help in Helene's arrest. After Rosloh leaves, Karlanner and Tessow confess that they are sick about the next day's work, and Karlanner reminisces about his feelings at the rally, when he really believed that their race was superior. Now he longs to sit in the sun like "the farmers and their wives" he noticed on the sunny day before, over the border in France, peacefully working together to harvest fruit (II. 5). Tessow reiterates his longing to have died on the battlefield in France in 1914 when what they were fighting against seemed clearer. Both long for the feeling of belonging and purpose they felt at the huge Nazi rally. Both seem to regret that their first big "action" is so petty, against such a weak enemy. One gets the feeling that if Rosloh had been worthier and the fighting more of a military nature, Karlanner and Tessow would not have changed their minds!

Whereas Karlanner's decision to join the Party and submit to his "mother-bound" emotions depends on surrendering his reason (sleepwalking, drinking the magic potion), his ultimate rejection of the Party is prompted by his refusal to arrest Helene. Within the context of the play, his act of resistance is represented as turning away from the "childish ideals" of Nazism to a more adult sense of individual moral responsibility. In the first flush of his conversion to Nazism, Karlanner talks about how when they were children, they would stand outside the store window at Christmastime and gape and wish. Now the whole nation stands gaping like that, and, in the words of a Nazi schoolteacher Karlanner overhears at the beerhall, "this fairytale [of Nazi control] is becoming reality" (I. 3). Near the end of the play, after they have taken part in violence against Jews, Karlanner and Tessow

lament their participation in the Party. Tessow admits that now he knows that “it is suicide to put your life under the spell of childish ideals” (III. 9). Even though earlier Karlanner has argued that it is better to give oneself over to an emotion, “no matter how meaningless,” than to just sit and think, by the end of the play, Karlanner has realized how misguided certain emotions are and what dangers they can lead to.

Structurally, in terms of Helene’s role in the story, Karlanner’s conversion process, like that of the “New Man” in Expressionist Wandlungsdrama, depends on her as a passive aid to his moral development.³⁶ And his conversion to anti-fascism means he must ultimately renounce his love for her and strike out as an individual. First, as his “trained nurse,” Helene rescues him from alcoholism and acts as a surrogate parent. Later, she concerns herself solely with their upcoming marriage and apartment. She has told him that she would gladly be baptized as a Christian because she is an assimilated Jew. When he abandons her and joins the Nazis, she decides to educate herself in Judaism and stand up for her fellow Jews, but even this is undermined in the text. Karlanner visits her after he has decided to fight against the Nazis and castigates her, equating her newfound sense of Jewish identity with the fanaticism of the Nazis: “[The Nazis’] insane disease is that suddenly we can’t be German enough. I am no longer myself, only a German. That is my madness. You are only Jewish. That’s yours . . . Both attitudes are equally foolish” (II. 6). Childishness, foolishness, Nazism, and now Helene’s education in Judaism, are all equated. And when he denounces her identification with her people as being of the same ilk as the narrow-minded nationalism of Nazism, she believes him. She also accepts his refusal to flee with her and gives up her previous desire to remain and suffer with her people.³⁷

But, unlike the women in the fascist play, Helene is also capable of behaving heroically. She stands up to her father, a stereotypically, greedy capitalist, who owns a factory that makes personal hygiene products.³⁸ She uses his occupation as a metaphor to describe the sickness of the Nazis: in this most hygienic land, she argues, they have completely neglected inner purity. Even though her father wants to help her escape, she refuses his help and decides (at first) to remain in Germany, in solidarity with other Jews, especially the poor Jews for whom her father has no sympathy. She also stands up to Karlanner when she encounters him again for the first time after he has joined the Party, furious at him for the violence they committed against Siegelmann, though she uses blatantly Christian imagery to criticize the Nazis:

What your Rosloh doesn’t know is that exactly nineteen hundred years ago, in 33, another Jew was forced to carry a placard, a much heavier one. It didn’t merely say, “I am a Jew.” It said, “King of the Jews,” King of the Despised; King. (*Quietly*) Even

if the Roslohs who laughed at him then have resurrected the kingdom of pain and shame, He also has been resurrected for all the oppressed, both Jew and Christian. Resurrected to be a haven for all those who have to carry the placard. They will outlive the Roslohs. Have no fear. They will outlive them once more. (II. 6)

Bruckner, like Johst, was, of course, a product of his time, and it is not my intent here to condemn him or to somehow equate the two playwrights. However, Bruckner was no doubt attuned to political circumstances that demanded that he write a play whose primary audience was Christian and to alert them to the dangers of fascism.³⁹ Bruckner and other anti-fascist writers were utilizing the tools they thought best to fight a real danger; the political necessity to reach the audience quickly and clearly dominated and displaced the possibilities of a gender critique, and even caused Bruckner to utilize Max, Helene's father, a stereotype. Though Karlanner remained the major hero the audience is to identify with, especially in the murder of Rosloh, Helene and Siegelmann both behave bravely and defy anti-Semitic stereotypes. Karlanner's final words, as the Nazis take him away to be executed: "It's my Germany too: for all eternity" underscore the idea of the "other Germany" and the possibility of resistance against the Nazis.⁴⁰

The benefits that the conjunction of theories about pre- and post-Oedipal desire bring to an analysis of fascism are multiple. Foremost among these benefits is the potential for analyzing gendered rhetoric in contemporary political discourse (e.g. in the Gulf War, the war on terrorism and other conflicts, as well as the misogynist, anti-Semitic, and homophobic platforms of various hate groups in the U.S. and Germany).⁴¹ This rhetoric reveals the continued necessity of analyzing the links between fascism and sexism and the need for critiques of this rhetoric which foreground or dispense with sexist tropes rather than reinscribing them.

Notes

1. See Theodor Adorno, "Freudian Theory and the Pattern of Fascist Propaganda," *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, eds. Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt (New York: Continuum, 1978); Walter Benjamin, "Theories of German Fascism: On the Collection of Essays *War and Warrior*," ed. Ernst Junger," trans. Jerold Wikoff, *New German Critique* 17 (Spring 1979): 120-128. Also Theodor Adorno, in collaboration with Betty Aron, Maria Hertz Levinson, and William Morow, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Norton, 1969), and Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism: Antisemitism, Imperialism, Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966).

2. *Male Fantasies*, vol. I: *Women, Floods, Bodies, History*, trans. Stephen Conway, in collaboration with Erica Carter and Chris Turner, and *Male Fantasies*, vol. II; *Male Bodies:*

Psychoanalyzing the White Terror, trans. Erica Carter and Chris Turner, in collaboration with Stephen Conway. (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987).

3. Alice Yaeger Kaplan, *Reproductions of Banality* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986). For other examples of object relations theory, see Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1978), and Dorothy Dinnerstein, *The Mermaid and the Minotaur* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976). The basic idea expands on Freud's theories and makes them historical and contextual. For example, the baby's usual first "love object" is its mother because in twentieth-century Western societies, women have been the primary childcare providers. The father is associated with power and society at large because in twentieth century Western societies, middle- and upper-class men have traditionally been the breadwinners outside the home. Object relations theorists, therefore, concentrate more on the mother-child bond because it has been overlooked more in Freudian psychoanalysis, though they build on Freud's initial foundations. Melanie Klein was one of the very first to shift the concentration in this direction in the 1930s, though her analysis lacked the historical contextuality of later theorists, such as Nancy Chodorow.

4. Hanns Johst, *Schlageter* (Munich: Langen/Mueller, 1933); Ferdinand Bruckner, *Jugend Zweier Kriege*, Band I (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1948) 225-339.

5. A few weeks earlier, the Deutsches Theater produced a play called *Ewiges Volk* (*Eternal Volk*), which exploited the mystical concept of the "Volk" characteristic of Nazi "Blut und Boden" literature. Written by Nazi Party member Kurt Kluge, the play was lauded by the Nazi press, but closed after only five performances. Max Reinhardt, the beloved Jewish director of the theater was forced to emigrate only one month previously, and the critic for a local newspaper explained the play's closure in terms of Reinhardt's departure: "The regular audience at the Deutsches Theater, which was fanatically devoted to the productions of Max Reinhardt, has now turned its back on the theater... They behave as if Achaz [Reinhardt's replacement] had driven away the great Reinhardt." For an excellent case history of the theater during this chaotic period, see Wayne Kvam's "The Nazification of Max Reinhardt's Deutsches Theater Berlin," *Theatre Journal*, 40.3 (October 1988).

6. For a more detailed description of this performance, see J.M. Ritchie, "Johst's *Schlageter* and the End of the Weimar Republic," *Weimar Germany: Writers and Politics*, ed. Alan Bance (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1982) 153-67. Ritchie reports that *Schlageter* is an unlikely candidate for martyrdom because it is suspected that he may have betrayed his own comrades in an attempt to save himself. See also J.M. Ritchie, *German Literature Under National Socialism* (London: Croom Helm, 1983).

7. The Freikorps was a group of elite soldiers—many of whom had served in World War I—hired by the Weimar Republican government to suppress various uprisings on the Left and on the Right during the tumultuous 1920s. Many Freikorps members became Hitler's strongest supporters. Leo Schlageter was also a Freikorps member. Theweleit studied over 250 manuscripts (letters, diaries, novels, and autobiographies) by members of this group. He drew his major conclusions about the links between fascism and misogyny from these manuscripts.

8. Theodor Adorno, "Freudian Theory and the Pattern of Fascist Propaganda," *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, ed. Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt (New York: Continuum, 1978) 118-137.
9. For further discussion of this theory, see George Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990). Other descriptions of "front plays" (plays about the soldiers who fought in WWI) can be found in William Sonnega, "Theatre of the Front: Sigmund Graff and *Die endlose Strasse*," *Theatre in the Third Reich, the Prewar Years*, ed. Glen W. Gadberry (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995) 47-64. See also Susan Manning, *Ecstasy and the Demon: Feminism and Nationalism in the Dances of Mary Wigman* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1993), particularly the description of *Totenmal (Call of the Dead)*, a dance tribute to the dead soldiers of WWI.
10. Sybil Oldfield describes some of the historical background of this "dubious legacy of Bismarck and von Treitschke" in her book *Women Against the Iron Fist* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).
11. Barbara Ehrenreich, introduction, *Male Fantasies*, by Klaus Theweleit, vol. 1 (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987) xi.
12. Ritchie, "Johst's" 153-67.
13. 154. The role of Alexandra in the premiere was played by Emmy Sonnemann, whom Goering later married.
14. All translations are mine from Johst, *Schlageter*.
15. Alexandra embodies one of the positive aspects of the Freikorps writers' three-sided perception of women Theweleit observes in terms depressingly familiar to feminists: 1) the neutral, pure, white, "asexual" nurses at the front; 2) the "Red" women—whorish, lascivious, dirty, proletarian, armed and dangerous; and 3) the women left behind, supportive and in need of protection, who signify an appropriate (absent and thus not threatening) sexuality. Both the asexual (virgin mother) nurses and the sisterly women left behind signify the "good" women, who are always associated with actual or potential motherhood.
16. Theweleit, *Male Fantasies*, vol. 2, 369.
17. Kaplan 11. Kaplan also notes that so-called "mother-bound" sentiments such as these gave no real power to women, who were mostly reduced to reproductive machines in Nazi ideology.
18. 11.
19. 11.
20. 11.
21. 12.
22. 24.
23. Paul Piccone, introduction, *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, ed. Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt (New York: Continuum, 1978) 17.
24. Melanie Klein, *The Psychoanalysis of Children* (1932; London: Hogarth Press, 1973) 184-5.
25. For a history of object relations theory's beginnings, see Janice Doane and Devon Hodges, *From Klein to Kristeva* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992).
26. E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood* (New York: Harper Collins, 1993) 308.

27. Rotundo 309.

28. Adorno, "Freudian Theory."

29. Johst wrote another play later, *Thomas Paine*, in which Paine becomes "the ideological Führer of the American War of Independence," who appeals to his followers to forge a community of "racially worthy citizens" based on the need for land. His life, too, comes to a tragic end, but he is seen as a heroic martyr because his "national idea" succeeded. For more on *Thomas Paine*, see Barbara Panse, "Censorship in Nazi Germany," *Fascism and Theatre*, ed. Gunter Berghaus, (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996) 149.

30. Ritchie, *German Literature*.

31. The Thingspiel movement began in Nazi Germany and was replete with gender bias. For example, in his book envisioning a new Nazi theater movement in Germany, Wilhelm Andreas von Schramm wrote in 1934 that the Thingspiel was an appropriately "masculine world" and juxtaposed its "manly plays" with the "degenerate, orgiastic" works of Weimar Republican playwrights, whom he described as "inwardly old, vain, unmanly, and faithless, [grown] sick on empty intellectualism." See Bruce Zortman, *Hitler's Theater: Ideological Drama in Nazi Germany* (El Paso: Firestein Books, 1984). For a history of this movement, see also Henning Eichberg, "The Nazi Thingspiel: Theater for the Masses in Fascism and Proletarian Culture," *New German Critique* 17 (Spring 1979), and John Willett, *The Theatre of the Weimar Republic* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1988).

32. Barry Edelstein, program notes, *Race*, dir. Barry Edelstein, Classic Stage, New York City, April 2001. An English translation of the play by Ruth Langner was performed by the Theater Guild in Philadelphia in 1934 and given a celebrated reading by luminaries of the German exile community in New York in 1942; since then, however, Classic Stage has been the only U.S. theater to produce the play. Edelstein used a mix of the Langner translation and a literal translation of the original German to create the text used in their production.

33. All translations are mine, from Bruckner, *Jugend Zweier Kriege*.

34. It is curious in Nazi rhetoric, the stereotypical associations of women with emotion and men with thinking and reason are switched. Emotion is seen as authentic, active; thinking is viewed as cowardly, holding back. As in *Schlageter*, emotion is associated with nature; thinking with culture.

35. Ritchie, *German Literature* 232.

36. For an excellent description of the role of women within Expressionism, see Barbara D. Wright, "'New Man,' Eternal Woman: Expressionist Responses to German Feminism," *The German Quarterly* (Fall 1987): 582-99.

37. Ruth Langner's English translation undermines Helene's heroic actions even further by having her proclaim that she only resisted as a challenge to Karlanner. Thus, her motives have more to do with personal revenge against him rather than real political commitment. She also declares that if Karlanner leaves her, she will have "nothing to cling to."

38. In the characterizations of Helene and her father, Bruckner puts a modern spin on medieval and Elizabethan literary tropes to deal with conflicting Christian attitudes towards Jews. The rich Jew and his beautiful, virtuous daughter were a stock pair which divided such conflicting views along gender lines, attributing the positive characteristics (faith, beauty, virtue) associated with Hebrews to the daughter, and the negative ones (greed, deicide, pharasaism) to the father. The daughter was seen as

being cursed by her bloodline but virtuous in her character, which often enabled her to be "redeemed" by Christianity, usually in the form of a Christian husband who converts her (e.g. *The Merchant of Venice*). See Ellen Schiff, *From Stereotype to Metaphor: The Jew in Contemporary Drama* (New York: State U of New York P, 1982).

39. When I asked myself why Bruckner would resort to this stereotype of Max, I recalled Vivian Patraka's fascinating discussion of another anti-fascist play, Lillian Hellman's *Watch on the Rhine*, and I borrow extensively from Patraka's ideas in analyzing Bruckner's possible motivations. See Vivian Patraka, *Spectacular Suffering: Theatre, Fascism and the Holocaust* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1999) 69-81.

40. The recent Classic Stage Company production in New York illustrated this point quite brilliantly in the final moment on stage: Karlanner is taken off by one of the Nazis while another brutally shatters the lamp with the bare bulb which had been the only light on stage. Karlanner's light, his life, and the light of reason and democracy were all tragically snuffed out.

41. For a thorough overview of contemporary parallels in gender-rife rhetoric vis-à-vis political policy in the U.S., see Linda Kintz, *Between Jesus and the Market: Emotions that Matter in Right-Wing America* (Durham: Duke UP, 1997). I found that many of the issues are strikingly similar to what I've discussed here. For overviews of the situation in Germany, see Hermann Kurthen, Werner Bergmann, and Rainer Ebb, eds., *Antisemitism and Xenophobia in Germany after Unification* (London: Oxford UP, 1997); Jan Herman Brinks, *Children of a New Fatherland: Germany's Post-War Right-Wing Politics* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000). For a perspective on Europe, see Richard J. Golsan, ed., *Fascism's Return* (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998).