# How Modern or Anti-modern is (was) Europe?

«Modernity, the shadow of the Revolution, absent here and incomplete there, no longer functions without crisis. Contradictions move through it and it constitutes their work in default of a radically revolutionary negativity which, according to the initial Marxist project, would have metamorphosed life itself. More: these crises multiply, grow closer together and become the general rule, the norm … Multiple and multifarious, despite all denials, these crises seem to constitute our Modernity. They are integral to its consciousness, to its image, to its apologetic project.»

Henri Lefebvre, «Theses on Modernity»[1]

The publication at hand is a scholarly companion volume to the exhibition *Anti:modern—Salzburg in the Heart of Europe, between Tradition and Renewal*. The notion that Salzburg is located in the heart of Europe can be regarded as an undisputed geographic fact. As a result, the city has become a beloved destination for cultural events such as the Salzburg Festival, which was founded in 1920, and a variety of significant congresses. As illustrated by a relatively recent event, Salzburg attracts more than simply affluent lovers of culture, business magnates, and scientists—fifteen years ago, Salzburg was a satellite location for the 2001 World Economic Forum in Davos, and one of the first demonstration sites for opponents of globalization.[2] In more recent history, Salzburg made news in 2015 as the bottleneck passage for Syrian refugees en-route to Germany. As the world looked on, Salzburg's civil society demonstrated tremendous involvement in helping shape a Europe that is open to a plurality of people, and especially to those who have fallen upon extremely precarious existential and economic situations brought on by war and displacement. Is Salzburg therefore—with all of its international appeal—merely conservative, or is it in fact, as has repeatedly been suggested, anti-modern?[3] Based on this perhaps provocative but widespread consideration, the exhibition and accompanying publication will attempt to illustrate a varied view of modernism in Salzburg as a case study for a region located in the heart of Europe. This volume includes new research and essays by prominent authors examining the extent to which there was a liberal cosmopolitan climate and openness to the modern arts in this west Austrian region, and if and how that climate was suppressed by 1930s political propaganda. How were local modern impulses expressed in comparison with international initiatives, and how did they relate to those well-known examples that

emanated from outside of Austria? Were these local impulses capable of connecting with those international initiatives (did they even want to)? And if so, what kind of relationships ensued? The preface for the first exhibition of the Wassermann artists group at Salzburg's Künstlerhaus in 1919 includes the words: «contemporary art is a cosmopolitan art that speaks to all of mankind, not just to individual nations.» This event is generally regarded as one of the few local examples of artistic departure into the modern age. As it continues, the text for the catalogue, which was written by Josef Mühlmann (who, like his half-brother Kajetan Mühlmann, operated as an art thief during the National Socialist era), illustrates the ambivalent nature of this departure. It reads: «It is up to each artist to decide if they desire or wish to conform to local or national [*völkischen*] circumstances. They all have one thing in common: they bring their present experiences alive through their creations.»[4]

This exhibition project examines the manifestations of modern and anti-modern world views through not only the lens of the fine arts, but through a large spectrum of other subjects as well including manifestations of modernism within society and politics as well as the formulations thereof in literature, dance, theater, and music, and scientific discoveries. Each of these will be discussed in terms of the far-reaching consequences of concepts and deeds that stood in opposition to modern life. The obliteration and emigration of vast portions of the population, the loss of valuable works of art and objects of modern art, and the defamation thereof play a central part of this narrative. Art historian Frederic Jameson suggests that, «the condition of modernity ... invariably requires the setting of a date and the postulation of a beginning.»[5] Because of the variety of disciplines, genres, and themes discussed herein, we have decided to set not just one date, but several dates as starting points, and to identify the beginnings of—and oppositions to—local manifestations of modernity that have been deemed significant for this study.

The image of the city, which was has been shaped by the rise of international metropolises including Berlin, Paris, and Vienna, is generally considered a platform for modernity. With the expansion of the city and the nineteenth century construction of the *k.k. privilegierte Kaiserin Elisabeth-Bahn* (Empress Elisabeth Railway), Salzburg became increasingly integrated within the network of major European cities, and the Salzkammergut region became a popular summer destination. This development also aided in drawing international scientists and scholars to Salzburg, as illustrated by the decision to hold the first International Psychoanalytical Congress in Salzburg in 1908. It even led to the establishment of family-run scientific laboratories within the Salzkammergut, such as that of the Exner family in Brunnwinkl on
lake Wolfgang. The Salzburg Festival is generally regarded as a catalyst for the arts. Its founders, Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Max Reinhardt, saw themselves as preservers of an Austrian baroque theater tradition, and established the Salzburg Festival as a renewal project for Austrian theater. As such, it was conceived as a bulwark against the kind of modernism and avant-garde that emanated from Berlin. In addition to the well-known Salzburg Festival, there are several lesser-known examples of decidedly modern initiatives of an international scale. One such organization is the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM), which was established in 1922 as an answer to the Donaueschingen Festival, at the time dedicated exclusively to German chamber music. Another example is the Elizabeth and Isadora Duncan School, which settled at Schloss Klessheim in Salzburg, but was soon—as was likewise the case for other dance schools of the time, especially those that taught German expressive dance—instrumentalized by the *Kraft durch Freude* (KdF, or strength through joy) ideology propagated during National Socialism.

The span of time covered in this publication includes the history of the Museum der Moderne Salzburg, which was initiated in 1976 with a donation from the collection of art



dealer Friedrich Welz, and opened in 1983 as the Modern Gallery and Graphic Collection—Rupertinum. During the National Socialist era, before becoming the head of the Salzburger Landesgalerie and later dean of the Rupertinum, Welz had been appointed by *Gauleiter* Friedrich Rainer to work as an art dealer for the National Socialist regime.[6] This being the case, the museum's most significant works were the subject of a thorough provenance study some years ago. As a result of this research Gustav Klimt's 1915 painting *Litzlberg am Attersee*, a central piece in the collection, was restituted to its rightful owner in 2011. Thanks to the former owners' generous donation of a portion of auction proceeds, the historic former water tower that sits beside the museum's newly constructed building on Mönchsberg was renovated. The water tower has been dedicated to Amelie Redlich, the original owner of the painting. Redlich, née Zuckerkandl, stemmed from one of the most well-known turn of the century families of art patrons. They commissioned—among others—Josef Hoffmann with the erection of the famous Sanatorium Purkersdorf near Vienna. A drawing of Georg Jorisch, the son of Amalie Redlich, documented that the painting had hung in the Sanatorium, and set the restitution
claim into motion.

## Which Modernism?

Modernism is a common but vast and ambiguous term, the content and historic conditions of which are the subject of constant revision. The modern era is generally understood as at the period in which our (modern) society developed in regard to social, cultural, technological, and economic advances. In Europe, the first steps toward a modern world occurred with the Renaissance and Early Modern periods, between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. The fall of papal and monarchistic structures of power laid the foundation for humanism, reformation, enlightenment, and secularization, and led to the foundation of nation states. While during the Middle Ages people were regarded as masses without individual rights, the individual gained central importance in the modern age. At the same time we saw the development of industrialization and the division of labor, which lead to a radical shift in the way life was lived. Conceptually, modernism in art originated in late seventeenth century France with the so-called *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, or the quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, whereby the primacy of antique literature and art were brought into question for the first time. Modernism brought with it art's claim for autonomy. Because artists now experienced more independence from patrons, they served as examples of the modern individual. During the course of industrialization common man, however, became increasingly subject to norms and systemization. According to Hans Belting, the autonomy of art was, «a projection of longing for the viewer, who could no longer fulfill his desire for autonomy in his post-revolution life, but found it in art.»[7]

The notion of modernity as an era did not take shape until the 1970s. According to Cornelia Klinger's analysis, this is because it «once and for all abandon[ed] the relational determinations of the respectively new, present-day, and current ... becoming tangible in and of itself, meaning it reflects upon itself, namely upon the conditions of its potentiality.»[8] Viewed from a critical non-Eurocentric and non-Western perspective, the establishment of colonies and their exploitation of raw materials, including the enslavement of their populations, which went hand in hand with modernity, was instrumental to the growing prosperity of the Western world. Walter Mignolo puts it well when he writes that, «modernity/coloniality are two sides of the same coin.» He reminds us that the, «European

Renaissance was conceived as such, establishing the bases for the idea of modernity, through the double colonization of time and space.»[9] National Socialism and other dictatorships flourished during the 1930s, so too did the dark side of modernity, and the consequences of this remain with us to this day. By the same token, the complicity of capitalist modernity and artistic modernism is becoming increasingly more recognized.[10] It is in this vein that Bruno Latour, in a critical observation of our society, postulated the thesis that we have never been modern.[11]

## Modern Life

Looking back, what were the significant characteristics and changes that denoted modern life? We've already mentioned the education of modern society with regard to a democratic order and humanistic values, and the drawbacks thereof. These went hand in hand with achievements in technology, science and—naturally—in the arts and culture. These spheres, as is generally known, are also fertile ground during dictatorial regimes. When we look back at ideas that today appear radical, it becomes apparent that the inter-war lifestyle was far more modern and avant-garde than that of today.

A glimpse into former times offers rich illustration of this epoch of change: A person en route 150 years ago from Vienna to Salzburg would have taken the *Kaiserin Elisabeth-Bahn*, which was constructed in 1860. The journey would have taken nine hours. The traveler would have arrived at the newly constructed Salzburg train station and, upon arrival—after glancing at the train station's clock—would have had to turn their watch back thirteen minutes. Back then, the Salzburg clock was set to a different time than those of the Austro-Hungarian Empire's western capital. Not even Vienna had achieved a standard time that was accurate to the minute. While the so-called «railway time» was used to calculate train schedules, local time was still determined by the mean solar time. A standardized time system was first introduced in Europe with the gradual implementation of Central European Time, which began in 1893 for Austro-Hungarian railway and telegraphy communications, but took until 1910 for Austria in general. This development simplified international transactions and communications, and paved the way for modern trade and industry, as well the standardization and monitoring of labor.

During the course of industrialization, cities such as Berlin, Moscow, Paris, Vienna, and New York grew into metropolises with employment opportunities and living space (most of the time insufficient ones) for their rapidly growing populations. These cities also offered stimulating artistic environments, and became creative hotspots for innovative artists whose work reflected upon modern life. Escaping the city, those city dwellers that could afford it—generally the bourgeoisie—spent their free time (also a product of industrialized work) in regions known for their beauty and in which the man-made environment harmonized with the landscape and nature. The city of Salzburg and its surrounding regions became the home of, and meeting place for, numerous personalities in the fields of industry, science, art, and culture—especially during summer time.

## The Loss of Modernity, Exile as a Condition, and the Revival of Modernity

Many essays in this book address the various expressions of different notions of modernity, tradition-conscious tendencies, and the instrumentalization of the arts during the 1930s. Exile, the loss of common values, and issues of national identity that continue to this day, followed by questions of how to revive modernity post-1945, also play an important role in these texts.

After the end of World War II, Europe—especially those countries that had endured the dictatorial regime of the Third Reich—found itself in a precarious situation the likes of which had been previously unknown. Entire cities, industrial sites, transportation routes, and public facilities were destroyed. But most importantly, millions of people, many of whom had contributed to social and economic advancement and to the lively pre-war cultural scene, had been either murdered or driven into exile. During the National Socialist era, modern art had been defamed as «degenerate,» and literature and scientific books had been publically burned. The 1938 burning of books on Salzburg's Residenzplatz went down in the city's history. This occurrence can be described as decidedly anti-modern and hostile toward the modern arts in general. How can modernity be revived after such an experience, and within a society in which many were not yet ready to accept guilt for the unparalleled genocide that had been carried out? How can we even begin to make up for the loss of a vast portion of the population—a portion that had a modern view on life, significant intellect, and a high level of knowledge? These are questions that have occupied the societies of the world—and especially those of Austria and Germany—since the end of the World War II until this day.

One of the most internationally renowned projects for the revival of modernism was the 1955 *documenta* in Kassel. Since then, this exhibition has taken place every four to five years. Eighteen years after the *Degenerate Art* exhibition and its anti-modern counterpart, the *Great German Art Exhibition,* academy professor Arnold Bode envisioned *documenta* as a presentation of precisely the modern art that had been defamed by National Socialists. The event was held at the hastily restored Fridericianum Museum, and helped Germany reengage with the international dialog on art. Roughly 130,000 people visited the first exhibition, which represented all major art movements and personalities from the previous fifty years. Four years later, *documenta 2* was no longer a review show. From that point on it became dedicated to contemporary art. It's early focus on abstract art, especially that of American abstract expressionists, paved the way for the geographic shift from the former European art capitals of Berlin and Paris to New York in the United States.[12]

The Salzburg International Summer Academy was founded in 1953, two years prior to *documenta*. Friedrich Welz, the aforementioned controversial and versatile Austrian art dealer, was able to secure Oskar Kokoschka—who had emigrated to Switzerland—as its artistic director. Kokoschka's School of Vision on Hohensalzburg Castle is Europe's oldest summer academy, and is geared toward amateurs as well as professional artists of all ages and artistic practice.

Let us continue with the assumption that Salzburg offers an especially fertile ground for tradition and conservative lifestyles. If this is true, then how is it different from other parts of the world that do not have his image? What are the requisite conditions for the production of anti-modernity? And what conditions are necessary to open society to innovative thought, to modern ways of life that are relevant in our time and true to progressive art? These central questions loom large over the *Anti:modern* project. This exhibition offers a selection of works by contemporary artists that provide a glimpse into their perspective on this subject, and suggest us possible paths into a modern future.

1 Henri Lefebvre, «Theses on Modernity,» in *Modernism and Modernity. The Vancouver Conference Papers*, eds. Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, Serge Guiltbaut, David Solkin (Halifax: The Press of Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 2004), 11.

2 The European Economic Summit was hosted in Salzburg from 1996 to 2002. *Der Standard* newspaper described Salzburg as resembling a fortress during the summit, and demonstrators were accompanied by a massive police presence. Artist Oliver Ressler addresses the events surrounding the demonstrations of July 1, 2001 in his video *This Is What Democracy Looks Like!*

3 See Robert Hoffmann, who quotes painter Peiffer Watenphul, who refers to Salzburg as the «Eldorado of anti-modernism,» in *Mythos Salzburg—Bilder einer Stadt* (Salzburg and Munich: Verlag Anton Pustet, 2002), 89. Oskar Kokoschka also referred to his own anti-modernism, particularly in regard to his position against abstraction in art.

4 Translated for this essay from Josef Mühlmann, «*Vorwort*,» in *1. Ausstellung der neuen Vereinigung bild. Künstler Salzburg «Der Wassermann,» Künstlerhaus Salzburg* (exh. cat. Kunstverein Salzburg, 1919), 5. Mühlmann was the half-brother of SS-*Standartenführer* Kajetan Mühlmann, who was named commissioner for the arts during the Third Reich, and who led the organized art theft in Poland and the Netherlands. See Birgit Schwarz's essay in this volume.

5 Translated for this essay from Frederic Jameson, *Mythen der Moderne* (Berlin: Kadmos Kulturverlag, 2007), 37.

6 See the essay by Susanne Rolinek, «‹Eine moderne Galerie …› —zur Vorgeschichte des Museum der Moderne Salzburg und zur Rolle des Kunsthändlers Friedrich Welz,» in *Vom Tafelbild zum Wandobjekt* 1, 1 (Weitra: Verl. Publ. P No 1, Bibl. der Provinz, 2005), 8-13.

7 Translated for this essay from Hans Belting, *Das unsichtbare Meisterwerk. Die modernen Mythen der Kunst* (Munich: Beck, 1998), 28.

8 Cornelia Klinger, «Modern/Moderne/Modernismus,» in *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe*, vol. 4, *Medien – Populär* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 147.

9 Walter Mignolo, «Coloniality. The Darker Side of Modernity,» in *Modernologies. Contemporary Artists Researching Modernity and Modernism*, ed. Sabine Breitwieser (exh. cat., Barcelona: Museum d'Art Contemporani; Barcelona: Igol, 2009), 39-49.

10 Gerd Blum and Johan Frederik Hartle, «Modernisme noir. Revisionen des Modernismus in der zeitgenössischen Kunst,» in *Cella. Strukturen der Ausgrenzung und Disziplinierung*, eds. Christoph Bertsch and Silvia Höller (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2010), 97.

11 *We Have Never Been Modern* is the English language title of Bruno Latour's *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes. Essai d'anthropologie symétrique* (Paris: La Découverte, 1991).

12 See Serge Guilbaut, *Wie New York die Idee der Modernen Kunst gestohlen hat. Abstrakter Expressionismus, Freiheit und Halter Krieg* (Dresden / Basel: Verlag der Kunst, 1997). Original French version: *Comment New York vola l'idée d'art moderne. Expressionsisme abstrait, liberté et guerre froide* (Nîmes: Hachette, 1983).

13 Deborah R. Coen, *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty. Science, Liberalism, and Private Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).

14 Translated for this essay from Karl-Markus Gauß, «*Rede für Salzburg*,» January 15, 2016, in: Salzburg 20!6, http://www.salzburg2016.at/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/Rede_Karl_Markus_Gauss_-_Innenteil_12-01-16.pdf_ (last accessed May 19, 2016)



## Acknowledgements

The impulse behind this exhibition and the publication at hand grew out of the book *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty* by historian of science Deborah R. Coen.[1] Her story about the Exner family of scientists, who had established a summer and research residence in Brunnwinkl on Wolfgangsee, introduced me to an entirely new image of Salzburg. In light of the museum's history and regional context, it seemed important to pursue this vision of an Austrian universe of great scientific achievements conceived in a liberal environment, followed by the tragedies that fell upon political, scientific, and cultural life during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which continue to shape us today. I am very grateful that Deborah Coen has also contributed an essay for this publication. In this respect I would also like to thank Nora Alter, professor for film and media art at Temple University, Philadelphia, who recommended I read Coen's book during my move from New York to Salzburg. I would furthermore like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the authors that contributed to this volume for their efforts, which I will roughly sketch out, and from which I have learned a great deal. Contemporary historian Oliver Rathkolb offers us deep insight into the socio-political environment that existed in Austria between 1918 and 1948, and pursues the idea of the ambivalent nature of reactionary modernism—in other words, of modernism within authoritarian and fascist regimes. In his essay social psychologist Karl Fallend describes the events surrounding the first International Psychoanalytical Congress, which was held in 1908 at Salzburg's *Elektricitätshotel* (today's Hotel Bristol) and during which Sigmund Freud gave a five hour lecture, as well as the development of psychoanalytical research during the post-war era, specifically at the University of Salzburg. In his analysis of Salzburg's architectural history and circumstances, art and architectural historian Roman Höllbacher likens Salzburg to a «frozen city» that has crystallized within a specific manifestation of beauty that—as a UNESCO World Heritage Site—cannot change. Höllbacher moreover looks back at controversial demands of art historian Hans Sedlmayr, who took over the professorship for art history in Salzburg in 1965. The book, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival. Austria as Theater and Ideology, 1890–1938* by Michael P. Steinberg offers one of the most profound analyses of the history of the Salzburg Festival. An abridged chapter from that volume appears in this publication, thus once again making a portion of this important, and unfortunately out-of-print, book accessible.

I am especially pleased with our cooperation with musicologist Monika Voithofer, who dedicated her essay to the establishment of the International Society of Contemporary Music (ISCM), and establishes Austria and moreover Salzburg as a setting «between reactionary traditionalism and radical modernism» within the history of music. Art historian Birgit Schwarz has published the results of recent research on the politics of National Socialist looted art in *Gau* Salzburg. She reports on Salzburg's attempt to recover vast collections from Vienna following the *Anschluss*, and to free itself form the yoke of the capital city. In her contribution, Elizabeth Cronin presents us with a type of traditional modernism that is exemplified by *Heimat*, or homeland photography—a genre that has several outstanding representatives in Salzburg. Dance historian Claudia Jeschke focuses on modern dance and masquerades thereof in Salzburg. These are characterized by schools such as those run by Elizabeth and Isadora Duncan, as well as Margarete Wallmann, and likewise include personalities like Kurt Joos, Harald Kreutzberg, and Grete Wiesenthal. Beatrice von Bormann's text examines whether artists can be propelled into exile as a result of esthetic considerations, and if there are potential connections between outsiders and emigrants,

as exemplified by the cases of Erika Giovanna Klien and Oskar Kokoschka. Last but not least, Hildegund Amanshauser describes the beginnings of the Salzburg International Summer Academy and, in light of current deliberations regarding a year-round academy project for Salzburg, addresses the topic of innovative models for contemporary art academies.

A number of other individuals and institutions in both Salzburg and beyond have generously contributed to the content and success of our publications and exhibitions, and are detailed at the end of this publication. Their contributions range from inspiration, ideas, information, and concrete curatorial contributions, to all of the donations that have kindly been made available to us. I would like thank Friedrich Urban and the entire 20!6 Salzburg board of trustees including its chairman Hans Mayr, this project would not have been possible without their support. The exhibition came together under my curatorial leadership and through the dedicated commitment of the project team: I am very grateful to Beatrice von Bormann, co-curator of modern art, as well as to curatorial assistants Barbara Herzog, Marijana Schneider, and Verena Österreicher. Finally, I would like to thank Ute Stadlbauer for another skillfully managed publication, and Martha Stutteregger for her unfailingly surprising and wonderful publication design.

I close with an excerpt from author Karl-Markus Gauß's «*Rede für Salzburg*» speech, held on the occasion of the opening of the celebratory year 2016. Contrary to suspicions that he is a backwoodsman, Gauß in part answered the question of why he still lives in Salzburg with: «Even the most remote regions [are] connected to transportation systems and—now more than ever—ideologically with the newest developments in the world while, conversely, the metropolises of the world are demonstrating an interesting tendency toward disintegrating into hundreds of villages.»[2]

1 Deborah R. Coen, *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty. Science, Liberalism, and Private Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).

2 Translated for this essay from Karl-Markus Gauß, «*Rede für Salzburg*,» January 15, 2016, in: Salzburg 20!6, http://www.salzburg2016.at/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/Rede_Karl_Markus_Gauss_-_Innenteil_12-01-16.pdf_ (last accessed May 19, 2016)





# **The Ambivalent Nature of Reactionary Modernism in Austria from 1918 to 1948.** Notes on the Debate on Conservative Revolution and Degenerate Art

Even though international debates on modernism and National Socialism—such as American historian Jeffrey Herf's *Reactionary Modernism*—would provide sufficient impulse for scholars of contemporary and art history to address the topic of modernism within authoritarian and fascist regimes, none other than British professor for contemporary history and political theory Roger Griffin has chosen to do so.

Traditional definitions of modernism are characterized by concepts of rationality and autonomy in art, they automatically equate the eras of technological advancement and industrialization that followed, as well as the phenomena of the democratization and secularization of newly developing social structures, with modernism in culture.

In the following analysis I endorse Herf, who interprets the reactionary modernism behind conservative German national forces and National Socialism as an amalgamation of an enthusiasm for technology and the simultaneous rejection of enlightenment and contemporary parliamentary democracy. From the outset cultural developments such as Expressionism and New Objectivity were marginalized, and classified as «degenerate» because they were by nature fundamentally opposed to anti-democratic dictatorships.

Discussions surrounding «cultural Bolshevism,» and «degenerate art,» governmental bans on stigmatized forms of music, dance, fine art, architecture, literature, film, et cetera, and the profound and deadly consequences these had for the artists themselves, are clear and brutal illustrations of Herf's thesis.

In his June 6, 1945 speech «Germany and the Germans» Thomas Mann coined the phrase, «the last highly mechanized romanticism» to describe the development of, and the atrocities committed under, National Socialism. National Socialism carried with it radical racism and anti-Semitism. These peaked, trumping any and all other points of view, following the 1933 assumption of power and were manifested by the equation of numerous aspects of modernism as «Jewish,» «culturally Bolshevist,» and «degenerate.» The reactionary modernism carried out by the National Socialist regime was profoundly anti-democratic, profoundly irrational, and demanded totalitarian control over the *Führerstaat* in general, and art in particular.

In the following text I will selectively touch on characteristics of this development that were specific to Austria, and whereby Austria—in contrast to Germany—was subject to ambivalent governmental implementation of this reactionary brand of modernism by way of the Catholic-conservative revolution that occurred during the 1933/34–1938 era

chancellor dictatorships of Engelbert Dollfuß and Kurt Schuschnigg. Within the Weimar Republic there was no such authoritarian interim period.

Herf developed his model for reactionary modernism based on prominent national conservatives such as Ernst Jünger, Oswald Spengler, Carl Schmitt, and Hans Freyer. There were, in fact, comparable personalities within the Austrian context, some of whom—such as Karl Anton Rohan, who like Hugo von Hofmannsthal has been subject to little political interpretation, and Othmar Spann, who is only discussed in isolated academic circles—have been forgotten.

Similar to the Weimar Republic, Austria's First Republic was ushered in as a result of the profound socio-economic and political consequences of the First World War. The victorious Allied powers barred Austria from joining democratic Germany, and it was thus obliged to search for a new model that could provide positive prospects for the unintentionally small state. Amidst profound economic crises with high permanent unemployment rates, the Austrian political culture was characterized by the formation of extreme political camps, which had in part begun with the development of the mass parties and their sub-organizations in the last years of the Habsburg Monarch.

German theologian and liberal politician Ernst Troeltsch estimated the ambivalent character of the European waves of democratization after 1918 as likewise applicable beyond Germany: «We became Europe's most radical democracy over night,» said Troeltsch in a lecture on December 16, 1918—this was also the result of socio-economic developments. Like many other political personalities of liberal, bourgeois, or even conservative persuasion, Troeltsch got to the heart of the quick adoption of democracy that was a means of preventing something worse—a communist revolution. In 1919 Troeltsch believed that democracy was «the only means we have today of ushering in a healthy and just formation of state, the reversal of class rule, the rule of the proletariat and to salvage the seed of a socialist state.» The kind of functioning democracy associated with this meant more than the implementation of political demands from the failed 1848 revolutions, it also implied the restructuring of social orders. But it was precisely this demand for social justice that Europe's young democracies were unable to realize.

By the latest with the 1920 dissolution of the national unity government, Austria's political system was dominated by, according to Detlef Lehnert, «two and a half camps» that were extreme rivals: The Christian Social Party which, together with the smaller and more fragile Greater German People's Party persuaded the majority to install primarily Christian Social chancellors, and the Social Democrats. The radical nature of the social split into various camps was expressed in the hermetically divided models of the birth of a «new man.» This split was palpable in numerous aspects of life, ranging from how people planned their recreational activities to their relationships to education and religion, and included a conflict-ridden federalism between the states that was dominated by «black» Christian-Social to Conservative political parties and Social-Democrat «red» Vienna. There were, in addition to this, subcutaneous monarchistic tendencies within the Catholic clergy among the former Habsburg Monarchy elite and among some civil servants and aristocrats who regarded the parliamentary republic as unnatural and undesired by God.



## The Notion of a «Conservative Revolution»

It is no coincidence that Hugo von Hofmannsthal, one of the cultural protagonists of the Habsburg Monarchy, introduced his concept for a «conservative revolution» at the end of a speech held at the University of Munich:

«I am speaking of a process of which we are in the midst; a synthesis, as gradual and great—if seen from the outside—as it is dark and scrutinizing from the inside. We may call this process gradual and great, if we consider, that even the long period of development that spans from the beginning of the Age of Enlightenment until now constitutes only a fraction of this process, and that it is, in reality, a internal counter-development against those upheavals of the mind that took place during the sixteenth century that we like to call the Renaissance and the Reformation. The process to which I refer to is nothing more than a conservative revolution of a scale not yet experienced in European history. Its aim is to shape a new German reality in which the entire nation can take part.»

It was also no coincidence that the prelate and leaders of the Christian Social Party, including chancellor Ignaz Seipel, supported Karl Anton Rohan in the establishment of an international alliance of European nation states and the European Cultural Alliance against Bolshevism and liberalism, which leaned heavily on France and developed into an intellectual network of top business leaders. This Catholic conservative network differed form Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi's Paneuropean Movement in its rejection of any form of Democratic-liberal institution and, above all, propagated the conservative concept of *Abendland* while emphasizing the significance of sovereign nation states.

Between the years 1924 and 1934 Rohan, under the influence of Max Scheler and Carl Schmitt, organized annual conferences in numerous European cities. Several industrial magnates from Germany and Luxemburg supported these activities as well as the widely read cultural periodical *Europäische Revue*, which Rohan ran from 1925 to 1936, and was geared toward opinion makers. Rohan, like Hofmannsthal and Seipel, was enthusiastic about Mussolini and Italian fascism, and openly advocated for a Catholic-fascist-National-Socialist union against communism.

As early as 1924, author Heimito von Doderer, who was initially fascinated by the youthfulness of the 1917 Russian Revolution, supported this new conservative trend and called for a revolution: «We must finally discard the 19th century like trash! Everyone must decide between: the future or the past. I have unequivocally chosen the future.» In 1927 Doderer began sympathizing with the National Socialists, and joined the NSDAP in April of 1933 at age 36.

The *Deutscher Kulturbund* (German cultural association) had been active in Austria since 1928 and was inaugurated as a Linz-based organization in 1931 with a speech by Alfred Rosenberg. Before being officially banned on March 12, 1933 the *Kulturbund* had established regional groups in Vienna, Graz, Linz, Salzburg, and Innsbruck, and brought together artists in various fields that were oriented toward National Socialism, including music: Leopold Reichwein, Heinrich Damisch; theater: Mirko Jelusich; architecture: Erwin Ilz; library science: Karl Wache; literature: Otto Emmerich Groh, Josef Weinheber; fine art: Ferdinand Andri. The *Deutscher Kulturbund* belonged to the National Socialist *Kampfbund* (battle league) for German culture. This was a melting pot for NSDAP-friendly artists who campaigned against artistic modernism employing anti-Semitic and racist methods and events, and who served as experts for the NSDAP after the assumption of power. There were among them, incidentally, and as demonstrated in a lecture by Othmar Spann entitled «*Die*

*Kulturkrise der Gegenwart»* (the contemporary cultural crisis) given at the *Kampfbund* headquarters in Munich, numerous connections to pre-1933 non-National Socialist reactionary modernism.

## «Acceptable Modernism» During the Chancellor Dictatorships of Dollfuß and Schuschnigg

On the occasion of the appointment of painter Herbert Boeckl as professor at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, the Ministry of Education summarized the essential criteria for a modern Catholic artist as based on artistic expression: «Painter Herbert Boeckl, born 1894, 41 years old, native of Carinthia, is at the forefront of the contemporary development of Austrian art. Boeckl also has the advantage that he—although involved in the modern art world of the large European art capitals in his youth, and since then positioned at the forefront of contemporary artistic developments—never let himself be misguided by the allure of extreme art movements (Cubism, Constructivism), but rather held on to the purity of form with great self-discipline and strictness, tending instead toward a clear and healthy popular appeal [*Volkstümlichkeit*] with each passing year ... In this context it should not be left unmentioned that Boeckl is deeply rooted in a Christian world view and attitude to life, and that, despite economic hardship, he has led an exemplary family life as the father of a large family (six children). These are qualities that are of especially great significance as examples for the ethos and inner attitude of academic art students.»

According to Schuschnigg's authoritarian regime, Boeckl was a perfect fit with the ideological specifications for the cultural sector—Catholic, the father of many children, worked with Christian subjects and, most importantly, not an extreme modernist—or worse yet, avant-gardist. An October 5, 1937 review of a group exhibition in the government-allied newspaper *Wiener Zeitung* by Hans Ankwicz-Kleehoven, who had been the paper's head of culture since 1920, serves as a paradigmatic symbol of the blurred distinction between the conservative critique of modernism as «hyper-modernism» and sympathy with the radical struggle of National Socialism against «degenerate art.» According to Ankwicz-Kleehoven, the Nazis were in fact not that far off the mark, and thus he (and others) argued against Expressionism and New Objectivity. The merits of the Hagenbund artists' association aside, Ankwicz-Kleehoven claimed that «radicalism has been taken too far.» Although he praised some of the works in the show, he indirectly criticized Carry Hauser's blue *Madonna vor der Stadt* (Madonna in front of the city, 1921) by mentioning Hauser's other «beautiful charcoal drawings.» Ankwicz-Kleehoven did give special mention to pieces by Professor Stemolak, president of the Hagenbund: bronze sculptures of a discus thrower, a shot-putter, and a runner.

Ankwicz-Kleehoven was not on principal a National Socialist, he was a conservative art historian who was forced into retirement in 1939 because his mother was Jewish. Yet he propagated precisely the type of anti-modernism that would lay the foundation for the fundamentally anti-Semitic and racist artistic radicalism of the National Socialists.

Tendencies toward baroque-ification and the regressions associated therewith were present within the fine arts as well as in theater that was being performed from the construction of the so-called *österreichischen Zeitalter* (Austrian age). Rudolf Henz's play *Kaiser Joseph II*, which premiered in 1937 at Vienna's Burgtheater, counts among the numerous politically motivated stylizations of the time; contemporary critiques lauded the work for its «profound and powerful verse,» and «devout expression of Austrian, Catholic, conservative desires, that are much needed in this time of struggle.» The Jewish newspaper *Die Stimme* criticized the fact that the play distorted the character of Josef von Sonnenfels using anti-Semitic stereotypes.



It should be noted in this context that a selectively open-minded official position emanated from the offices of the authoritarian-dictatorial corporate state regarding contemporary twelve-tone music in the 1920s and 30s. This supposed forward-looking attitude toward Anton Webern, Alban Berg, and Ernst Krenek was ultimately grounded in the fact that, despite the criticism of atonality from bourgeois circles, these composers contributed to «Austria's increasing reputation as a musical country par excellence.»

In those years the reactionary atmosphere within cultural bureaucracy was so powerful that even the performance of an operatic work that was, in principal, ideologically aligned with the heads of the chancellor dictatorship could be prohibited. One such example for this was Ernst Krenek's *Karl V* (1933), which the composer himself considered, «a work that is about the glorification of the old Catholic-universalist concept of empire, Austria's history, and its past.»

Ultimately, the retrograde music performed at the Vienna State Opera between 1933 and 1938 could have ensured that its program remained relevant to the times—particularly works that demonstrated conventional stylistic devices such as Wilhelm Kienzl's *Don Quixote*, Bernhard Paumgartner's *Rossini in Neapel*, and Josef Lorenz Wenzl-Traunfels' *Die Sünde*. In spite of negative reviews of the libretti, the government continued to support new performances of such traditional works—artistic progress and aesthetic innovation were less important than conforming to the system.

The International influence of reactionary modernism that originated in Mussolini's fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany was clearly palpable within the cultural landscape from an early point. At the initiative of the Italian Fascist Syndicate of Fine Arts *Moderne italienische Kunst* (modern Italian art) was exhibited as part of the 54th annual show at Vienna's Künstlerhaus in 1933. In 1935 this was followed by *Italienischer Plastik der Gegenwart* (Italian contemporary sculpture) at the Vienna Secession. While the 1937 Paris Exposition was dominated by progressive contemporary art that was criticized by the Vienna artists' associations, the 1935 competition exhibition for the 1936 Berlin Olympics at the Vienna Künstlerhaus primarily presented artists that were amenable to the Nazi regime and its conservative racist understanding of art—artists that were also politically aligned with National Socialism— including Ferdinand Andri, Wilhelm Frass, and Rudolf Hermann Eisenmenger. Austria's cultural policy remained inconsistent on the whole, and was characterized by critical expressions of resistance against political provisions at various award ceremonies. In late 1937 the National Socialist faction prevailed at the Künstlerhaus when Leopold Blauensteiner was elected as president of the organization. It is not surprising then, that in April of 1938 15 percent of the roughly two hundred Künstlerhaus members (or thirty members) revealed themselves to be members of the NSDAP, this despite the fact that the party had been banned from 1933 to 1938.

The 1938 *Anschluss* (annexation) of Austria brought these reactionary developments—in music as well—to a negative climax when each of the previously accepted «twelve-toners» (with the exception of Webern) were forced into exile on racist and/or political grounds. These included: Ernst Krenek, Max Brand, Wilhelm Grosz, Alexander von Zemlinsky, Franz Mittler, and Bruno Granichstaedten.

# «Replacement Modernism» or Contemporary Art during National Socialism and the Second World War.

On March 27, 1938, just a few days after the annexation of Austria to National Socialist Germany, an anonymous article entitled «*Volkswerdung der Deutschen*» (nationalization of the German people) appeared in the Sunday supplement of the politically conformist *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*. The article deliberately broached the connection between the inter-war dialog on «conservative revolution» and «reactionary modernism»:

«The great illness brought onto Europe by the ideas of 1789 have been overcome in Germany—not in the negative sense, but in the positive creation of a new state; and the people of other nations, want to or not, will have to either take a similar path according to their traditions, or be forced to do so by destiny in bloody revolutions. Today the German nation, which offers the world a new image, is no longer interested in inquiring after the thoughts and rights of its grandfathers in order to determine the laws of the twentieth century; we affirm the sign of our times with the explanation that the National Socialist revolution is also a conservative revolution, not in the sense of a return of surviving cultures and forms of government, but in the preservation of the eternal characteristics of the German people. These cannot change. People can endure only when they have eternal laws in their midst. In this new environment these values must be defended and enforced by means of the new technical inventions of our time, which only a child of the twentieth century itself can master—not a backward-looking scholar or a reactionary party official.»

This commentary illustrates that modernism, according to the National Socialist interpretation and in an anti-democratic and anti-parliamentary environment, is based solely on technological innovations that ought to question previous scientific traditions, and that it should ultimately be understood as a conservative revolution, in Hofmansthal's sense of the term, and fit within the field of reactionary modernism.

Unlike his predecessor Josef Bürckel, Vienna's new *Reichsleiter*, former *Reichsjugendführer* (youth leader for the Reich) Baldur von Schirach, tried to position himself in Vienna as a patron of the arts in order to secure his acceptance with the local elite and (like Hermann Göring in Berlin or Hans Frank in Krakow) to distinguish himself as a great leader. The driving force in the background was Walter Thomas, head of the General Division for the Vienna State Theater, who had previously worked at the Stadttheater Bochum as a young dramaturge. Schirach was primarily concerned with providing generous funding for classic cultural institutions such as the Vienna State Opera, the Burgtheater, and public museums, and was also an active supporter of the contemporary arts. It was in this context that composer Werner Egk, leader of the composers' organization STAGMA (*Staatlich anerkannte Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungsrechte*), which was part of the *Reichsmusikkammer* (state music bureau), was invited to hold a conference in Vienna in 1942 on the subject of modern classical music. Hitler and Reich Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels were enthralled by Egk's works, and he was praised as «the» up and coming composer loyal to the party line.

In preparation for the conference, Egk analyzed the programs of the Berlin, Dresden, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Cologne, Munich, Stuttgart, and Vienna operas, and came to the conclusion that of the 12,443 performances held on those stages between 1935 and 1941, 5,700 of those were foreign works. The ranking list was: Richard Wagner (1,913 performances), Guiseppe Verdi (1,896), Giacomo Puccini (1,291), and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (988). Egk's analysis was a deliberate attempt to urge the opera houses to re-evaluate their



priorities: «What must interest me as the head of the composers' organization is whether the German operatic repertoire can continue to grow organically. If this question is not solved the German opera will soon become a utterly diluted representative house.» The theme of the conference was the, «Vienna new music week of contemporary music,» and it opened with presentations by Walter Thomas and Werner Egk—the latter was especially celebrated—and a ceremony for fallen composers. Schirach's active cultural policy, which was time and again imbued with an underlying «Viennese» flavor, did not go unchallenged by Berlin. In November of 1941 Schirach was informed by Adolf Hitler by way of Martin Bormann that the *Führer* no longer wished to see a distinction made between *Altreichdeutsche* (Germans from pre-1938 Nazi Germany) and people from Vienna, and that Schirach must enforce this aim.

As a whole, National Socialist politics continued to become ever more radicalized. In 1941 Schirach was instructed to cease the development of all new apartments and instead—in accordance with Hitler's wishes—«deport all Jews, and all Czechs and other foreign people in cooperation with *Reichsführer* SS Himmler.» On June 6, 1942, at the appeal of the DAF (German Labor Front), Schirach bluntly and publicly explained that: «As early as in the fall of this year, 1942, we will celebrate a Jew-free Vienna. We will then turn our attention to solving the Czech situation in Vienna. The bullets that struck our comrade Heydrich also injured us, for this bullets were meant for all of us. As the *Gauleiter* of Vienna, I therefore command the deportation of all Czechs out of Vienna following the evacuation of the Jews. Just like I am making this city free of Jews, I will make it free of Czechs.» With these clear ideological, and racist cues Schirach bought himself a few more months of full legal capacity in cultural policy matters from the leadership in Berlin.

In an earlier speech, Schirach had signaled apparent freedom for artists after an incident involving shouting matches and provocations by the old guard of the NSDAP following the premier of Rudolf Wagner-Régeny's *Johanna Balk* at the Vienna State Opera in April of 1941. In the speech Schirach attempted to transform the consequences of this scandal into a general positive statement with the message: «Well, I don't want a cultural peace of the graveyard [*Friedhofsruhe*] in Vienna ... It is not my business to advocate for or against him. It was indeed, however, my intention to encourage the discussion surrounding him, just as in the past when I encouraged the discussion surrounding Eberhard Wolfgang Möller when I agreed to the performance of *Untergang Karthagos* in Hamburg. I neither wrote that piece, nor composed the music to *Johanna Balk*.»

It is of upmost importance to closely trace and precisely analyze Schirach's cultural codes. While on a central level—as witnessed by his previously mentioned analysis of the opera program for all of Germany and Vienna—the dominant trend was toward classic cultural reproduction, Schirach sought to pursue a more contemporary approach, especially after 1941. It was not his intention to undermine National Socialism, but to strengthen the party—and especially the strength of the military—by pooling all social forces under the umbrella of National Socialist leadership.

His Vienna art policy would eventually fail with the opening of the widely discussed 1943 exhibition *Junge Kunst im Deutschen Reich* (young art in the German Reich). The aim of the exhibition was to establish connections with certain pre-1933 modern traditions, and to invite artists whose works were either little or not at all shown, and that went beyond the preferences of the ruling art establishment and officially sanctioned National Socialist taste. The prerequisite, however, was that the artists were not stigmatized as racist or political—there were, therefore, clear boundaries to this seemingly open approach. This cultural political experiment was also connected to a political claim that was to be implemented even before the inauguration of the exhibition.

The exhibition was slated as «what's new» within that artistic production of the German Reich, Schirach's skillfully coded communication signaled the individuality of artists and signaled a certain amount of freedom. Simultaneously, he clearly criticized the pithy style of the court and the «*Führer*-painters» that dominated the visual arts, thereby attracting the attention of his critics. As a result Adolf Ziegler, for example, president of the *Reichskammer der Bildenden Künste* (Reich Chamber of Culture), travelled to Vienna to write a denunciatory report that he forwarded to Hitler by way of Gerdy Troost. Troost, chief decorator of Hitler's Munich home, had undoubted influence over the *Führer* in cultural political matters. The exhibition was closed within days, and Schirach was ordered to report to Hitler, who in no uncertain terms forbade Schirach from pursuing his cultural political agenda. During this point in time—mid 1943—Schirach attempted to win a new position through the services of his wife, who was the daughter of Hitler's personal photographer and confidant, Heinrich Hoffmann. But Hitler denied him in a coarse and impolite manner. Following the war, Schirach was simply discharged from his Vienna position.

## Anti-Modernism after 1945

Until 1970 there was no reference to the plurality of cultures within the Habsburg Monarchy. Quite the contrary, in fact, all scientific and cultural achievements that had occurred within the Austro-Hungarian melting pot were Austria-fied. The modern era was omitted entirely, and was only re-imported into Austria through foreign publications such as those by William Johnston and Carl E. Schorske. It was not until the era of Bruno Kreisky, who—although a Social Democrat—had a strong affinity for the large cultural region of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, that these Catholic-conservative and imperial constructs begin to break down, allowing for a slow opening toward the modernism of circa 1900 and beyond.

Following Austria's liberation in 1945, even top-level communist officials such as Minister of Cultural Affairs Ernst Fischer showed no interest in modernism, the avant-garde, or even anti-fascist contemporary drama. Fischer, much like the administration of the Soviet occupation, supported the classical traditions (this was due also in part to the fact that Raoul Aslan, a Catholic-conservative legend of the Burgtheater, had been installed as its director). It should be noted here that in the early weeks and months the political realities of the government combined with a lack of suitable plays and scripts resulted in the performance of solely the classics. Ernst Fischer was, moreover, convinced that the Austrian national character could be resurrected by cultivating the works of Franz Grillparzer and Johann Nestroy into an overarching cultural ideology that would defeat German nationalism, or «Prussianism,» once and for all, an approach that he deliberately allied with the cultural political concepts of Catholicism and Austrofascism.

Contemporary art and the modern age circa 1900 and after 1918 were dear to KPÖ city counselor for culture, Viktor Matejka, a self-proclaimed Catholic who had been freed from a concentration camp.[1] In Vienna, the task at hand was to signal continuity and to bring back the big stars—this time in the service of a new form of government. There were a series of individual measures in 1945/46 geared at re-establishing and propagating modernism and contemporary art as cultural anti-fascism. In this vein the *Neues Österreich* newspaper reported on May 24, 1945 on the re-establishment of the Austria section of the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM), and plans for an opening concert in June (with Sergei Prokofjev's *Overture to Hebrew Themes* and works by Paul Hindemith,



Maniel de Falla, and Arnold Schönberg). Premiers of Hanns Eisler songs with texts by Bertold Brecht, Ignazio Silone, and others, were also in the works. The first People's Party celebration was dedicated to and entitled «Immortal Masters—Eternal Austria» (Ludwig van Beethoven, Franz Grillparzer, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Franz Schubert, and Anton Wildgans). The Vienna Philharmonic again bean performing works by Gustav Mahler that had been outlawed by National Socialists. The ÖVP affiliated *Österreichische Kulturvereinigung* (Austrian cultural association) regarded itself as *christlich-abendländisch* (occidental Christian), but the association went against the national trend with the 1946 exhibition *Moderne österreichische Kunst* (modern Austrian art), which included graphic works by Gustav Klimt (who had also been exhibited at the Künstlerhaus during National Socialism) from the Albertina collection, Oskar Kokoschka, and Egon Schiele, and only later introduced *Große Kunst aus Österreichs Klöstern* (great art from Austria's monasteries).[2]

The ambivalent phase of 1945/46 was a consequence of the lack of structural definition and regulation of governmental organizations active in the fields of art and culture, issues that first entered into the rightist conservative Catholic agenda on a national level with the 1946 election of ÖVP mister of education, Felix Hurdes. While during 1945 there were still anti-fascist manifestations connected to the banishment and persecution of modern art, the year 1946 was characterized by a return of conservatism. It is no coincidence that, with few exceptions, the Cold War that began in Austria in February of 1946, determined the cultural political fronts along the lines of ideological demarcation.

Paradigmatic for this was the *Österreichisches Tagebuch* dispute between émigré Eva Priester, who had returned from London, and Alexander Lernet-Holenia over the definition of Austrian literature. While Priester pleaded for a contemporary, political literature that had contemporary relevance, Lernet-Holenia wanted to, «continue where the dreams of a mad man interrupted us ... we don't find it necessary to flirt with the future and work on nebulous projects. We are, in the best and most valuable sense, our past, we just have to reflect upon the fact that we are our past, and that it will become our future.»

Incidentally, Eva Priester had landed on the Cold War «black list» as early as 1946. A communist, she had been removed from a list of potential poets for the new national anthem by Minister of Education Hurdes, and replaced by Paula Grogger. The latter felt herself «connected to all German peoples,» and predicted a new *Anschluss* («my Austrian genes are strong enough to endure the *Anschluss* to my brothers across the border»). Although Hurdes himself had been in interned in a concentration camp in 1938/39 and again in 1944/45, he was apparently not bothered by the ideological proximity of German nationalism and National Socialism.

In late 1946 Edwin Rollet, chairman of the *Verband demokratischer Schriftsteller und Journalisten* (association of democratic authors and journalists) who was, like Hurdes, interned in a concentration camp from 1938 to 1940, and again in 1945, called attention to a political imbalance in the production of post-war literature. There was a dominance of Catholic literature, defined by the likes of Rudolf Henz and Paula von Preradović, and too few contemporary compositions. This state of affairs was accompanied by various intrigues against «completely moral and respectable people,» while «all sorts of bridges are being built for those who really have much to answer for.» The situation escalated in 1948 when *Literaturgeschichte Österreichs* (literary history of Austria) appeared in a Linz publishing house by Josef Nadler, who actively helped spread National Socialist ideology as a professor at the University of Vienna, and who had worked extensively on the 1941 fourth edition of the *Literaturgeschichte des deutschen Volkes* (literary history of the German nation). Rollet, representing seventy-five public personalities, presented Minter of Education Hurdes with

a memorandum, and Hurdes agreed to audit the case. People including Viktor Reimann, star columnist of the *Salzburger Nachrichten* newspaper since 1946 and co-founder of the VdU, a melting pot for «former» NSDAP members, used this conflict to demand an end to discussions about the National Socialist past.[3] The seventy-five intellectuals—including the playwright Fritz Hochwälder, movie director Georg Wilhelm Pabst, and numerous cultural officials—were severely attacked and pilloried in a sort of «black list.» The battle for the votes of the 400,000 former NSDAP members who had regained their right to vote as a result of general amnesty also became part of the cultural landscape.

The theoretical head of the traditional-conservative current within the public debate on art policy that opposed modernism and the avant-garde with an extreme aggression that ran contrary to bourgeoisie social mores and conservative etiquette came out of the fine arts: art historian Hans Sedlmayr. His still-famous pamphlet against modernism (and against the French Revolution and its consequences), *Art in Crisis: The Lost Center* (1948), was created as early as between 1941 and 1944. Sedlmayr, who had been let go from his position as professor at the University of Vienna as a result of his NSDAP membership, had ample time to prepare his work for print (he would go on to teach again in Munich in 1951, and Salzburg in 1962).

Much to the chagrin of the author, *Art in Crisis: The Lost Center* was ignored in France, however, it found a wide audience and was met with strong sales in the German speaking world (by 1960 around 150,000 copies, including the soft-cover edition, had been sold sold copies). Critics bowed before the work, even historian Friedrich Heer, who had been incarcerated by the Nazis, argued for a differentiated meaning of modern art in the Catholic periodical *Die Furche.* Hamburg painter, author, and dramaturge Lothar Schreyer, however, expressed his outrage that the Catholic Otto Müller publishing house had «published that horrible book *Art in Crisis: The Lost Center* by Sedlmayr, a book that repeats all of National Socialism's accusations against modern art (except that it is a Jewish invention),» in a letter:

«We have come full circle with Sedlmayr's book *Art in Crisis: The Lost Center.* From interwar reactionary modernism to its extremist and inhumane version during the National Socialist era, and back to discussions of the pre-1933 ‹conservative revolution›—not as radical and racist as the National Socialist agitation against modernism as degenerate art, but with ultimately the same goals: to aid the breakthrough of reactionary modernism.»



Translator's Note

1 refers to the KPÖ, or *Kommunistische Partei Österreich* (Austrian Communist Party).

2 refers to the ÖVP, or Österreichische Volkspartei (Austrian People's Party).

3 refers to the VDU, or *Vereinigung der Unabhängigen* (Association of Independents)

Bibliography

Griffin, Roger. *Modernism and Fascism. The Sense of a Beginning Under Mussolini and Hitler*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Ebner, Katharina, «Karl Anton Prinz Rohan und der italienische Faschismus in Österreich,» in *Bananen, Cola, Zeitgeschichte. Oliver Rathkolb und das lange 20. Jahrhundert*. eds. Lucile Dreidemy et al., Vienna: Böhlau, 2015, vol. 1: 191–202.

Herf, Jeffrey. *Reactionary Modernism. Technology, Culture and Politics in Weimar and the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

John, Eckhard. *Musikbolschewismus. Die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland, 1918–1938*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1994.

Kleinlercher, Alexandra. *Zwischen Wahrheit und Dichtung. Antisemitismus und Nationalsozialismus bei Heimito von Doderer*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2011.

Müller Guido. «Rohan, Karl Anton Adolf Julian Victor Maria Prinz,» in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 21. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2003: 760–761.

Rathkolb, Oliver. «Der kulturpolitische Kontext 1930–1960: Brüche, Kontinuitäten und Transformationen,» in *Das Wiener Künstlerhaus. Kunst und Institution*. eds. Peter Bogner, Richard Kurdiovsky and Johannes Stoll. Vienna: Lehner, 2015: 135–149.

Rathkolb, Oliver. *Die Paradoxe Republik. Österreich 1945 bis 2015*. Vienna: Paul Zsolnay, 2015.

Rathkolb, Oliver. «Förderung von vaterländischen künstlerischen Bestrebungen. Der Hagenbund und der kunstpolitische Handlungsrahmen von der Monarchie bis zur Kanzlerdiktatur,» in *Hagenbund. Ein europäisches Netzwerk der Moderne 1900 bis 1938*. ed. Agnes Husslein-Arco, Matthias Boeckl and Harald Krejci, exh. cat., Vienna: Belvedere/ Munich: Hirmer, 2014, 9–15.

Rathkolb, Oliver. *Führertreu und gottbegnadet. Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich*. Vienna: ÖBV, 1991.

# Visitors to Salzburg
## Sigmund Freud and Psychoanalysis

During his lifetime Sigmund Freud was fully aware that his revolutionary discoveries would face strong, emotionally fuelled opposition and, indeed, even meet with rejection.[1] The extent to which he had affronted humanity was simply too great. After Copernicus, who no longer defined the earth as the center of the cosmos; Darwin, who demolished the partition between mankind and animals, Freud then came and explained that man was in fact not master of his own household. By this he meant that the ego—everything that we call our consciousness—constitutes only a small part of our inner life, and that our thinking, feelings, and actions are, in fact, dominated by our unconscious. Through his *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (1901), *Jokes and their Relation to Everyday Life* (1905) and *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905) Freud founded his revolutionary science of the psyche with which he shaped, and provoked, the twentieth century.

Although initially isolated, from 1902 onward Freud was joined in Vienna by loyal colleagues with whom he met regularly for discussions in his waiting room, and in 1908 achieved his first breakthrough in terms of international recognition. Swiss Eugen Bleuler and Carl Gustav Jung of the renowned Burghölzli psychiatric hospital in Zürich were interested in his theories. It was Jung (a pastor's son, and not Jewish—a fact to which Freud attached great importance), who organized their first international meeting, which took place from April 26–27, 1908. Salzburg «the incomparably more beautiful and comfortable» city, which could be reached in only «six hours by fast train» from Vienna, was chosen as a suitable meeting place.[2] The choice of venue for the meeting indicates that the organizers were in touch with the times: the Hotel Bristol, which only short time before was still known as the *Electricitätshotel* (electricity hotel), was the first hotel on the right bank of the River Salzach to be modernized by the introduction of electric light.

On April 27th forty men and two women from Germany, England, Austria, Switzerland and the United States gathered to hear almost exclusively clinical lectures. Sigmund Freud opened the series of lectures at eight in the morning. Speaking without notes, the founder of psychoanalysis, who was almost 52, talked about case histories, in particular about a case of obsessional neurosis, for three hours until he stopped himself. But—at least according to the memory of British psychoanalyst Ernest Jones—those present insisted he continue, «Which he did for almost an hour. Someone who can command the attention of his listeners for five hours must have something to say. What fascinated us so much was not



just the new ideas he presented to us, but also his exceptional ability to explain things so clearly.»[3]

Freud's followers were delighted; the «master» was satisfied. Not least of all because while in Salzburg a decision had been made to produce a journal, the *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen* (yearbook of psychoanalytical and psychopathological research). In the future this would make it possible to publish without restriction. In the years that followed, the processes of institutionalizing and internationalizing psychoanalysis, the foundations of which had been laid in Salzburg, made enormous steps. That is, until this progress was rudely interrupted by the First World War. Later, in the 1920s, psychoanalysis would finally embark on its triumphal course.

In 1918 not a single stone was left standing. More than six centuries of Habsburg Monarchy were suddenly history, and the future was uncertain. There was plenty of room for fears and dreams of a classless society, equal rights for women, the liberation of sexuality, and unrestricted experiments in music, painting, literature, architecture and et cetera. The new generation was open to such experimentation, and found in psychoanalysis a theory for this liberation. Freud's world of ideas about the unconscious life of the psyche permeated more than just the sciences and arts—Hollywood consulted professor Freud in Berggasse about filming the greatest love stories of all time, starting with Anthony and Cleopatra, under his supervision. Film producer Samuel Goldwyn offered Freud 100,000 US Dollars to perform this service, but Freud rejected the offer. He could not, however, prevent his students Karl Abraham and Hanns Sachs from working as scientific consultants in 1926 in Berlin on the first feature film about psychoanalysis: *Geheimnisse einer Seele* (secrets of a soul), directed by Georg Wilhelm Pabst and starring well-known actor Werner Krauß.

By this time psychoanalysis had become a worldwide movement. Sixteen years after the first conference, proponents met again in Salzburg from April 21–23, 1924. The Hotel Bristol was once again chosen as the location for the meeting and discussion of scientists. The one hundred and twelve members of the International Psychoanalytic Association hailed from Austria and England, and from France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Palestine, Poland, Switzerland, and the United States.[4] But the most important person was missing: cancer of the palate, followed by operations, a prosthetic jaw, partial deafness, and acute flu, had forced Sigmund Freud to miss a psychoanalysis conference for the first time. Although Freud was to live for another fifteen years, a sort of doomsday mood began to spread. Conflicts between his most loyal adherents, which had always simmered just below the surface, came to a head in Salzburg and were above all apparent in a number of innovations in the area of theory. One instance of this is the book *The Trauma of Birth* by Otto Rank, which appeared in 1924 and in which the author attaches significance that extends throughout the lifetime to the experience of birth. Freud made efforts to satisfy the «brotherhood» from afar, but these ultimately proved unsuccessful. The conference in Salzburg was nonetheless considered a success. The lectures, which covered a wide variety of themes, were of good quality and the institutionalization of psychoanalytical training continued to develop. The conference helped psychoanalysis achieve greater international recognition and —a particularly remarkable aspect—women made up around one third of those in attendance at the conference. Women also spoke and acquainted listeners with the themes they regarded as relevant. According to the meeting program, Helene Deutsch spoke on *Die Psychologie des Weibes in den Funktionen der Fortpflanzung* (female psychology in the functions of reproduction) and Melanie Klein on *Zur Technik der Frühanalyse* (the technique of early analysis), in other words child analysis. From an early stage, these women

had struggled to obtain an education and escape the expected roles for women at that time *Kinder, Küche, Kirche* (children, kitchen, church). These roles would, ten years later under Roman Catholic Austro-fascism, would be elevated to the status of state doctrine.

From 1933 onwards Sigmund Freund and his followers in Vienna looked on as National Socialism ravaged Germany, erected concentration camps, and burned books (including those written by Freud). The belief that the clerical *Ständestaat* (Austrian corporate state) would protect them through political abstinence was short-lived. When German troops marched into Austria on March 12, 1938 the situation became life threatening, and psychoanalysis as an enlightened science came to an abrupt end. In regard to the burning of books, Salzburg was the only city in what was now known as the *Ostmark* to follow the example of German National Socialists: on April 30, 1938 books were publicly burned on the Residenzplatz. Freud and his followers were persecuted and driven out. All that remained in Austria of the great community of psychoanalysts following the *Anschluss* (annexation) were of Freud's students in Vienna: August Aichhorn, Richard Nepallek and Alfred Winterstein. Four of Freud's five sisters were killed in concentration camps, he himself died in exile in London in 1939.

The expulsion and destruction of psychoanalysis as an intellectual tradition had an impact that can still be felt today. After 1945 few of those who had been driven out of the country wanted to return, and hardly any of them were officially invited to do so. The damage and the pain caused was simply too great: Kurt R. Eissler, for instance, initially refused to use the German language, so as not to be reminded of the suffering. In 1946 the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society was re-founded by Freud's student August Aichhorn and a handful of interested people who had completed psychotherapy training within the framework of the *Deutsches Institut für psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie* (German institute for psychological research and psychotherapy) during the National Socialist era. For a long time an affective mix of a bad conscience, optimistic belief in the future, and nostalgic longing for a bridge back to the glorious times of the 1920s prevailed. It was not until 1971 that psychoanalysts from around the world met again in Vienna, at an International Psychoanalysis Conference. A great deal was said but, due to wounds that had yet to heal, few participants really engaged with one another.

Around this time something unexpected happened: Igor A. Caruso was appointed honorary professor at the Psychology Institute of Salzburg University in 1967, and full professor in 1972. This appointment represented the first time that a psychoanalyst—and one with an eventful biography behind him nonetheless—was granted a chair of psychology in Austria. In the decades following Caruso's death his 1942 role in the children's ward at *Am Spiegelgrund*, a Viennese youth care facility,[5] became the subject of particularly heated debate.[6]

In 1969 Caruso co-founded the Salzburg *Forschung- und Arbeitskreis für Tiefenpsychologie und Psychosomatik* (research and working group for depth psychology and psychosomatics) at the university's Institute for Psychology, which was registered in 1974 as the *Verein Salzburger Arbeitskreis für Tiefenpsychologie* (society of Salzburg working group for depth psychology), and still exists today.[7] The emphasis of this group has remained unchanged: the training of clinical psychoanalysts, who are themselves in competition within the profession of psychotherapy.[8] Caruso's emphasis on the «social aspects of psychoanalysis» that went beyond the analyst's couch, and the social involvement in teaching and research that took place at the university were developed by his staff to such an extent that numerous young people from throughout Austria flocked to Salzburg to join the exceptional program.[9] Work with marginalized social groups, the anti-psychiatry movement, the



study of foreign cultures, and the appraisal of National Socialism all formed portions of these studies, as did continued reading of Freud and the study of psychoanalysis as a critical research method.

The 1979 retirement of Igor A. Caruso, the controversial proceedings of the subsequent appointment commission, Caruso's death in 1981 and, finally, the 1982 nomination of his successor, who was known as an opponent of psychoanalysis, transformed the Salzburg student group into a creative and protest-oriented movement. The students took to the streets to demand the continuation of their program, and worked on developing interesting alternatives of an exceptional kind. They set up, for instance, the *Werkstatt für Gesellschafts- und Psychoanalyse* (workshop for social and psychoanalysis), an alternative university to replace the training facilities they had lost. This new workshop included guest lectures, seminars and reading circles. Internationally acclaimed academics and experts supported the initiative through their visits, lectures, and teaching.[10] In this regard a lecture series on the *Welt von Gestern* (the world of yesterday) is worthy of particular mention. Lectures were given by, for example, instructors such as psychoanalyst Rudolf Ekstein, who had been forced to flee Vienna; Ernst Federn, who had spent seven years in concentration camps; and the Vienna-born psychoanalyst Marie Langer, who fought in the Spanish Civil War, later emigrated to Argentina and, on account of her involvement in Nicaragua, attracted the interest of numerous students.

There was a pervasive general feeling that these activities and disputes that addressed the future direction of the field should be made public, and so in 1984 committed students set up their own publication entitled *Werkblatt. Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und Gesellschaftskritik*.[11] This journal still exists today, more than thirty years later. The *Sexualberatungsstelle Salzburg* (Salzburg sexual counseling center), which was based on the concepts of Wilhelm Reich and opened in 1987 to introduce a Freudian touch to Salzburg, addresses practical needs as well as theoretical issues.[12]

The students of that era have passed on the knowledge they acquired back then in numerous ways and in many different places, through writings and talks, and today are approaching retirement age. People in Salzburg, at any rate, will have to patiently wait for the next appearance of Freudian psychoanalysis. As Freud, in a January 9, 1908 letter to his friend Karl Abraham in Berlin suggested: «In the words of Salzburg's motto, ‹take your time.› Mental changes are never quick, except in revolutions.»[13]

1 Cf. Sigmund Freud, «Die Widerstände gegen die Psychoanalyse» in ibid. *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. XIV (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1976), 109.

2 Sigmund Freud, letter to C. G. Jung, December 21, 1907, in *Sigmund Freud—C. G. Jung, Briefwechsel*, ed. William McGuire, Wolfgang Sauerländer (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1984), 51.

3 Translated for this essay from Ernest Jones, *Das Leben und Werk von Sigmund Freud*, vol. II: *Jahre der Reife. 1901–1919*, (Vienna: Verlag Hans Huber, 1978), 60.

4 Cf. Helmut E. Lück, Elke Mühlleitner, eds., *Psychoanalytiker in der Karikatur* (Munich: Quintessenz Verlags-GmbH, 1993), 23.

5 Editor's note: *Am Spiegelgrund* was the name of a youth care facility consisting of a home and children's mental hospital on the grounds of *Am Steinhof* psychiatric hospital and nursing home. Hundreds of children were murdered there within the framework of the National Socialist euthanasia program.

6 Cf. Gerhard Benetka and Clarissa Rudolph, «‹Selbstverständlich ist vieles damals geschehen …› Igor A. Caruso am Spiegelgrund,» in *Werkblatt. Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und Gesellschaftskritik*, no. 60 (2008): 5–45. Eveline List, «‹Warum nicht in Kischniew?› – Zu einem autobiografischen Tondokument Igor Carusos,» in *Zeitschrift für psychoanalytische Theorie und Praxis*, vol. 23, iss. 1/2 (2008): 117–141. Karl Fallend, «‹Carusos Erben.› Reflexionen in einer erhitzten Auseinandersetzung,» in *Werkblatt. Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse und Gesellschaftskritik*, no. 64 (2010): 100–127. Josef Shaked, «Zu Carusos Tätigkeit Am Spiegelgrund,» in ibid., 80-99.

7 Today the society is known as the *Salzburger Arbeitskreis für Psychoanalyse*.

8 Cf. Johannes Reichmayr, «Psychoanalyse in der Kleinstadt,» in Institutsgruppe Psychologie der Universität Salzburg, ed., *Jenseits der Couch. Psychoanalyse und Sozialkritik* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1984), 255–274.

9 Igor A. Caruso, *Soziale Aspekte der Psychoanalyse* (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag), 1969.

10 These include, to name just a few: Goldy and Paul Parin, Mario Erdheim, Emilio Modena (Zurich); Helmut Dahmer, Klaus Horn, Alfred Lorenzer (Frankfurt am Main), Wilfried Gottschalch (Amsterdam).

11 See: www.werkblatt.at (last accessed on April 11, 2016).

12 See: www.sexualberatung-salzburg.at (last accessed on April 11, 2016)); and: Sexualberatungsstelle Salzburg, ed. *Trieb, Hemmung, Begehren. Psychoanalyse und Sexualität* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

13 Sigmund Freud, letter to Karl Abraham on January 9, 1908, in: *Sigmund Freud—Karl Abraham, Briefe 1907-1926*, eds. Hilda C. Abraham and Ernst L. Freud (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1980), 34.





# A Lens of Many Facets
# Science through a Family's Eyes

In the first year of the twentieth century, the Austrian physicist Franz Serafin Exner (1849–1926) visited Vienna's Museum für Kunst und Industrie (Museum for Art and Industry) armed with a photometer. His target was the museum's trove of Persian carpets. Under the lens of his instrument, Serafin (as he was known to family and friends) would extract the secrets of these richly colored yarns, yielding quantitative values of hue, brightness, and saturation. As a young man Serafin had journeyed to Persia, interested in studying an exotic climate. Now he sought, in the vibrant patterns woven in that distant land, an answer to the question that had recently riven Viennese society in two: What is beautiful? To Serafin, the recent unveiling of Gustav Klimt's mural for the university's philosophy faculty had been an outrage. Where Serafin and his colleagues had expected to find an allegory of enlightenment, they had seen only the nightmare of a troubled mind. Yet Klimt's supporters had retorted that the new age demanded a new aesthetics. «What Is Ugly?» had been the title of a recent lecture, and the answer, apparently, had been «nothing»—aesthetic norms were supposedly the fleeting products of their age.[1] Now even Hilde, Serafin's own daughter, had joined the ranks of this «Secession.» Serafin intended to uphold a more objective standard. As his old friend Gottfried Semper had shown, the patterns of Persian carpets had adapted over the course of hundreds of years to the ultimate arbiter: universal human taste. How else to explain the appeal of these rugs here, in the bourgeois households of turn of the century Vienna, where, as the museum's curator wrote, it was «absolutely a point of honor to own at least one authentic Oriental carpet»?[2] As we will see, Serafin's quest for beautiful colors would lead to the Orient only by way of a middle-class parlor. This was a hunt for the universal that began and ended at home.

The bourgeois household where Serafin Exner laid his own Persian carpets was home to Vienna's foremost scientific dynasty. Over the course of three generations, born between 1802 and 1886, the Exners produced ten professors at universities in the Habsburg lands. Their members included an architect of the imperial education system, scientific mentors to such luminaries as Sigmund Freud and Erwin Schrödinger, and a leader of Vienna's women's movement. With their hands in projects spanning science, politics, and the arts, the Exner family is an ideal guide for a tour of Vienna a century ago. At musical evenings in Vienna and at Brunnwinkl, their lakeside retreat near Salzburg, they entertained the cream of Austria's intellectual and artistic elite. Ernst Mach and Ludwig Boltzmann were close colleagues, Freud and Schrödinger numbered among their students, and Josef Breuer and

Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach were their intimate friends. Though neglected by historians, their scientific accomplishments were celebrated by contemporaries and remain fascinating and pertinent today. The physicist Franz Serafin Exner made physical indeterminism plausible well before the advent of quantum mechanics, while his nephew Felix Exner (1876–1930) showed how meteorological problems could be handled statistically in ways that computers have now made invaluable. Felix's father Sigmund Exner (1846–1926) introduced the concept of neural networks that is at the heart of contemporary brain science and artificial intelligence. Those familiar with the work of the Nobel Prize–winning biologist Karl Frisch (1886–1982) might be surprised to learn that he too was an Exner, on his mother's side. Frisch's work on insect communication remains exemplary today for biologists studying the relationship between brain and behavior.[3]

The Exners were equally active outside the laboratory. In their roles as university administrators and as advisors to the education ministry and to the upper house of parliament, they shaped the content and values of the education system of a mighty European empire. From the birth of the first Franz Exner at the turn of the nineteenth century to the death in 1947 of the grandson who bore his name, the Exners' Austrian world changed dramatically. Franz Exner I (1802–1853) belonged to the generation of educated middle-class Austrians who first demanded liberal reforms of the conservative Catholic regime. His children came of age in the 1860s, the golden age of Austrian liberalism. By the 1870s, economic depression and a resurgence of Catholic power had weakened liberal authority in Austria. As the third-generation Exners matured in the Vienna of the fin de siècle, the liberal party dissolved and the politics of the multiethnic empire became dominated by nationalism, anti-Semitism, and socialism.[4]

Throughout these upheavals, the stable center of the Exners' lives was their summer home, Brunnwinkl, a rustic hamlet on the Wolfgangsee, near Salzburg. When the family began vacationing in the Salzkammergut in the 1840s, they were among the first wave of Vienna's educated middle class to establish summer retreats, or *Sommer-frischen* (sic!), as refuges from the congestion and disease that plagued the metropolis in the warmer months. Summers there were often rainy, but there was a cool breeze off the lake on even the warmest days. Marie Exner von Frisch (1844–1925) had purchased and renovated the cottages one by one in the 1880s, buying out craftsmen who were sunk in debt and eager to try their luck in Salzburg or Vienna. By 1900, the little town of St. Gilgen was no longer a backwater. Colleagues from the University of Vienna were among the Exners' neighbors, and erudite friends visited frequently from Vienna, Munich, and Zurich.

The summer retreat was, in the words of Emilie Exner, née Winiwarter (1847–1909), an «experiment in uniting so many uniquely gifted people in a single spot.» For the experiment to succeed, the individual must be shielded from «the herd existence.» The family must not become a «sect»; it must preserve «diversity alongside what is held in common.» Brunnwinkl's «unwritten laws» therefore guaranteed individual freedom.[5] As these phrases suggest, the summer retreat fostered «experimental» living in two senses: as a setting for scientific inquiry and as a liberal utopia in miniature.

## Rationality and Domestic Intimacy

In *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, Carl Schorske famously argued that modernism was born of the bourgeoisie's abandonment of rational public engagement in favor of an obsessive preoccupation with their private selves.[6] Freudian psychology, Jugendstil art, and populist politics were all consequences of this middle-class escapism. By cultivating the domestic sphere and exploring intimacy in art and psychology, the bourgeoisie is supposed to have forsaken its own ideal of rationality. In this way, studies of fin-de-siècle Vienna have cemented a perceived dichotomy between reason and family life.

More recent readings of Austrian modernism offer an alternative interpretation of the intimate world of the Viennese.[7] The distinguishing feature of Austrian modernism, according to Karlheinz Rossbacher, was its questioning of the reality of the individual subject and its search for a viewpoint outside the self. Rossbacher reads this literary culture as an effort to navigate the modern tension between individualism and intimacy. Drawing on Norbert Elias's account of the civilizing process, Rossbacher interprets literary writing and discussion as channels for formalizing intimate conversation once polite society made direct language taboo. Essential to this interpretation, although Rossbacher does not emphasize it, is the context of Austrian liberalism. Opposed, on one hand, to the dogmatism of the Catholic Church, and fearful, on the other, of the anarchic potential of radical skepticism, Austrian liberals performed a delicate balancing act. They were alternately enamored of and repelled by individualism, and they dreaded solipsism as much as conformity. Rossbacher sometimes implies that literature was simply a means of establishing intimacy. Yet it is clear that the liberal intellectuals of his study were seeking something more multivalent, a discourse that could regulate intimacy and distance.

Natural science performed that function as much as literature and the visual arts. Within the close-knit circle of liberal intellectuals to whom Rossbacher introduces us, one was as likely to meet a scientist as a poet. We tend to forget that even after the laboratory revolution, scientific work was often carried out in the home, with relatives as collaborators. The very rhythm of this domestic labor, with its intervals of solitude and companionship, served to moderate the extremes of independence and intimacy. Science trained the senses and the communicative faculties. To become a connoisseur of flora and fauna, to record constancy and change in the heavens, to report on the physiology of one's own senses—all of these activities involved learning to observe the world independently, yet with a mind constantly attuned to the challenges of communication. By presenting novel challenges of perception and communication, science became a means of negotiating the boundaries between interiority and intimacy. Science in the home became part of the modern struggle to form and maintain a self that is both independent and related. And the home itself became a transitional space, bridging the public and private lives of its inhabitants.[8]

## The Normal Eye

In the summer of 1901 Emilie Exner sat peacefully at her desk, pen in hand, peering up at Michelangelo's Sistine ceiling. The photograph, plastered to the ceiling of the cottage, had been a gift from Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, recently back from Rome. Emilie was reflecting on her plan, as the newly elected president of Vienna's Society for the Gainful Employment of Women, to reform the city's Drawing School for Women and Girls. What the school needed was a «modern» makeover. Rote copying and stale conventions would make way for direct observation and a fresh, unmannered style. «It is remarkable,» Emilie wrote of the Michelangelo, «how much one delights in something really good in daily interaction, without any aesthetic élan, almost unconsciously.»[9] This, she made clear, was the best way to tutor young eyes.

Next door to Emilie, Serafin's wife had painted their cottage with scenes of her husband's voyages to the Orient and the tropics. In the old miller's house, Marie displayed her

watercolors of local landscapes, rendered in the naturalistic style in which better-known painters had captured the beauty of this region in previous decades. Among the writers and artists of the Exners' circle, aesthetic «realism» in this sense stood opposed to crass naturalism, on one hand, and to modernist experimentation, like that of the *Jung-Wien* movement, on the other. It was a style associated with the golden age of Austrian liberalism.[10] Wherever one turned within the cottages, one found models for viewing the natural world beyond the walls.[11]

Brunnwinkl's male scientists made these models their own. As Karl Frisch would later write, it was the scientist's aim to describe nature «without any attempt to ornament the poetry of reality with fantasy.» When Sigmund Exner wrote of «the white brick columns of the barn facing one of my windows, its red-tiled roof and brown planked walls ... each of the delicate branches of a small plum tree against the blue sky,» he was describing not a work of art but a view afforded by a dismembered insect. Gazing through the amputated eye of a firefly, Sigmund recorded this «small landscape framed by the microscope mirror.»[12]

Unlike the eyes of most insects, a firefly's eye remains in a lifelike state after being removed. The photograph reproduced on page 61, for example, is a view through a window, seen through the many-faceted eye of a firefly. To create this image, Sigmund Exner arranged a camera and a microscope with 120-power magnification just behind the retinal opening, where an image would ordinarily form. Decades after the photograph was published in 1891, Karl Frisch found the view at once disorienting and familiar: «You recognize the shape of the window, the window frame, you see the letter «R» pasted to a window pane and, admittedly somewhat blurred, a church tower farther in the distance.» In keeping with the empiricist theory of vision associated with Sigmund's teacher Hermann von Helmholtz, the scene hints that seeing is not a passive reception of information but an active interpretation of a visual language. The letter «R,» pasted to the window as a test figure (and reversed by the process of magnification), reminds us that we are «reading» the image. The window's frame is not a transparent opening onto the outside world but a murky boundary to our field of vision. It is a reminder of the mediation of our visual apparatus in our experience of the world.[13] The shadowy church spires and the grainy texture might have reminded a contemporary of the Impressionists' experiments in recording their subjective impressions of color, light, and shadow. And yet this image is a photograph. Unlike the heightened effects of the Impressionists' landscapes, this is an unmediated record of light passing through organic and inorganic lenses. As Sigmund noted in a caption, the distance of the window from the eye was 225 cm, that of the church from the window 135 steps. The entire picture could be reconstructed using geometrical optics, as indicated by Sigmund's physical analysis of the compound eye.[14]

In the context of the 1890s, this photograph challenged the antirealist position of Sigmund Exner's opponents in the new field of experimental psychology. Ewald Hering and his followers sought an account of perception in terms of pure sensation, rejecting explanations that began with physics, like those of Sigmund and his teacher Helmholtz.[15] Within this dispute the photograph was a witty comment on the putatively solipsistic nature of vision. After all, it succeeds in showing us the world quite literally through someone—something—else's eyes. As Karl Frisch noted, the wonder of the picture is that it is so recognizable.

It was not unusual for the Exners' research at Brunnwinkl to lead them to the fuzzy boundary between the impersonal material world and the realm of perception. Karl Exner (1842–1915) spent one of his first summers at Brunnwinkl studying the scintillation of starlight, taking advantage of an atmosphere free of city dust. At the time, this phenomenon



dangled at the disputed border between physics and physiology. Karl Exner's analysis of atmospheric optics would set it firmly on the side of physics. As his brother Sigmund would put it, building on Karl's research, the scintillation of starlight could now be seen as an example of a phenomenon at once «subjective» and universally human. At Brunnwinkl such efforts to translate between subjective experiences were often themselves collaborative. Karl Exner, for instance, corrected the mathematics of Sigmund's analysis of light sensitivity and provided geometrical calculations for his study of insects' eyes.[16] These collaborative investigations of perception demonstrated the possibility of communication about a shared material world, testifying to the transcendence of solipsism. We might see these studies as a means of managing the conflicting desires for independence and intimacy.

In a further collaboration, Sigmund in turn helped his nephew Karl Frisch with his first experiments on the vision of bees. Having installed several hives at a safe distance from the cottages, young Karl investigated the bees' abilities to recognize colors, shapes, and patterns. He found that the visual cues they could distinguish, though widely varied, corresponded to those resembling sights they encountered in nature. The bees themselves seemed to be naturalistically inclined. «Even when they are capable of the most complicated instincts, insects do not easily leave the narrow circle of what is familiar and has been inherited through generations.» Moving on to investigate how the bees recognized and protected their hives, he found that the insects used visual memories as a form of communication and community building. Insects had served since antiquity as models of «natural» societies, and Frisch continued in this vein. The young bee on its first venture outside the hive went through a ritual Frisch called a «rehearsal.»[17] It flew out tentatively, with frequent glances back toward the hive. Frisch supposed it was adjusting its color sense in order to be able to recognize its home. The reflexivity of his investigations came through clearly on the map of Brunnwinkl that accompanied his published article. Nearly at the center is a circle labeled «L,» marking the location of the linden tree, the Exners' literal and symbolic center of communication. As in the human colony in which these experiments unfolded, visual learning helped the insect colony cohere.

At the heart of the Exners' various projects on the physics and physiology of vision lay the effort to translate between subjective experiences, to see through the eyes of another. Still, their divergences are revealing. Karl Exner, a physicist, located the basis for the equivalence of perceptions outside the viewer, in the geometrical optics of the atmosphere. For the physiologist Sigmund Exner, the universality of visual experiences rested instead on shared features of the sensory apparatus. Karl Frisch, meanwhile, reined in this universalist dream, emphasizing instead that visual experiences bounded (and bound together) a community.

Keeping these potential conflicts in mind, we can nonetheless uncover the assumptions that lent continuity to these projects. In the tradition of Gustav Theodor Fechner, Hermann Lotze, and Helmholtz, the Exners understood visual representations as symbols that «called forth visual memories in the viewer of that which they signify.» Writing at the dawn of aesthetic modernism in the 1880s, Sigmund Exner insisted that paintings should invite viewers to match their own memories to the common experiences represented on the canvas. It was the artist's task to «interact [*verkehren*] with the viewer through a language that speaks to the eye.»[18] The verb *verkehren* (to associate or traffic with) underlined the social aspect of communication through and about visual representations. The open-ended conversations instigated by secular, realist art were thus a means of avoiding solipsism without sacrificing autonomy. The relations mediated by realist paintings—between artist and viewer or among viewers—embodied a liberal ideal of sociability.

The universal language of art was of necessity «subjective.» As Sigmund Exner reasoned, «It lies in the nature of the matter that if the artist depicts what he sees, and the viewer demands to be reminded of what he has seen, then various subjective visual phenomena creep into the art work. This is not only natural but also entirely justified, as long as these subjective phenomena befit all people.» Here «subjective» indicated not a personal idiosyncrasy but an experience shared by subjects who possessed a common sensory apparatus and faculty of reason. Reflecting the empiricist philosophy taught at the Austrian *Gymnasium*, Sigmund understood aesthetics as a matter of empirical investigation, to be decided by consensus. In accordance with this empiricist view, he applauded artists who mimicked the perceptual habits of normal vision; they were, in effect, skilled psychologists. It was another matter entirely to bring «subjective phenomena into art when these are not universally human, but rather limited to certain individuals.» No one was guiltier of this transgression than the French. Impressionists and pointillists transmuted visual pathologies into painterly tricks. «When I walk through a modern art exhibition I am always tempted to make diagnoses of the so-called state of refraction of the eyes of each painter ... It seems in fact that the manner in which the near-sighted painter sees the world ...has grown into a fashion in modern painting.» By publicizing their pathologies, Sigmund charged, modern artists threatened to «injure the normal eye.»[19] It was the duty of the artist to compensate for his own visual idiosyncrasies—by using eyeglasses, if necessary, but more importantly through self-discipline. Leave solipsistic fantasies to the French, Sigmund implied. What Austrians needed was a language of transparency.

## Savage Tastes

Twenty years after its founding, then, Brunnwinkl seemed to have achieved an aesthetic consensus. With the new century, however, came the first stirrings of dissent. The youngest Brunnwinklers were just then reaching adulthood. Karl von Frisch and Felix Exner had embarked on their scientific careers, Alfred (1875–1921) and Robert Exner (1891–1960) were budding doctors, and Franz Exner (1881–1947) and Hans Frisch (1875–1941) would soon be jurists. Emilie Exner was pleased to see her daughter Ilse (1879–1924) married. «Now she runs the house, cooks and shops independently,» Emilie wrote her friend Eschenbach, «with the same enthusiasm with which she used to sketch figures.»[20] It was natural that Ilse should give up her artistic career and the studio she shared with her cousins Nora (1879–1915) and Hilde Exner (1880–1922) to devote herself to her new household duties. One could only hope that Nora and Hilde would soon follow Ilse's good example. Yet Nora and Hilde would not let themselves be distracted from their artistic pursuits. Men did not seem to interest Hilde at all, while Nora's marriage to a respected physician would remain childless. In 1901 the cousins enrolled at the Kunstgewerbeschule, which had just opened its doors to women the previous year when it came under the control of Klimt's avant-garde allies. Both took up sculpture, a medium widely considered unsuitable for women, since the plastic arts required a sober gaze and the physical capacity to «capture movement.» Soon they were exhibiting with the Secession. By 1905 they had left their studies and were sharing a studio on the outskirts of Rome, where a visiting cousin found them to be «merry girls, filled with ambition and with their art.» Nora herself wrote of being «happily full of ideas and creative desire.» Ten years earlier, an adolescent Nora had written that nothing would have stopped her from accompanying a family friend on his scientific voyages, had she only been a boy.[21] Now she was having adventures of her own, far from the sheltering walls of Brunnwinkl.



When Nora arrived at the Wolfgangsee, fresh from her first year at the Kunstgewerbeschule, her aunt Marie entrusted her with a small task. She was to paint an altarpiece of angels playing music, a familiar baroque theme paying tribute to one of the family's favorite communal pastimes and to their good taste in music and art. Marie's first impression was that Nora was «making it very sweet. She has learned a great deal indeed.» But the following day she complained that Nora had spoiled her first sketch «with her crazy colors.» She had decked one angel out in red and white checks, the other in blue and white, «so that I gave a cry when I came upon it. What's more, she raged like a savage in the paint box and uses as much color for a single square-foot surface as I use for ten. To be sure, it has all been done with talent, only her taste seems to me spoiled to the core, despite Italy.» Nora and Hilde were apparently given a chance to redeem themselves in another of the cottages. Once again, however, they left the bare white walls of a cottage «patterned with garish colors, which were utterly unsuited to the rustic character of the house.»[22]

The family's scorn for Nora and Hilde's choice of colors expressed a dense web of anxieties. The modern fashion for vivid colors, made possible by advances in the dye industry, seemed linked to a broader social transformation. Emilie Exner described a common scene on summer evenings in Vienna's urban gardens, where respectable young women gathered in a sea of «shimmering silk, flowers, ribbons, and feathers.» As Emilie put it, their brash colors made it virtually impossible to distinguish well-born ladies from kept women. The sight of such costumed women seemed to be spoiling the judgment of young men, making their eyes insensitive to the more muted charms of chaste young women. In the fine arts, Emilie's husband Sigmund likewise discerned a trend toward heightened colors and gaudy effects. The public, with its «sensitive nerves,» was developing a taste for the «breathtaking,» a dangerously feminine weakness. In their sense that modern art, women's tastes, and social change were somehow linked, Emilie and Sigmund Exner were not far from the mark. The Secessionists were responsible for reopening the Kunstgewerbeschule to women, and women would outnumber men among the school's students during World War I. Hilde Exner, for one, refused to be known as a «woman artist.» She declined an invitation to join the Association of Austrian Women Artists [*Vereinigung bildender Künstlerinnen Österreichs*], founded in 1910, explaining that she would be interested only in joining an organization of «artists, no matter whether men or women.» Her reason was, as she put it, «artistic.» Male and female artists «all pursue the same goal, even if perhaps their ways and means appear quite different.»[23] One reason, then, why the new color trends became so controversial among the Exners was the transformation of gender roles they presaged. The older generation fostered the independence of the young Exner women, but they still feared its implications for Brunnwinkl's future.

## Color Wars

At the time, color was a topic hotly contested by scientists and artists, physiologists and psychologists, conservatives and modernists. In another account of the origins of the Exner brothers' color theory, the one they would later tell their scientific colleagues, their preoccupation with color begins on a summer afternoon. We can picture Sigmund hiking alone up the Schafberg, the peak that rose behind the Exners' cluster of cottages. With a few strokes of his pen, Sigmund removed himself from the battlefield of cultural politics and resurfaced in the calm of the summer retreat. Assuming the habitus of the «Sommerfrischler,» he cast himself as the consummate connoisseur of nature, sharp-eyed and untainted by dogmatism. Sigmund recalled «experiments ... which I set up without taking notes, almost as a game

on hot summer days. It was on a mountainside covered with countless flowers and low bushes, where all sorts of insects buzzed around, flying from flower to flower.» In this fertile clearing, Sigmund «amused himself» by playing a little trick on the insects. He laid down slips of colored paper in shades to match the surrounding flowers and watched as the insects flew to them, «apparently deceived.» He began to wonder about the appeal of flower colors to insects and about the «aesthetic pleasure» that flowers afforded humans.[24] How was it that bees, with their multifaceted eyes and microscopic brains, were attracted to the very same flowers as poets?

Perhaps Sigmund shared this observation with Serafin at supper that night. Serafin would have countered with his own query: Why was it that in the history of art and industry, throughout the ages and across cultures, not only certain colors but certain shades appeared to dominate? The physicist and the physiologist would now have seen the outlines of a project. For Sigmund, it would be a return to an investigation he had begun in the 1860s, under the influence of Helmholtz's physiological optics. For Serafin, it would mean embarking on a new field, one that lay at the contested nexus where physics and physiology intersected with the new experimental psychology. For both men, it would be an effort to resolve the aesthetic disunity that had cut a rift through their professional and domestic worlds.

In essence, the brothers conducted an empirical test to determine the «most beautiful» colors.

Employing two hundred volunteers and papers of several different shades within each color family, Serafin asked his subjects to choose those colors that, «without regard to any practical application, stimulate the most or least pleasant sensation in the eye.»[25] The subjects confirmed his suspicions. Despite the vagaries of «personal taste, idiosyncrasies of the eyes, and other contingencies,» they showed a significant preference for certain shades of red over others and, likewise, for particular blues and greens. He then correlated these shades to three fundamental wavelengths: a blue close to indigo, a green verging on blue-green, and a red «similar to carmine, only further towards purple, somewhat like very dark roses.»[26] These corresponded to the «fundamental sensations» of the physiological theory of color perception that Serafin adopted from Hermann von Helmholtz. Conversely, the further a color lay from the primary, the «more unpleasant» the observers found it. The «beauty» of a color was therefore determined by its saturation and by the ratio in which it excited the eye's red, green, and blue receptors. Serafin concluded that beautiful colors did indeed exist—not as romantic ideals or rational principles, but as the consequences of spectral physics and the physiology of the normal eye.

## Many-sidedness

In the end, the Exners' «normal eye» is less convincing as sensory physiology than as a sociology of color. And this is precisely how it was later interpreted by the psychiatrist Robert Exner, nephew to Serafin and Sigmund. In the 1930s Robert argued that the fundamental sensations were neither physical nor physiological facts but, rather, abstractions that had evolved through social interactions. Drawing on anthropology and linguistics, Robert marveled at how color names had evolved in each culture to produce «the same effect in many differently disposed brains!» Linguistic usage thus reflected the «average capability» of individual observers.[27] Yet for Robert such an average was a contingent product of social life, not—as for his uncles—a norm incarnated.

The «normal eye» of the older generation was in part a statistical construct, an average over multiple observers. As an avowed approximation, this concept avoided any tinge of



dogmatism or the implication of externally imposed conformity. Yet the normal eye was more than a mathematical mean or an absence of pathology. The Exners specified not only the wavelengths of light to which the normal eye was sensitive but also its favorite colors and its tastes in the fine arts and even in women. The normal eye encapsulated their standards of friendship, family, and sexual relations. As a definition of the universally human, the normal eye did not spring fully formed from mathematical calculations or laboratory investigations. Like nineteenth-century ideas of the nation, the normal eye was a labor of the imagination.[28]

I suggest that we see this concept as its authors themselves saw it: as an account of the possibility of communication between autonomous beings about a shared world. What these scientists deemed universal originated as a vision of what they held in common on a far smaller scale.

The concept of the normal eye was rooted in the experience of social intimacy, of private *Verkehr*. Of course, laboratory measurements constrained the contours of the Exners' vision of universal taste. But what breathed life into this abstraction was their self-consciousness as members of a private community. Consider this remark from Sigmund and Serafin's joint publication on color theory in 1910: «We know of course that we can associate [*verkehren*] with a person for an entire lifetime, have innumerable conversations with him about paintings and other colored objects, and only late in life discover that this person is color blind, of which he too was ignorant, until specially designed experiments demonstrated it.»[29] The point of this vignette is that intimate relationships rest on the perpetuation of conversation about a common world and thus on the willingness of each individual to adjust his or her perceptions to a shared standard. The essence of intimacy is the attempt to see through the eyes of another.

It is becoming apparent that science at Brunnwinkl was never simply an exercise in individualism. Working at the boundary between the physical and sensory realms, the Exners were driven to bridge the gulfs between individual minds, to build a high road over the abyss of solipsism. In the parlance of Viennese liberalism, their goal was *Vielseitigkeit* (many-sidedness or versatility), the ability to see from perspectives beyond the personal. According to an educational philosophy that had become common wisdom by the mid-nineteenth century, learning proceeded from one-sidedness to many-sidedness: *Vertiefung* (absorbed contemplation) in the object of knowledge gives way to *Besinnung* (self-conscious reflection), through which the pupil relates the newly acquired knowledge to other ideas and experiences.[30] To call someone many-sided was to bestow the highest compliment of this educated society.

Many-sidedness expressed a liberal vision of a society whose cohesion would emerge from successful communication, not from imposed uniformity. Communication was the key to overcoming the personal and class-based conditions of perception. Like the empiricist's asymptotic vision of a universal human nature, the ideal of many-sidedness equated the common (a normative concept) with the normal (a descriptive and statistical concept). In the context of the Industrial Revolution, the call for many-sidedness was a bid to overcome the specialization required by a modern division of labor and the dehumanizing effects of bureaucratization. The modern state demanded experts, however, and entrusted public institutions with producing them. The liberal bourgeoisie therefore expected the seeds of many-sidedness to be planted and nurtured within the sphere of the family.[31]

Here, then, was the relationship of the family and the state as envisioned by Austria's liberal educated middle class: neither an opposition between private and public, nor a replica of patriarchal authority on a smaller scale, the family was instead a training ground

for the challenge of participating in a newly diverse society. Even in an age of public education, bourgeois families cultivated many-sided personalities in their parlors, gardens, and summer retreats. In this way, the family was meant to be a first approximation to universality. It was the smallest sample size of the population that allowed one to glimpse the contours of the universally human. What was most intimate came to be associated with both the «common» and the «normal.» In the domestic effort to cultivate many-sidedness, the education of the senses was paramount. To move from one-sidedness to many-sidedness, from absorption to reflection, meant learning to look at the world autonomously, yet with a mind attuned to the imperatives of communication. It meant relying on one's own perceptions, while constantly adjusting these to facilitate conversation. Art was thus a prime vehicle for fostering many-sidedness, just as Schiller had celebrated art's potential to free viewers from class-based conventions and prejudices. But Austrian education was distinctive in giving equal weight to the «humanistic» value of natural science. The study of natural history, for instance, was said not merely to develop «acuity and precision of observation»; it could, as well, guide «the gaze up and beyond» the realm of the everyday.[32] In this sense, science could match art in its capacity to teach one to see from a perspective beyond the local and personal.



1 Serafin's public response to Klimt's mural is quoted in Hermann Bahr, *Gegen Klimt* (Vienna, 1903), 23–24. His brother Sigmund Exner signed the professors' petition against the mural. On this episode see Carl Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage, 1981), 233. The lecture «What Is Ugly?» was given by the Viennese art historian Franz Wickhoff; see ibid., 232.

2 Alois Riegl, *Altorientalische Teppiche* (Leipzig: Weigel, 1891), 4.

3 Deborah Coen, *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty: Science, Liberalism & Private Life* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 2007). On the work of individual members of the family see Paul A. Hanle, «Indeterminacy before Heisenberg: The Case of Franz Exner and Erwin Schrödinger,» in *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, vol. 10 (1979):225–269; Michael Stöltzner, «Franz Serafin Exner's Indeterminist Theory of Culture,» in *Physics in Perspective*, vol. 4 (2002):267–319; Olaf Breidbach, *introduction to Sigmund Exner, Entwurf zu einer physiologischen Erklärung der psychischen Erscheinungen* (Thun/Frankfurt: Verlag Harri Deutsch, 1999); and Tania Munz, «The Bee Battles: Karl von Frisch, Adrian Wenner, and the Honey Bee Dance Language Controversy,» in *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 38 (2005):535–570. On the sculptors Hilde Exner and her cousin Nora Exner von Zumbusch see Sabine Plakolm-Forsthuber, *Künstlerinnen in Österreich, 1897–1938: Malerei, Plastik, Architektur* (Vienna: Picus, 1994), 220. On the Exner-Frisch family see Karl Frisch, *Fünf Häuser am See* (Berlin: Springer, 1980); K. Frisch, *Erinnerungen eines Biologen* (Berlin: Springer, 1973); and Berta Karlik and Erich Schmid, *Franz Serafin Exner und sein Kreis* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982).

4 On the history of Austrian liberalism see Pieter Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Experience, Social Politics, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848–1914* (Ann Arbor: Univ. Michigan Press, 1996); Lothar Höbelt, *Kornblume und Kaiseradler: Die deutschfreiheitlichen Parteien Altösterreichs 1882–1918* (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1993); Harry Ritter, «Austrian-German Liberalism and the Modern Liberal Tradition,» in *German Studies Review*, vol. 7 (1984):227–248; and Steven Beller, ed., *Rethinking Vienna 1900* (New York: Berghahn, 2001).

5 Emilie Exner, *Der Brunnwinkl* (Vienna: Kainz, 1906), 7.

6 Carl Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage, 1981). William McGrath, *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1974).

7 Karl-Heinz Rossbacher, *Literatur und Bürgertum: Fünf Wiener jüdische Familien von der liberalen Ära bis zum Fin de Siècle* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2004). There is also a growing body of research on the Austrian bourgeoisie. See esp. Hannes Stekl, ed., *Bürgertum in der Habsburgermonarchie*, 10 vols. (Vienna: Böhlau, 1990–2004); and Rossbacher, *Literatur und Liberalismus: Zur Kultur der Ringstrassenzeit in Wien* (Vienna: Verlag Jugend & Volk, 1992).

8 Here I echo the psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott's concept of a «transitional space,» a (figurative) space between the self and the external world in which play, creativity, and cultural production become possible. For a Winnicottian interpretation of another Central European intellectual colony see Peter Loewenberg, «The Creation of a Scientific Community: The Burghölzli, 1902–1914,» in *Fantasy and Reality in History* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1995), 46–89. On the historical development of the bourgeoisie's audience-oriented subjectivity see Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), 43–51.

9 Emilie Exner to Marie Ebner von Eschenbach, August 16 1901, signature 81082Ja, Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv, Vienna.

10 Karl Frisch, *Aus dem Leben der Bienen* (Berlin: Springer, 1927), vi (signed «Brunnwinkl, Easter, 1927»).

11 Rossbacher, *Literatur und Liberalismus*, 23.

12 Sigmund Exner *Physiologie der facettirten Augen von Krebsen und Insecten* (Leipzig/Vienna: Franz Deuticke, 1891), 37.

13 Karl Frisch, «Leben der Bienen, » in *Techniques of the Observer* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990), 64.

14 With the help of his brother Karl, a specialist in optics, Sigmund explained the geometry of insect vision in the first chapter of *Physiologie der facettirten Augen von Krebsen und Insecten*, where this photograph was published.

15 R. Steven Turner, *In the Eye's Mind: Vision and the Helmholtz–Hering Controversy* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1994).

16 Karl Exner, «Über das Funkeln der Sterne und die Scintillation überhaupt,» in *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, sect. IIa, vol. 84 (1881):1038–1081, 1057; Sigmund Exner, *Physiologisches und Pathologisches in den bildenden Künsten* (Vienna: Verein zur Verbreitung naturwissenschaftlicher Kenntnisse in Wien, 1889), 8; K. Exner, «Über die Curven des Anklingens und des Abklingens der Lichtempfindungen,» in *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, sect. IIa, vol. 62 (1870):197–201; and Sigmund Exner, *Physiologie der facettierten Augen von Krebsen und Insekten*, 2.

17 Karl von Frisch, «Der Farbensinn und Formensinn der Biene,» in *Zoologische Jahrbücher*, vol. 35 (1914):1–105, 79, 87. On insects as models of «natural» society see Danielle Allen, «Burning the Fable of the Bees: The Incendiary Authority of Nature,» in *The Moral Authority of Nature*, ed. Lorraine Daston and Fernando Vidal (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 2004), 74–99; and Abigail Lustig, «Ants and the Nature of Nature in Auguste Forel, Erich Wasmann, and William Morton Wheeler,» ibid., 282–307.

18 Sigmunf Exner, *Physiologisches und Pathologisches in den bildenden Künsten*, 4–8, here 4.

19 Ibid., 8, 10. See also Kurt Blaukopf, «Von der Ästhetik zur ‹Zweigwissenschaft›: Robert Zimmermann als Vorläufer des Wiener Kreises,» in *Kunst, Kunsttheorie und Kunstforschung im wissenschaftlichen Diskurs: In memoriam Kurt Blaukopf*, ed. Martin Seiler and Friedrich Stadler (Vienna: Öbv & Hpt, 2000), 35–46.

20 Emilie Exner to Marie Ebner von Eschenbach, July 15, 1902, signature 81082Ja, Wiener Stadt- und Landesarchiv, Vienna.

21 The remark about the need for sculpture to «capture movement» is from a review by the influential critic Arthur Roessler, «Plastiken von Nora von Zumbusch» (1914), quoted in Plakolm-Forsthuber, *Künstlerinnen in* Österreich, *1897–1938*, (Vienna: Picus, 1994), 220; on Nora and Hilde in Rome see K. Frisch, *Erinnerungen eines Biologen*, 22. For Nora's views see Nora Exner to Franz Serafin Exner (II), January 20, 1906, 640/37, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna; and Nora Exner to Otto Benndorf, May 7, 1895, 666/6, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.

22 Karl Frisch, *Fünf Häuser am See*, 65.

23 Emilie Exner, *Die Emancipation in der Ehe* (Hamburg: Voß, 1895), 32–33; Sigmund Exner, *Physiologisches und Pathologisches in den bildenden Künsten*, 26; and «Nicht nur mit Lippenstift,» in *Wiener Zeitung* (April 9, 2004): (quoting Hilde Exner). On the themes of neurasthenia, gender, and aesthetics in this period in France see Debora Silverman, *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1989).

24 Franz Serafin Exner (II) and Sigmund Exner, «Die physikalischen Grundlagen der Blütenfärbungen,» in *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, sect. I, vol. 119 (1910):191–245, 197.

25 Franz Serafin Exner (II), «Zur Characteristik der schönen und hässlichen Farben,» in *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, sect. IIa, vol 111 (1902):901–921.

26 Franz Serafin Exner (II), «Über die Grundempfindungen im Young–Helmholtz'schen Farbensystem,» in *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, sect. IIa, vol. 111 (1902):857–877, 868.

27 Robert Exner, «Die Genesis der vier Kardinalfarben,» in *Psychiatrisch-Neurologische Wochenschrift*, vol. 40 (1938):1–18, 16, 2.

28 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1991).

29 Franz Serafin Exner (II) and Sigmund Exner, «Physikalischen Grundlagen der Blütenfarbungen,» 192.

30 This discussion relies heavily on Dietrich Benner's lucid analysis in *Die Pädagogik Herbarts* (Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1986) and in J. F. Herbart, *Systematische Pädagogik*, *vol. 2: Interpretationen*, ed. Benner, (Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1997).

31 Herbart, *Systematische Pädagogik*, ed. Benner, 108–115.

32 Franz Exner (I), *Entwurf der Organisation der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Oesterreich* (Vienna: Schulbücher Verlag, 1849; 1875), 171.





# The Image of the Frozen City

Contemporary analysis of a city has come to mean a struggle for the mastery of images, its visual axes, and Canaletto-like views. The city of Salzburg is better suited than most to the study of this phenomenon, which has at times been interpreted as a battle between «modernists» and «conservatives.» The parties that fuel these discussions are characterized labels like «conservative,» «avant-garde,» and «modern versus anti modern,» but are not always so easily identifiable as belonging to one of those camps. According to American visual culture scholar W.J.T. Mitchell, images (and I include therewith images of cities) force us modern people to succumb to pre-modern behavioral patterns:

«In regard to objects, we are stuck in magical pre-modern attitudes—and especially with regard to images ... it is not our task to overcome these attitudes, but to understand them and to work our way past their semiotics.»[1]

When we translate this conception of images to historic places, we can understand why these days cities like Salzburg attract so many people. Not as a result of interest in their histories, but as a result of the spell cast by the image of cities and the objects of which they are composed. The modern audience succumbs to its atavistic subconsciousness. Most of the thousands of tourists that pass through Salzburg's laid out paths know no more about Salzburg's history than that Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was born there, and that the *Sound of Music* (1965) was filmed there. Yet they are nonetheless spellbound by the place.

In an era in which technological advances have turned us into supernumeraries in the stream of data flowing through the World Wide Web, we cling to old cities that, compared to contemporary soulless non–places, have a magical effect.[2] The modern mass-tourism nomad attempts to distinguish himself from the nineteenth century cultural tourist who rushed from one monument to the next, leafing through history books, Baedeker travel guide in hand. The earlier tourist still possessed a differentiated image of the city. Salzburg essayist and historian Adolf Ritter von Steinhauser offers us an example of this. Looking down from Mönchsberg, current location of the Museum der Moderne Salzburg, an observer describes the scenery:

«O yes, he replies, the view of valley and mountain is quite wonderful, but I have seen beautiful landscapes, and have perhaps seen many more beautiful in my life; what I find especially appealing here is something else.... I hardly know another German–speaking city that is so steeped and fluent in history as this one. Your city lies down there like an open book. Those who understand the language of stone can learn plenty of interesting things.»[3]

The «language of stones»—Steinhauser quotes the inscription «*Te saxa loquuntur*» that adorns the entrance to Salzburg's Siegmundstor tunnel—speaks to history's vicissitudes. He is concerned with deciphering the image, the scripture, the language of stones, rather than their glorification.

## Lucky Coincidences ...

Salzburg's political decline was an indirect consequence of the French Revolution. At the end of the Napoleonic Wars Salzburg was plundered by the Bavarians, the French, and the Habsburgs, and left an independent principality with an archbishop at the helm. The most valuable works of portable art were dispersed between the museums of Florence, Munich, Paris, and Vienna. What remained was that which was not moveable: its buildings—the city with its churches, palaces, and town houses. This would eventually be interpreted as a stroke of luck for the city, for it remained—albeit robbed of its political–economic significance—more or less unchanged until the mid–nineteenth century. Conflict did not begin to sprout between the progressive minded and the anti–modernists until the city exceeded its borders, walls and ramparts, freeing itself from the obstacles that hampered traffic and growth. The terms «walls,» «ramparts,» and «obstacles that hampered the flow of traffic» (these also understood in the metaphoric sense) are truly expressions of that era. During the neo-absolutist eras of the 1850s and 1860s these terms signaled the awakening of a liberal bourgeois society, and opposition thereto. Moments such as these indicate thresholds whereupon the status–quo dissolves, leaving old and the new to confront each other in a, to borrow a topos from the history of literature, *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*. A late seventeenth century French literary dispute questioned whether the era of Ludwig XIV could be considered on a par with the sublime works of antiquity. The Sun King's France answered in the affirmative—the opposite was the case in regard to Salzburg's cityscape. Viennese architecture critic Friedrich Achleitner found the appropriate words for this phenomenon:

«Like every other important central European city, Salzburg—by which we mean the Old Town —is complete, perfect. In the eyes of the Salzburgers, their city is the ‹most perfect.› If a picture is complete, the tiniest interference will—from the viewer's standpoint—be life-threatening.»[4]

Contemporary urban development and architecture can never live up to the aesthetic effect and significance of the old city. This would, by definition, pose a threat to the complete picture of the city. This position likewise informed art historian Hans Sedlmayr's credo following his emeritus from Munich as formulated in his 1965 inaugural lecture as newly appointed art historian at Salzburg University:

«In consideration of the dangers posed by the *Gründerzeit*[5] and the last war, the old city of Salzburg has been preserved remarkably well. Every little detail must be guarded with the upmost care, and it is our duty to preserve it. It only takes a glance at Salzburg's suburbs to recognize that the certainty of design, in which art truly influences all avenues of life, is over.»[6]

Every little detail is essential in the formation of a complete picture. Sedlmayr recommended anyone who doubted this simply take a walk of penance through Salzburg's suburbs. His diatribe *Die demolierte Schönheit* (demolished beauty), in which he pointed to the necessity of a comprehensive protection of Salzburg's old city, was even more radical than his aforementioned speech.[7] Quoting Max Dvořák's 1916 *Katechismus der Denkmalpflege* (The Catechism of Historical Preservation), Sedlmayr concluded that people themselves are the



greatest threat to history's artistic treasures.[8] Salzburg's 1967 old city preservation act, of which Sedlmayr was the intellectual father, was based on his belief that the contemporary imagination was no longer capable of creating true works of art in the sense of *Gesamtkunstwerk* (a total work of art). According to Sedlmayr, the representatives of «true modernism» were those who brought historic works of art to life by means of their interpretation, in a vein similar to that of Salzburg's highly esteemed performing arts and music. While Sedlmayr conceded that there continued to be significant individual feats in art, he did not believe that their existence belied the fact that they suffered from a fundamental deficiency:

«A few good, perhaps even outstanding, exceptions do not change the fact that Hegel's notion of the highest form of art harkening back to the past continues to ring profoundly true in our time.[9]

Sedlmayr's polemic abbreviation of Hegel manifests his distrust of contemporary art and architecture. As is well established, Hegel's intentions with the aforementioned quote laid elsewhere. He saw the mystical and worshipped art that ended with the Middle Ages, as art's highest form. Sedlmayr's judgment falls short when we take Hegel's philosophy at face value. Hegel's philosophy allows for an analytical perspective on art and architecture. It offers no reason to value modernist buildings, of which Salzburg has developed it own local varieties, any less than «nondescript» ones. Martin Knoll's Posthof (1930–1932), Peter Behren's Kolleg St. Benedikt (1926), and Wunibald Deininger's former police barracks (1927–1931) on Rudolfsplatz (which was later disfigured to resemble the *Heimatstil*), are all modernist works that fail to appear in Sedlmayr's world.

Clemens Holzmeister has no doubt enriched Salzburg's old city with his Salzburg Festival buildings, but Sedlmayr directs his attention to small details in order to deflect from the fact that twentieth century contributions were essential to the ongoing development of the old city. He moreover denies the possibility of comprehending the old city's typology and structure based solely on architecture. The history of art has underscored and interpreted this notion in fact, but is not capable of constructing a city.

Even the nineteenth century development of Salzburg into a modern city, which Sedlmayr conjured as the «danger of the *Gründerzeit*,» has been revised.[10] As of 1995 the *Gründerzeit* districts that lay just outside the old city were granted preservation status similar to that of the historic center. Friedrich Achleitner emphasized the significance of the urban *Gründerzeit* system long before art historiography did: even if the *Gründerzeit* system had «little in common with the old city, it has the advantage of orderliness, of possessing a ‹legible city structure,› which cannot readily be said of the city's later development.»[11]

Individual *Gründerzeit* buildings are now regarded differently before the picturesque backdrop of the old city. Art historian Gerhard Plasser demonstrated that the state courthouse, built in the neo–baroque style from 1903 to 1909, reflects its local surroundings in a multitude of ways. Its architect, Alexander von Wielemans, deliberately chose the baroque style, which had been reinterpreted a few decades earlier, and was—set among Salzburg's baroque churches and palaces—exemplary of the style in the early twentieth century.

Its architect, Alexander von Wielemans, deliberately chose the baroque style,[12] which had been reinterpreted just a few decades earlier in the early twentieth century, influenced by Salzburg's baroque churches and palaces. In addition to style, the building also responds to its surrounding historic ensemble. Contemporary critics, however, had a different view.[13] Salzburg's *Gründerzeit* districts were long disregarded in comparison to those of other Austrian and international cities, in part as a result of the previously noted preconceptions. In the long shadow cast by these opinions even experienced politicians like Johannes Voggenhuber[14] have had a difficult time evaluating this era without unfair bias:

«The ideal image often evoked is that of the city up until the 1920s, but factual analysis of urban development offers a completely different picture. The social causes for the destruction of the city, which were in full effect after 1945, had come into being as early as the mid nineteenth century. The first decisive blow against the idea of the city occurred with the urban redevelopment of the *Gründerzeit*. The resistance of individual citizens against these developments also began in the previous century.

About one hundred and thirty years ago a syndicate made up of large landowners, merchants, and speculative builders became the successors to Salzburg's princely bishops, and thus the new developers of the city. This cartel succeeded in using politics and administration to enforce its interests.... Land speculation became the driving force for urban development, the purpose of architecture became the masking of social grievances and the pretense for a long lost continuity.»[15]

It should be noted that this bourgeois politician lamented the nineteenth century liberal bourgeois class as a mob of land speculators. When we remember that such views continued governing political discourse up until the 1980s, it is all the more surprising that areas of urban *Gründerzeit* expansion were included within the *Altstadtschutzzone II* (old city landmark zone II) less than ten years later.[16]

Sedlmayr's judgment on the *Gründerzeit* as laid out in his brilliant account of the era entitled, *Verlust der Mitte* or *Art in Crisis: The Lost Center*, has been overcome. But what about his assertion that the *Sicherheit des Gestaltens* (the reliability of design) has been lost? And that it was merely a stroke of luck that the *Gründerzeit* and World War II had only the slightest impact on Salzburg's cityscape? Sedlmayr wasn't quite right in regard to that last point: A decision was made to reconstruct the dome as well as the Kaiviertel—a section of the city bombed to destruction—but other areas were not handled so sensitively. In those areas the path drawn by the bombs was used to create, for example, the Griesgasse passageway. A new five–story building was erected on a part of Mozart's home that had been destroyed by a bomb. The Mozarteum Foundation's restoration of the building to its original condition led to an absurd dispute between both the conservative supporters and opponents of the undertaking.[17]

After close examination of the historical facts and reevaluation of past eras, there was in fact little substance left of Sedlmayr's assessment. Does Sedlmayr's conviction—which was incidentally shared by his critic, art historian Thomas Zaunschirm—that there was nothing worth adding to the old city still hold true?[18] Let us pose the question differently: What are the implications of the idea that art has nothing left to contribute in a time when buildings continue to be built?

Two examples from the 1970s, representing a type of conformist architecture that seemingly fits in with the appearance of the city, can help illustrate the answer to this. The first is the AVA building (1970–1973), an uninspired stylistic copy of the «foundations of characteristic buildings,» that wants to fit in with the city, but merely represents a caricature of an old Salzburg town house. The new Mozarteum University building (1978) serves as the second example. The original plans for the latter, by architect Eugen Wörle, were revised after much protest. He was forced to remove one story of the building while keeping the floor plan intact. The result was a disaster in terms of functionality, and the design for the facade was just as unfortunate as that of the AVA building. In those days, the only nineteenth century church by Salzburg painter and conservator Georg Pezolt was torn down in plain sight of art historians and monument conservators.[19] The university building was largely demolished in 2004 as a result of serious functional deficiencies and a series of suspicious illnesses. With the subsequent new construction (completed in 2006) Munich



architect Robert Rechenauer achieved the integration of a modern and fully functional new building in the old city. Rechenauer therewith—as emphasized by Friedrich Achleitner in regard to the newly constructed Museum der Moderne Salzburg—became one of many Munich architects to prove themselves capable of handling the city with much more care than their predecessors.

The preservation policy of Salzburg's old city, which was initially a facade (in this regard Hans Sedlmayr's criticisms were justified), treated new construction as unobjectionable *per se*. Contrary to the belief of some, the policy didn't require new constructions to replicate historical styles, with raised roofs and other historically inspired architectural details. New construction in protected zones, amendments to the 1980 preservation law of the old city unequivocally state that, «a historic construction style, an imitation of old buildings, is not only according to law not required, but is not furthermore deemed desirable.»[20]

The cultural significance of the historical center has been protected in the sense that characteristic buildings may not be altered in regard to building height, depth, nor lines since 1967. Not only was the historic substance of the structures protected, but buildings worth preserving were likewise determined in the year 1967. The city is not as frozen in time as the aforementioned excerpt suggests. The current debate has not been about «modernists» versus «conservatives» for some time.

The city's current problem is its borders—self established ones and political—such as municipal boundaries. The latter must be taken into account even if the latter are principally arbitrary, and it quickly becomes apparent that development opportunities are very limited within the total 16,229 acres of the city of Salzburg. 9,142 acres of these are parkland and permanently protected from development. The old city zone I encompasses 583 acres, and the old city zone II 236 acres, which means that the demand for the remaining 7,413 acre area (1,235 of which are dedicated to traffic) is rapidly growing.[21] Land prices are soaring as a result, and there is a lack of affordable living space. These issues often appear in the media and are used as political fodder. The pressure surrounding the few remaining lots has caused more dense development, which in turn leads to conflicts with neighbors who fear increased traffic, the loss of the few remaining open spaces, and the loss of valuable historic structures that naturally accrued over time.

## Remembering Modernism

We must concern ourselves with addressing the development of the old city and the roots of modernism—buildings from the 1920s and 1930s, as well as those from the second half of the 20th century—that are so readily overlooked in Salzburg. In so doing, we must also take modern man into account, with his contradictory pre–modern attitudes as predicted by architect Paul Geppert Jr. in 1934:

«My client, I believe, is a modern man of this day and age. He is well dressed and surely desires a contemporary house. Thus I show him pictures of new Swiss buildings that I believe are compatible with his taste, and explain to him the concept of the Swiss house as it would apply to his wishes.

But I have erred. ‹No, no,› he exclaims, ‹that's not what I want, I want ...›
Gradually I begin to understand that he would rather have a country house. Since it will be built in Salzburg, I take out a picture of one of our farmhouses from the lowlands to show him.»[22]

Lois Welzenbacher first introduced some of his most significant buildings in the *Salzburger Werkbund* journal.[23] Among these are the Heyrovsky house and the Buchroithner house, both located in Zell am See. During the First Austrian Republic, modernism and traditionalism still ran parallel to each other. The direction that would prevail had yet to be decided. But while Welzenbacher introduced some of his revolutionary living space concepts—which he regarded as «dissolving spatial borders»—Geppert already had a portfolio with pictures of Flachgau farmhouses ready for his «modern clients.» Welzenbacher also published his almost iconic 1927 competition design for the construction of Salzburg's Aiglhof grounds in the previously mentioned journal.[24] Therewith he proposed the construction of a modern Salzburg that exceeded the historical center and *Gründerzeit* district, a project that never came to fruition.

It was not immediately possible to change the course of Nazi city planning doctrines even after the National Socialist dictatorship had ended. As demonstrated by architect Otto Ponholzer, there were in some instances even consistencies in personnel that spanned from the Third Reich into the post war period. Like Welzenbacher's proposal for the Aiglhof, arbeitsruppe 4's 1953 concept for the satellite city Taxham remained merely a concept for a different kind of city. What was in fact realized was a design that founded upon the concept for a *Volksgemeinschaft*. This settlement, which lay on the edge of the city, was subdivided in its interior, and sealed off on the exterior, long remained an alien element that did not fit in with its surroundings.

As demonstrated by the 2015 exhibition *Salzburg Unbuilt*, these examples document Salzburg's selective interaction with modernism.[25] Failed projects include Hans Poelzig's expressive modernist festival hall in Hellbrunn (planned in 1920–1922), the previously mentioned examples by Welzenbacher and arbeitsgruppe 4, Álvaro Siza's Casino Winkler conversion (1986), Hans Hollein's vision of a Salzburg Guggenheim Museum (beginning in 1989) on Mönchsberg, and Dominique Perrault's service center (1994) on Franz–Rehrl–Platz. All of these projects render clear one thing; to once more quote Friedrich Achleitner, who doesn't hold back when characterizing the attitude he observes in Salzburg: «The people of Salzburg demand grandness, even if they've made a mess in their pants.»[26]

The kind of modernism that was realized in Salzburg does not—save for few exceptions—live up to its name. Anonymous apartment complexes around the train station, on the grounds of the Rennbahn, and in the Lehen district, corrupted the goals of an enlightened modernism. Sedlmayr's dictum that one need merely glance at Salzburg's suburbs to identify that from which the old city needed protection, really does apply in these instances. There is, however, another tradition: The works of Gerhard Garstenauer—his Gänsbrunn Haus (1960), apartment tower in Lehen (1971), Mercedes Benz warehouse (1974) celebrated for its uncompromising clarity, and his own home (1978)—together with arbeitsgruppe 4's Church in Parsch (1953–1956) and the St. Josef seminary (1953–1956)—signal that the leap towards modernism, a unique period in the history of Salzburg, was not accidental. Open–minded entrepreneurs, church members, and cooperative developers mustered significant resources for that time in order to incorporate modern buildings into the cityscape.

Perhaps an image and a quote will suffice to illustrate the current situation. The image is a contribution by architect Elsa Prochazka to the exhibition *Salzburg Unbuilt*. The text is by Josef Frank, the great Austrian architect who was forced to emigrate in 1934. During a time when Clemens Holzmeister was building the Salzburg Festival theater building, Frank was developing a different kind of modernism, it went beyond an indoctrinated conceptuality and, in so doing eluded categorization. Frank's quote—inexplicably penned 75 years before Elsa Prochazka's photomontage—offers a fitting caption to her image in



which the high towers of San Gimignano on the left bank of Salzburg's Salzach river rage into the sky.

«The modern culture lover's image of the modern man—who, after he has been riding on the railroad all day long and has earned money, comes home, switches on his phonograph, and exercises—does not exist, and if he does, he does so in many varieties! Absolute size is not critical, and the high–rise mania is a mere decorative anachronism that strives to recreate a new S. Gimignano.»[27]

In the photomontage Prochazka created for the *Salzburg Unbuilt* exhibition, she refers to the original dimension of utopian thought. By attributing the role of the un-built to this image from the outset—neither intended as a proposal for a new development, nor a concrete vision for the city—she creates a mysterious image that points to an unanswered question: How is the city to deal with its borders and the issue of growth? The second half of the twentieth century has focused on protecting the old city and its green belt by establishing boundaries against uncontrolled exploitation by a modern economy. The city has now reached a point where there is little room left to maneuver, it seems to be frozen. Images like Prochazka's are significant not because they represent the city's future, but because they work against the standstill of society using a tool developed by the avant–garde: the breach of taboo.

1 Translated for this essay from W. J. T. Mitchell, *Das Leben der Bilder. Eine Theorie der visuellen Kultur* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2008), 48.

2 By this Marc Augé means transient spaces in suburban areas such as shopping malls, airports, and highways. Cf.: Idem., *Nicht–Orte*, trans. Michael Bischoff. (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2010).

3 Translated for this essay from Adolf Ritter von Steinhauser, «Ueber den Profanbau in Salzburg und das altsalzburgische Bürgerhaus,» in *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde*, vol. 19, (1888): 203, 202–226.

4 Friedrich Achleitner, «Foreground and Background,» in *Museum der Moderne Salzburg* (Salzburg: Anton Pustet, 2004), 75, 75–77.

5 *Gründerzeit*, was the Austrian economic era that directly preceded the great stock market crash of 1873.

6 Hans Sedlmayr, *Salzburgs Aufgabe in der Kunstgeschichte* [Inauguration lecture held on December 15, 1965] (Salzburg: Anton Pustet, 1966), 10.

7 Sedlmayr, Hans (1957). *Art in Crisis: The Lost Centre* (London: Hollis & Carter, 1957).

8 According to Dvorák the heritage of historic art is threatened by: «1. Uncertainty and insolence; 2. Greed and fraud; 3. Misunderstanding ideas about progress and present day demands; 4. Improper needs for beautification and renovation, artistic illiterateness and poor education.» Quoted from: Sedlmayr, *Die demolierte Schönheit*, 14.

9 Hans Sedlmayr, *Salzburgs Aufgabe in der Kunstgeschichte*, 10.

10 Christiane Krejs has provided a new perspective on these urban planning that has helped revise earlier judgments. Cf.: Idem., *Salzburgs Stadterweiterung im 19. Jahrhundert: 1860–1874. Bruch oder Aufbruch in Stadtplanung und Architektur?* (Salzburg: Phil. Diss., 1990).

11 Friedrich Achleitner, *Österreichische Architektur im 20. Jahrhundert. Ein Führer in drei Bänden*, vol. 1: *Oberösterreich, Salzburg, Tirol, Vorarlberg* (Salzburg / Vienna: Residenz, 1980), 246.

12 Austrian art historian Albert Ilg was instrumental in the rediscovery and renewal of the baroque style. He viewed it as a religiously founded, dynastic and super-national style that reflected the multi-ethnic Habsburg state.

13 During the late period of the Habsburg monarchy Alexander von Wielemans, a student of Friedrich Schmidt, was as central in the construction of courthouses as the Hellmer & Fellner office was in the construction of theaters. Salzburg's court building was Wieleman's last large-scale court building, and was harshly criticized by contemporary critics such as Joseph August Lux. This critique marked a decisive turning point in the perception of Salzburg's old city.

14 Johannes Voggenhuber was the speaker of Salzburg's united citizen initiative from 1977–1982, and from 1982–1987 served as a city council member.

15 Johannes Voggenhuber, *Berichte an den Souverän. Salzburg: Der Bürger und seine Stadt* (Salzburg/Vienna: Residenz, 1988), 35–36.

16 The *Gründerzeit* villas along the Salzach river bank located just outside the old city were not included in the old city protection zone until 1976, up until that point the protection zone had been divided.

17 Cf. Thomas Zaunschirm, *Die demolierte Gegenwart. Mozarts Wohnhaus und die Salzburger Denkmalpflege* (Klagenfurt: Ritter, 1987).

18 He stated that, «Salzburg's famous city panorama cannot be improved upon by any structural measures. No spectacular newly constructed building could attract more visitors. Rather, the opposite would improve the quality of life. Salzburg doesn't need a Bilbao effect. You get used to everything. Only very few citizens are particularly concerned about the festival theaters that lack moderate proportions and good taste.» Cf. Thomas Zaunschirm, «Ideen für die Stadt,» written statement for the *Salzburg Unbuilt* exhibition, sent by e-mail on September 6, 2014.

19 Cf. *Ein Traum von einer Stadt. Georg Pezolt (1810–1878) und Salzburg*, exh. cat. (Salzburg: Dommuseum, 2011), 22–24.

20 The amendment to the 1980 bill explicitly refers to paragraph 5 «other buildings within the protection zone,» which applies to all new construction. Cf: *Salzburger Altstadterhaltung. Maßnahmen und Ziele*, Salzburg: 1982 (Series of publications by the state press office, no. 64), 47.

21 «The municipality of Salzburg commits itself to the protection of its world heritage site, especially in regard to the protection of the historically significant old city, as well as its city landscapes.» MD/00/27560/2006/015, official report, public petition regarding «Rettet unser Grünland,» Salzburg, November 13, 2007, 11. The content of the park declaration was drafted by city council member Johannes Voggenhuber in the mid 1980s. Cf. Dietmar Steiner, ed., *Das Salzburg-Projekt. Entwurf einer europäischen Stadt. Architektur—Politik—Öffentlichkeit* (Vienna: Falter, 1986), 48.

22 Paul Geppert Jr., «Das Schweizerhaus,» in *Vierteljahresschrift des «Werkbund Salzburg»*, no. 1 (April 1934): 33, 33–36.

23 «Der geöffnete Wohnraum. Aus den Bauten von Lois Welzenbacher,» in: *Vierteljahresschrift des «Werkbund Salzburg»*, no. 1 (April 1935): 1–7.

24 Lois Welzenbacher, «Die Kirche und ihre städtebauliche Einfügung in Siedlung und Stadtbau,» in *Vierteljahresschrift des «Werkbund Salzburg»*, no. 3 (October 1935): 55–64.

25 The exhibition *Salzburg Unbuilt*, which took place at the Museum der Moderne Salzburg on Mönchsberg from March 28–July 12, 2015, was a cooperative project between the Initiative Architektur und Museum and the Museum der Moderne Salzburg, curated by the author of this essay.

26 Friedrich Achleitner, «Foreground and Background,» 72.

27 Josef Frank, «Der Baugedanke unserer Zeit,» in *Architektur als Symbol. Elemente deutschen neuen Bauens* (Vienna: Erhard Löcker, 2005), 173–174.





# Festival Planning and Cultural Planning

I

The Salzburg Festival had a long period of germination, but when it was finally born in 1920 it attempted to rise to the challenge of national self-definition. It took the collapse of Habsburg Austria and the inception of the culturally undefined First Republic to transform the sleepy traditions of Salzburg—Mozart and the church—into the unified mythos of Salzburg, to energize and consecrate the traditions of the past into defining principles of the present and the future. Salzburg became a celebration not of tradition but of a reforged link with the past, a past that was adapted, if not invented, to serve the spiritual as well as the political desires of future-minded conservatives. In Hugo von Hofmannsthal the formation of an institution found a champion; in a long sequence of cultural entrepreneurs, journalists, and critics, the intellectual and ideological campaign for the festival found its infantry.

By 1918, national redefinition had become the most urgent project to everyone committed to the idea of a Salzburg festival. The festival had become a symbol, but also a component of what was being symbolized: an Austrian, in other words a Catholic German, culture that claimed the title of keeper of German high cultural tradition. The theater pieces that were to be performed at the festival were to create their audience out of Austro-German Catholic congregants. The actual spectators were to serve as a paradigm for the nation as a whole. They were to see themselves—their «passion»—mirrored onstage. Audiences from 1920 on understood this charge, and often showed it by wearing the regional folk-costume of Loden capes and dirndls, a style that itself represented a Catholic world incorporating Austria, Bavaria, and Tyrol.[1]

Nineteenth-century tourists knew Salzburg for the splendor of its baroque architecture and its evocations of Mozart. Those attributes complemented each other while adding a symbolic «southernness» to the city, which was geographically a main gateway between Germany and Italy. In the age of Winckelmann and Goethe the south, and Italy in particular, had garnered an aura of purity and rejuvenation. Nietzsche had renewed that symbolism in musical terms in the 1880s, identifying Mozart (along with Bizet) as the symbol of the youth and health of the south, and Wagner as the voice of the stifling and diseased north.[2] The spirit of the south was in addition, for Nietzsche, an international spirit, combining German and Italian attributes. In a similar reflection on southern Germany in general, and why it had resisted the Reformation in particular, Hegel had alluded to the «mingling of elements which is the general characteristic of its nationality.»[3]

Spurred by its nebulous national identity, the history, or perhaps the mythos, of Salzburg is one of autonomy. From the fifteenth century until the advent of Napoleon, Salzburg remained under the rule of an autonomous archbishop or *Kirchenfürst* (ecclesiastical prince). Many of these rulers gained reputations as lavish spenders for secular as well as religious projects. In 1618, during the rule of Markus Sittikus, the first opera in a German-speaking country was performed at the Schloss Hellbrunn. Under Johann Ernst Graf von Thun Fischer von Erlach, architect of the Karlskirche in Vienna, was commissioned to build the Kollegienkirche in Salzburg. It was Hermann Bahr who coined the celebrated paean to Salzburg as the city where «nature is turned to stone and stone turned to spirit,» a statement that contains the ideological cornerstone of the Salzburg Festival: the continuity from nature to culture to divinity.

Salzburg's self-fashioning as the center of German Catholicism was not a cosmopolitan process. In 1498 the *Kirchenfürst* Leonhard von Keutschach banished the city's Jews, and in the 1740s the Protestants were similarly expelled. Salzburg's last *Kirchenfürst*, Hyeronimus Colloredo, was exiled by Napoleon, who placed Salzburg under the authority of the Elector of Bavaria. Ten years later, it fell under the authority of the Habsburgs. Technically, then, the city that after 1918 was to embody Austria and «the Austrian idea» had been a part of Austria for only a hundred years.

In 1841 the city of Salzburg celebrated the founding of the Dommusikverein und Mozarteum, and the academy for the study of church music and Mozart. The Mozarteum, separated in 1880 from the Dommusikverein, became the institutional base for musical life in Salzburg, and the springboard for the ambition to start some kind of music festival there, with an emphasis on Mozart. In 1870, in collaboration with the Breitkopf publishing house, a group of Viennese financiers led by Carl Freiherr von Sterneck and Karl Spängler, founded the Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum, with the intention of publishing a complete new Mozart edition. It seems to have been Carl von Sterneck who in the same year also came up with the idea of building a Mozart festival hall in Salzburg.[4] The first decisive support for the idea came from celebrated conductor Hans Richter, active with both the Vienna Philharmonic and the Bayreuth Festival, who conducted on a fairly regular basis in Salzburg from 1879 on. In that year he conducted the Vienna Philharmonic in their second appearance there, and in August 1887 he conducted a series of centennial performances of Don Giovanni in Salzburg. It was apparently at a roundtable of artists participating in the 1887 production that Richter proposed a permanent Mozart festival in Salzburg and offered his help in gathering together the necessary artists.[5] He himself was instrumental in founding a committee to investigate the possibility of both a festival hall and a regular festival.

In 1890, under the leadership of a Professor Karl Demel, the committee that Richter had helped form was appointed the *ActionsComite für ein Mozart-Festspielhaus in Salzburg*. The committee expressed its goal in a short, collectively signed article titled «The Mozart Festival Hall in Salzburg.» «Similar to the Wagner theater in Bayreuth,» it read, «[the Salzburg theater] should be a nurturing ground for good music in a broader sense, but should in no way be considered a competitive undertaking to Bayreuth.» In the spirit of the ideas of the *ActionsComité*, Ferdinand Fellner, one of central Europe's most renowned theater architects, suggested an opera house for Salzburg reminiscent of the Bayreuth Festival Hall. In the tradition of Bayreuth, as noted above, the theater was to be built on Mönchsberg, the imposing cliff overlooking the town. In supporting the plan, the *ActionsComité* argued that Mönchsberg possessed the dignity befitting a festival as well as the tranquility that could not be found amid «the noisy activity of everyday life, the screeching of wheels and



the shrill whistle of locomotives» in town. The Mönchsberg theater was to seat 1,500; three hundred seats were to be inexpensively priced. The proposed theater building itself was described as a baroque structure, whose interior would be in the style of a concert hall rather than an opera house, with nearly the entire audience placed in front of the proscenium rather than on balconies. The exterior nearly duplicated the Bayreuth theater. The entire conception, however, met with opposition from Salzburg conservationists, who protested the potential use of Mönchsberg for a theater site. Interrupted by long gaps as a result of deficits, music festivals of some sort were held in Salzburg in 1877, 1879, 1887, 1891, 1901, 1904, 1906, and 1910.

II

The process that created the Salzburg Festival of 1920 and beyond really began in 1903 with a dialogue between two well-known Austrian figures, the cultural critic and essayist Hermann Bahr and the director-impresario Max Reinhardt. The ideas these two men shared for a potential dramatic festival in Salzburg coincided to a great extent with the program Hofmannsthal would formulate fifteen years later, though Bahr and Reinhardt referred neither to a «German national program» nor to Mozart. At first, Reinhardt spoke of a combination of Shakespeare and «romantic theater.» Bahr had written an essay in 1900 called «The Capital of Europe: A Fantasy in Salzburg,» which consisted of a conversation between a narrator and an imaginary, unnamed interlocutor about a festival in Salzburg. On a stroll through Salzburg, the narrator (Bahr) exclaims, «To play theater here! Imagine ... leaves would rustle and the water would spring up. Wouldn't that be beautiful?»[6]

In 1903 Bahr enlisted Hofmannsthal, Richard Strauss, and the art nouveau architect Henry van der Velde for a projected 1904 festival that would highlight Eleonora Duse and Isadora Duncan. In 1906, on the recommendation of Reinhardt, Bahr went to Berlin as the «traveling director» of a «theater of five cities» that would tour Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Salzburg, and Vienna. Among the participants were architect Otto Wagner and designer Alfred Roller. The venture failed for lack of funds, was resurrected in 1908, and failed again. In a letter of 1908 to Reinhardt, Bahr returned to the idea of a stationary festival in Salzburg and proposed a program of Shakespeare, Lessing, and Gorki.[7] Bahr moved to Salzburg in 1912, into the baroque Schloss Arenberg across the river from the old city and its fortifications, and adopted the role of intellectual promoter of Salzburg as the «capital of Europe.» He grew to be well respected by city and church officials and, once the festival got going in 1920, became a key middleman in the negotiations between Hofmannsthal, Reinhardt, and the festival promoters on one hand, and the church officials on the other.

Despite Bahr's presence in Salzburg, however, and his continued, if sporadic, efforts to promote the idea of a festival there, talk of a festival and the potential building of a festival hall was supplanted by the rebuilding of the Mozarteum, for which the cornerstone was laid in 1910. The first major step toward a refocusing of attention on the festival idea came in October 1913 with the initiation of a correspondence between the Salzburg merchant Friedrich Gehmacher and the Viennese music critic Heinrich Damisch.[8] Gehmacher had been instrumental in the rebuilding of the Mozarteum, which he considered only the first stage in the creation of an institution whose culmination would be a festival in its own festival hall. Only when the festival hall is built, he wrote, «will validity be given to the saying that was often quoted to me as encouragement during the construction of the Mozart house: We are creating an Austrian Bayreuth in Salzburg.»[9] Damisch agreed with this principle, and wrote in 1918 that Salzburg should be to Mozart as Bayreuth was to Wagner. Thus, unlike the early ideas of the 1890 *ActionsComité*, those of Bahr and Reinhardt,

and the later ones of Hofmannsthal, those of Gehmacher and Damisch focused on Mozart more exclusively. In their minds, then, the relevance of Bayreuth and its cultism had more to do with the celebration of one man than with the celebration of some kind of national mythology.

On August 1, 1917 the *Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde* (society for a festival hall in Salzburg) was formed in Vienna. The society had headquarters in Vienna and Salzburg and intended to divide its meetings between the two cities, but first set itself up in Vienna to attract the Viennese financial support that was clearly necessary for the project. Gehmacher's motives for the formation of the society, as he expressed them to Damisch in a letter of February 6, 1918, were the following: «Among other things the purpose of our society was to prevent Reinhardt from building the festival hall. The open-air performances he can have. Eventually we might have to strike some kind of contract with him, just as long as we gain a definite influence on the festival hall and Reinhardt doesn't rule alone.»[10]

The reasons for Gehmacher's antipathy to Reinhardt are difficult to determine. lt might have resulted from a perceived difference in purpose; Gehmacher wanted a Mozart festival and may have expected Reinhardt to be inclined toward a more eclectic theater festival, as Reinhardt had himself envisioned some fifteen years earlier. It might have stemmed from the general unease of a conservative in relation to a perceived theatrical innovator, and it might have been a case of tacit anti-Semitism. In any case, when the society held a general meeting on August 15, 1918, Reinhardt was appointed to the artistic advisory board, along with Richard Strauss and Franz Schalk.

So strong was his apparent desire to convince Künzelmann, critic, writer, and member of the *Festspielhausgemeinde* of his earnestness and enthusiasm for a festival in Salzburg that he described the project as his «life's task.»[11] He suggested further that his entire career in Berlin amounted to a «great and comprehensive preparation for what is in question here.» Rhetorical passion increases as the letter proceeds, and, whatever the measure of sincerity, Reinhardt shows very clearly his understanding of the ideological incentives for the Salzburg Festival: sacred theater as a representation of sacred culture and Austro-German nationalism as joint foundations for post-war reconstruction.

«The merry and pious genius of Salzburg» itself, Reinhardt writes, suggests the two sides of the festival character: the secular,lighthearted, and the popular on one side; the sacred (mystery plays and Christmas pageants) on the other. These elements would be united «under the sign of Mozart.»

Salzburg would also return the roots of European theater to their original soil. The theater is essentially Austrian for Reinhardt. Even in Berlin, the leading theatrical talents, he writes, come from Austro-Hungary; He is writing only months before the dissolution of the monarchy, but it is clear that Austrian identity is for him still firmly connected to the monarchy and to its «fortunate population mix.» Austrian theater must, he writes, «reach once again these proud heights, reconquer the banner of leadership and plant it in Salzburg—this is a task as enticing as it is achievable. With beauty, spirit, and cheerfulness, above all with the deep belief in this mission, with godly sparks of joy, the world can be conquered and fraternized.»

The Austrian mission of purification through theater has been made more urgent by the war, and Salzburg, «with its wonderfully central location, its natural and architectural splendor, its historical curiosities, its memories, and not least its unspoiled virginity, has therefore a calling to become a place of pilgrimage for the countless people who long to be redeemed through art from the bloody horror of our time.» «This very war,» Reinhardt continues, «has shown that the theater is not a dispensable luxury for an elite of ten



thousand, but rather an indispensable nourishment for everyone.» Certain measures will have to be taken, Reinhardt warns, if the Salzburg Festival is not to lose its sense of mission and become instead a «theater-hotel, in which art would never feel at home.» To be avoided at all costs was a festival composed of imported, guest performances with no indigenous identity. Reinhardt warns first of practical consequences, then of spiritual ones. Productions transplanted from urban theaters will lose their freshness, terseness, and sparkle. Productions designed for one theater will not work in another. The festival will sink «to the level of a summer theater that will surely be visited with pleasure during rainy weather by the hotel guests who happen to be around.» But he goes on: «The solemnity, celebration, and uniqueness that all art has, and the theater of ancient times and of the time of the infancy of the Catholic church—this must be returned to the theater. In this virtue lies the very strongest justification, indeed the burning necessity, for the festival hall away from the big city, whose atmosphere in turn produces substantial and fruitful work to be sure, but no more, and at most in the rarest cases the miracle that alone raises the theater to the level of art.»

In a short discussion of possible repertory, Reinhardt reveals that his imperial sense of Austria does not displace his dedication to an essentially Germanophone theater and culture. «I can even imagine that the Hungarian, Czech, and other national theaters might make guest appearances here» (as well as Russian theater, opera, and ballet and English, French, Italian, and Scandinavian troupes), «but the core of the festival must unconditionally be a local, homegrown art. That art must be the master of the house who chooses to extend the hand of friendship to guests.» The nationalistic and imperial resonances of the «house» metaphor are intensified by the accompanying image of non-German speaker as «guests.»

Reinhardt concludes with a plea that charitable causes be considered and that «a mite be collected from every festival visitor for this purpose.» Again, he considers the practical as well as the spiritual. «None of us today has the right to think about art without having fulfilled his duty toward the poor victims of these difficult times,» he suggests. But a concern for charity would also «assure the required official promotion of the project.» lt is hard to tell whether he has in mind civic or church support, but his model for the collection of charity money clearly shows a view of a theater audience in terms of a church congregation.

III

The fact that the earliest of Hofmannsthal's propagandistic essays on Salzburg dated from 1919, shows that there is no question that his participation in the festival ideal postdated that of Reinhardt and Bahr.[12] Once initiated, however, his presence became crucial in two aspects beyond (or beneath) the level of ideological contextualization: the provision of the central works of the festival repertory, *Jedermann* and *Das Salzburger grosse Welttheater*, and international fundraising beyond the reaches of the Salzburger *Festspielhausgemeinde*. That process underscored the «cosmopolitan» character of the festival and thus became for Hofmannsthal a consistent as well as necessary extension of the festival idea.

Hofmannsthal and Reinhardt had worked well together for years in both drama and opera; *Ariadne auf Naxos* had been dedicated to Reinhardt. Both men saw themselves as preservers of an Austrian, baroque theatrical tradition. This similarity existed despite the difference in their views of the political context of Austrian theater. For Reinhardt, baroque theater signified a performance tradition; for Hofmannsthal it formed a symbolic discourse of Austrian identity. Both nevertheless viewed a reground theater in Austria as a bulwark

against the modernism that was becoming more and more associated with, and characteristic of, Berlin. Whereas the Berlin theater, as it was developing from Hauptmann through Erwin Piscator to Bertholt Brecht, tended to represent mundane brutality from a Marxist, class-oriented perspective, Reinhardt had become famous in Berlin for exactly the opposite: a production of Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* that emphasized the dream quality and unreality of life.[13] Whereas the new Berlin theater strove to bring the audience down to harsh reality, Reinhardt strove to use the theater to redefine and sublate reality through the representation of an all-encompassing dream world.[14]

Theater as the locus of a dream world was the principle of the Vienna Burgtheater and the crux of its importance to those personal ambitions and aesthetic sensibilities that Reinhardt and Hofmannsthal unquestionably shared. The Burgtheater became a dream world that Hofmannsthal strove to redefine as reality. As Brach suggested: «from the very first moment, the Burgtheater gave to [Hofmannsthal's] work a decisive ethical significance. For everything the Burgtheater added up to, the elevation of the naturalistic and the psychological into the realm of ethical motive, the unveiling of a higher reality which, through the reality of the stage, does not deny its Platonic heritage, this orderly transformation of the dreamlike into the cold dream of art and, through art, into a new warmth—in short, this attitude of ‹self-transcendence›—became for Hofmannsthal the basic principle of all ethicality and the basic attitude of his life.»[15]

IV

On July 30, 1918 the *Neue Freie Presse* announced the formation of the Salzburger *Festspielhausgemeinde*, with its headquarters at Karlsplatz 6, the Musikverein building, in Vienna. Headquarters were set up in Vienna as well as in Salzburg on grounds of accessibility to the centers of Austrian finance. The festival committee immediately embarked on a membership drive, attempting to draw support from Germany as well as Austria. The flyer that contained the membership information was headed by a call to arms: «Join the Salzburg Festival Society! *Help* the construction of the Salzburg Festival Halls in the Hellbrunn Castle Park! *Help* build a mountain of the Grail for the most genuine and great art! *Enable* at the same time the *reconstruction of Austria*, of which the Salzburg Festival will always be a most important factor! *Prepare* the way for the lasting harmonization of spirits from the bedrock of all-encompassing art!»[16] Perhaps the most interesting image in this highly rhetorical plea is that of the mountain of the Grail. This is a sure reference to Wagner's *Parsifal*, the music drama that, in its combination of a Catholic mythology with a festival setting, was repeatedly used as an example for the spiritual builders of Salzburg.

The language of the flyer was in general very revealing of the vantage point of the Salzburg inner sanctum. The international character of the festival and its proposed repertory, especially in these early planning stages, always came second to the festival's prime purpose of national cultural reconstruction. A great difference in tone separated this flyer from a short piece by Ernst Ehrens that appeared in the liberal Berlin theater journal *Schaubühne* on March 7, 1918. The latter was also a piece of propaganda, and urged the public to contribute to the festival cause. But instead of stressing Austrian cultural reconstruction as the goal of the enterprise, Ehrens stressed its international character.

Karl Hauptmann warned that the Salzburg Festival Hall must differentiate itself from existing theater structures by presenting «something of the future;» it must be grandiose. «A chamber theater cannot be a festival hall. [A festival hall] must be the new, great instrument of the true popular theater [*Volkstheater*].» The conservative Catholic, Austrian poet Anton Wildgans suggested that the festival repertory revitalize a purely Austrian, literary



canon, Grillparzer above all, and that the performances of these works be conceived in a unique festival style. Bruno Walter, later to become a major figure in Salzburg, offered a suggestion that went in the opposite direction: he proposed an alliance with the Vienna opera, so that operatic performances of high quality, with all the trimmings, would be assured.[17]

Early in 1919 the Vienna and Salzburg branches of the *Festspielhausgemeinde* each circulated a pamphlet restating the general purpose of the Salzburg Festival within the general context of Austrian cultural reconstruction. The Viennese pamphlet was signed by the entire board of directors of the society, which now induced the artistic advisory board. The piece opened with the proverbial homage to the «magic» of Salzburg and the reminder that the idea for a Salzburg Festival had existed for some time. The current context, the article suggested, redefined and gave a new urgency to that festival idea. The article called on «state and nation» to take up the festival cause and lend it the necessary «legitimation.» At stake was the construction of an—printed in bald type—Austro-German festival hall, which would house «spiritual and earthly festivals of the musical and dramatic art of all nations under the leadership of German, in particular Austro-German art.» The resulting spiritual rejuvenation would be supplemented by economic benefits in the form of new tourism in the city and province of Salzburg. This new revenue could in turn, the pamphlet suggested, be used for an expansion of the Mozarteum into «a new center of intellectual life for *Mitteleuropa*.» The festival idea, the pamphlet concluded, was testimony to the cultural consciousness that the Austrians had retained through the war, and would serve as a cornerstone of the «reconstruction of destroyed intellectual life and shattered cultural contacts.»[18]

The Salzburg pamphlet made the same points with more inflamed rhetoric. It opened with the suggestion that the current Austrian condition was one of peace without hope, that the cruel peace that had been inflicted was all the more cruel for the fact that Austria had never been understood by her allies, to say nothing of her enemies. The Salzburg Festival was to be a «visible symbol» of the Austrian «summoning of spiritual strength»: «We are not concerned with the foundation of a theater, with the project of dreamlike fantasies or the local affairs of a provincial town. We are concerned with European culture, and one of eminently political, economic, and social significance.» Like the Vienna article, this one combined a pan-European perspective with one of Austro-German superiority. The festival, it proposed, would «show our specifically Austrian essence through the works of our masters.» The strength of the festival vision, it proposed, lay in the «selfless devotion to the dream of artists and of the people» shown by the greatest living Austrian and southern German artists. The Salzburg Festival, the article concluded, would reestablish Salzburg as the «spiritual bridge» between East and West, the traditional Austrian prerogative, and make of it a bridge between North and South as well, and hence the true cultural pivot of *Mitteleuropa*.[19]

In the summer of 1918 the *Festspielhausgemeinde* had inaugurated a regular forum for the expression and discussion of the Salzburg Festival idea: the *Mitteilungen der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde* (newsletter of the Salzburg Festival Society). It was edited in Vienna by the entire board of directors of the society.[20] The December 1918 issue, published a month after the final Habsburg collapse, opened with a short column, «To Our Readers»: «The content of the drama on the world stage has not been able to cripple or hinder the quiet, determined work of the festival idea.» The baroque image of the world theater was clearly at work. The column continued: «The fast weeks have brought epochal tremors and changes to the development of German theater culture as well. The individual charge

of the art of the stage, the noble, old culture of the dynasties and courts has for the time being come to an end. New vistas and possibilities present themselves. The theater is entirely in the hands of the nation and the people.»[21] There is no doubt that it was in the interest of the directors of the *Festspielhausgemeinde* to campaign for the ongoing importance of their project during a time of crisis when other things were clearly judged more vital by everyone else. But their earnest belief that their project was crucial to the reformation of Austrian identity should not be undervalued, and the fact that the festival did begin to take form during this period suggests further that the importance its promoters attached to it was accepted by a much larger number of people.

This tone was reinforced in an article of January 24, 1919 in the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, entitled «*Das Erste*» (the first thing), and signed «B.Z.» It opened: «An empire is destroyed. A throne tumbles. A people rises up. A new state order is forged. New world orders dawn. Of the old traditions nothing remains. And what is the first thing to rise from this chaos? A Mozart Festival Hall in Salzburg! A temple dedicated to the divine, to be erected in the park of Hellbrunn as a living symbol [*Sinnbild*] of an indestructible Austria, as a sign of the indestructability of the essential character of German Austria's religious confession of faith. The first thing! Even before misery, insecurity, worry, and suffering are eliminated ... we erect a structure dedicated to art in the place where Mozart was born ... Reconstructed from the Austro-German spirit, true to its *völkisch* mission, it has been chosen as media tor between South and East, between North and West. May it be an auspicious sign for us ... Behold, one day it will be said: This was German Austria's first deed.»

The inaugural issue of the *Mitteilungen der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde* opened with an article entitled «The Mozart Festival Hall in Salzburg,» by Konrad Lindenthaler. Its argument was that it would be «unmozartly» to perform only Mozart in the new hall, and that works of other composers should be presented as well (with the exception of Wagner, for technical reasons). The October 1918 issue contained an article by Josef August Lux called «Ideas for the Festival Hall.» It set an example for future articles by continuing the tradition of discussing the proposed Salzburg Festival as a foil to Bayreuth. Lux argued that whereas Bayreuth was an artificial construction that promoted tourism, Salzburg was a natural and holistic place of pilgrimage. In Bayreuth the festival atmosphere is limited to the interior of the festival hall. For the first time since the creation of the Olympics, Lux writes, the Salzburg Festival presents «a total aesthetic realization [*Durchbildung*] of the festival character, which here in Salzburg is to embrace art, architecture, landscape and social structure.»[22]

Lux's spirit was matched by the *deutschnational* Theodor Antropp in a January 1919 article called «The Festival Idea.» Antropp offered a new perspective on the Bayreuth-Salzburg connection by placing both festivals as late examples in a historical process that began with Attic tragedy. Antropp provides the theoretical underpinning for the aestheticism he shares with Lux: Greece, he proposes, was rediscovered as an aesthetic whole by the Renaissance, only to be challenged by the «nature evangelist» Rousseau. Rousseau was then countered by the «art evangelist» Schiller, who in his *On the Aesthetic Education of Man* revitalized the Renaissance world-view by uniting it with idealism. The post Schillerian artist, of which Wagner is the greatest example, must view his universe aesthetically, as a totality. Through the works of Mozart and the playwright Ferdinand Raimund, the Salzburg Festival had the potential «to fulfill the ethical demand of Richard Wagner ‹to bring about an elevation of the ethic of the nation through an ennobling of taste, and to encourage, through the cultivation of an ever growing public the liberation of a richly talented *Volksgeist*.›» Salzburg could thus take up the unfinished task of Bayreuth.[23]



Bayreuth retained its presence in a three-part article by Paul Marsop titled «On the Way to the Salzburg Festival Hall.» for Marsop, «Bayreuth is no goal, but a starting point» for the Salzburg endeavor. The crucial element of the Salzburg Festival is the sacredness of Austro-German *Volkskultur* (folk culture). In order for that character to be retained, the festival planners must guard against the victory of tourism—Bayreuth's scourge—which turned the opera house into a *Zopf-Museum* (hairdo museum) full of «hare-brained philistines.» The design of the Salzburg Festival Hall, Marsop proposed, must be dictated by two stylistic principles: Salzburg's topographical uniqueness, and its baroque traditions. The interior must be acoustically perfect and fireproof, with enough inexpensive seats to pay homage to German «democratic consciousness.» «The choice,» Marsop suggested, «is between the anti-German, antidemocratic, money-swallowing tiered theater which leads to catastrophe in a fire or a pan and the German theater, or rather, festival hall.» The second choice to be made, Marsop wrote, is that between the society parades of the Berlin Lessing Theater and the Munich Volkstheater and «a temple of Austro-German artistic genius.» Although German participation, encouragement, and funds are to be solicited, the festival must remain an Austrian phenomenon, in support of the principle that «German culture is the product of the decentralization of the German character.»[24]

The newsletter also solicited columns from more celebrated advocates of the cause. Hofmannsthal's well-known essay «A German Festival in Salzburg,» cited in the first chapter, was originally published there in April 1919.[25] Proposals for the physical layout of the festival theater were contributed by Alfred Roller and the architect Hans Poelzig.[26]

Roller's main point was the familiar one, that a festival hall must be physically different from a repertory theater. He proposed a 2,000 seat theater, «without ornament and colored in very dark tones.» Poelzig, who had just completed the celebrated 3,000 seat Grosses Schauspielhaus in Berlin for Max Reinardt, agreed with the emphasis on the festival character of the proposed Salzburg theater, but disagreed with Roller's proposal for a stark, dark structure. The Salzburg Festival Hall, he argued, should instead be a symbol of revitalized German art, which is essentially baroque: «All German art is more or less baroque, intricate, irregular, unacademic, from the Romanesque through German Gothic period up to Rococo.» Poelzig characterized the German baroque tradition as a convergence of German Gothic and Italian Baroque, and Salzburg was of course the prime example, geographically and architecturally, of that convergence. A resumption of that style would provide a «confrontation with the magic of the past.»

Almost every article perpetuated the Salzburg rhetoric of the reawakening of Austro-German culture. In October 1919 the newsletter reprinted the initial publicity pamphlet of the *Festspielhausgemeinde* about the goals of the festival. It replaced the original ending with a call to the national governments for supporting funds, and therefore adopted a more practical tone, stressing the potential benefits for tourism and local employment. Yet the rhetoric remained: the festival would revive Austria's «wounded national pride» and recapture «the Europe of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries with its supranational spirit ... whose highest expression was German music, [and which] lies behind us like a lost paradise.»[27] This superb example of the Salzburg idea as «nationalist cosmopolitanism» concluded with the leitmotif of the Salzburg Festival as the «grail mountain of art of all peoples, under the aegis and leadership of German, and in particular Austro-German art.» The almost parenthetical stress on the Austro-German face of the endeavor reveals its ultimate place in conservative German ideology per se. It was not difficult to sublimate the Austrian cultural ambitions of Salzburg into German ones, despite the essentially anti-German rhetoric of Austrians such as Hofmannsthal and Bahr. They spoke only of Austria

when they spoke of Salzburg, but the Salzburg *Festspielhausgemeinde* often spoke of the festival as «a question of the German people, of German culture.»[28] Perhaps the most sweeping appropriation of the Salzburg program into a panGerman cultural ideology came from the Berlin representative to the *Festspielhausgemeinde*, a Herr Merkel, in a 1921 speech. Salzburg, he claimed, should become not so much an Austro-German as a German festival, striving against the present world cultural situation, in which «culture is losing more and more ground to civilization.»[29]

V

On August 19, 1922, on the eve of the opening of the third Salzburg Festival—the first full festival season, including the Premiere of Hofmannsthal's *Welttheater* and four Mozart operas performed by the Vienna State Opera—a group of leading festival committee members and Salzburg luminaries gathered in the Hellbrunn Castle park to lay a cornerstone for the Salzburg Festival Hall. They recorded the ceremony with their signatures on a piece of «ancient Salzburg parchment.»[30] The parchment proved to be more the death warrant for the Hellbrunn theater than its birth certificate. The inflation of 1923 seemed to preclude any festival at all; Max Reinhardt ultimately staged Moliere's *Malade imaginaire* at his own Schloss Leopoldskron, and thus provided, at least pro forma, a festival for 1923. In 1924 there was no festival at all. These general problems were further exacerbated by a growing feud between the Salzburg and Vienna branches of the festival society. The 1925 festival opened with the *Welttheater*, performed no longer in the Kollegienkirche—a relief for the Salzburg church hierarchy and a victory for a large part of the conservative Salzburg citizens—but in the new, temporary festival hall next to the old and revered Felsenreitschule. In 1926 the festival hall was remodeled and made into a permanent theater structure, designed by architect Clemens Holzmeister (who ultimately designed the new «large festival hall» in 1960).

Much of the money came from the new, Christian Social, pro-festival governor of the province of Salzburg, Franz Rehrl. Another significant portion came from the fundraising efforts of Hofmannsthal, who generated a correspondence with Europe's old nobility and thus created the lasting international, aristocratic profile for his national, popular festival. Hofmannsthal's goal was to create a group known as the Friends of the Salzburg Festival, with a total membership of about one hundred of the most prominent figures in the major European countries and the United States. Prominence was defined by money, aristocratic position, a place in high culture, or a combination of those attributes. Hofmannsthal himself handled most of the recruiting of Austrian members of this elite committee. American recruitment was left to a great extent to Strauss, who had conducted in the United States in 1920 and had done some footwork for the festival.

All of Hofmannsthal's emissaries were aware of the character and significance of their cause. Baron Georg von Franckenstein, Austrian ambassador in London, summed it up in a 1937 speech at the unveiling of a bust of Hofmannsthal in Salzburg: «The idea of the Salzburg festivals sprang from [Hofmannsthal's] profound belief that it was our country's mission to preserve and consolidate its inheritance of intellectual and cultural supremacy—despite poverty, the hard struggle for survival, and our restricted national frontiers.»[31] The tact and success of the pan-European Salzburg propaganda came from the fact that this nationalist program could be expressed as a cosmopolitan ideal that would in turn seem like pure internationalism to the English and the French.[32]



VI

Both Hofmannsthal and Reinhardt agreed with Bahr's celebrated characterization of Salzburg as the city where nature was turned to stone, and ultimately to spirit, and despite the new festival hall, they went on using Salzburg's nature, stone, and spirit for settings and scenery. The carved rock of the Felsenreitschule continued to be used for opera, the cathedral facade for *Jedermann*, and in 1922 the actual altar of the Kollegienkirche became the stage for *Das Salzburger grosse Welttheater*. No chance was missed to reinforce the idea that the festival emanated from indigenous Salzburg soil and spirit. Salzburg natives, however, did not necessarily accept this idea. In planning their theatrical coups Hofmannsthal and Reinhardt were profoundly fortunate in finding the unequivocal support, from 1922 on, of Salzburg governor Franz Rehrl and, from the beginning of their enterprise, the somewhat more equivocal support of Salzburg archbishop Ignaz Rieder.

Rehrl, born in Salzburg, a life-long Christian Social, pro-Anschluss in 1918 nonetheless, but staunchly anti-Nazi after 1933 despite a definite strain of anti-Semitism, was *Landeshauptmann* (governor) of the province of Salzburg from 1922 to 1938 (when he was imprisoned). Rehrl expressed the motive for his attention to the festival with the formula *Festspiele=Wirtschaft*, or festivals=economic growth. Yet purely economic considerations do not adequately explain Rehrl's interest, beyond economic rationality lay what Ernst Hanisch has called Rehrl's «emotional aversion to Vienna.»[33] Rehrl felt that Salzburg had, since 1816, been «colonialized» by Vienna.[34] According to Rehrl, Salzburg had a closer affinity with Bavaria than with Vienna, an affinity that could be reinforced by the festival. For Rehrl, Bavarian tourism was a crucial prospect, and a practical consideration which therefore reinforced his festival ideology. This is an attitude markedly different from that of the Viennese Hofmannsthal, for whom Salzburg presented a national image compatible with and even complemented by that of Vienna. The Salzburg Festival retained a Bavarian tint—especially in the constitution of its audience—until 1933, when Hitler exacted a 1,000 Mark fee from any German crossing the Bavarian-Austrian border.

Archbishop Ignaz Rieder also cooperated productively with the festival, and with Max Reinhardt in particular. By allowing the cathedral facade and the Kollegienkirche altar to be used as stage sets, Rieder had much to do with the theatrical success of the Hofmannsthal-Reinhardt-Roller miracle plays. Yet his relationship with the Salzburg impresarios was always one of compromise, for Rieder had continually to balance his sincere belief in the religiousness of the Salzburg plays with the skepticism and the anti-Semitism of his constituents. On July 16, 1920 Reinhardt wrote to Rieder and sketched the planned staging of *Jedermann* in front of the cathedral. He stressed the fact that this setting would allow a large enough audience to include the «less well-off» and would therefore assure widespread popularity for the festival among the Salzburg locals. He concluded that first letter by explaining that one technical problem had still to be solved. At the moment of *Jedermann's* death the text called for the ringing of church bells. In an outdoor performance, these bells would have to ring from the surrounding churches, and Reinhardt was concerned with the problem of sound balance between the bells and the onstage voices. Those bells did come to cause a major problem, but not the technical one that Reinhardt feared. A contingent of Salzburg locals protested the use of church bells for what they considered purely theatrical and profane purposes. These protests, as Hans Spatzenegger has suggested, ranged from «anonymous anti-semitic insults to difficulties within the church hierarchy.» The result was that in 1921 Rieder withdrew the permission for the ringing of the bells.[35]

With the planning of the *Welttheater* performances for the summer of 1922, Hofmannsthal took over the correspondence and negotiations with Rieder, often with the mediation

of Hermann Bahr. In a letter to Hofmannsthal of January 16, 1922, Rieder expressed his doubts about staging the new play in the Kollegienkirche. He suggested that the acoustics were not good, and that several other locations would serve better: the cathedral square (as it had for *Jedermann*), the Felsenreitschule, or the armory of the baroque palace across the river. However «noble and beyond reproach» the new play may be, «a house of God cannot be turned into a theater.» Rieder then suggested that if the church were to be closed for two weeks for restoration, the play could be performed during that time—when the building would not really be serving as a church—and the proceeds from the performances could contribute to, indeed enable, the restoration.[36]

Hofmannsthal answered on February 6th, and argued for the importance of the Kollegienkirche. To perform a sacred play like the *Welttheater* in an ordinary theater, he wrote, would be «to abandon spirit for money.» To perform it in the cathedral square would be all right with him, but not with Reinhardt, whose already tense rehearsal process would be made unbearable by the logistical worries of an open-air performance, and most of all by the threat of the usual rainy weather. The riding school and the castle armory, he added, did not have enough doors. Finally, he argued, the *Welttheater* needs «beautiful, old, worthy music, choruses, trumpets, and most of all the organ; the music must amount almost to an oratorio,» and this could be achieved only in the church or on the square, which might ultimately be used for a few performances anyway, weather permitting.[37] On June 12th, following the intervention of Friedrich Gehmacher, the *Festspielhausgemeinde* announced that an agreement had been reached: the play would be performed in the church, and proceeds would go toward its restoration. The *Festspielhausgemeinde* would immediately contribute four million Kronen from its own funds, and there would be a special category of inexpensive tickets for the local population.[38]

VII

The discussion of the ideology of the baroque between 1860 and 1938 finds a parallel in the history of scholarly interest in baroque culture. A similar situation holds for the history of the Salzburg ideology. This ideologically informed institutional history emerges in dialogue with trends in the contemporary intellectual history of Austrian and German conservatism. Hofmannsthal himself bridges these discourses most clearly. The rhetoric of the Salzburg Festival, from Hofmannsthal's elegant pronouncements to the more prosaic campaign literature of the festival committee, drew its power from its emblematic position in the general process of cultural planning for the First Austrian republic. The efforts of the members of the *Festspielhausgemeinde* and the musical journalists helped piece together a Salzburg ideology and the festival through instinctual expressions of received cultural and aesthetic loyalties to Austria, Salzburg, Mozart, sacred high culture, and Bayreuth. The fact that the Salzburg Festival planners—including Hofmannsthal—did not concern themselves with programmatic planning beyond the bounds of their single project does not displace the universal claims of their ambitions into the realm of rhetoric without concrete intentions. Neither does it sever «theater politics» from national politics. Salzburg involved the invention of a national culture, the invention of a state of mind. Once in place, that state of mind could be transferred and applied to more detailed and programmatic contexts, such as secondary education. The mechanics of the application of the Salzburg state of mind is secondary to the fact that it was conceived as a totality, as a *Weltanschauung*, in Freud's use of the term.[39] The fact that the Salzburg ideology was conceived as a poetic whole, as the «mirror of the nation»—to use a phrase of Hofmannsthal's— dictated that it was a program to be accepted in full, on faith, as the definition of national and self-identity. It was



absolutely a cultural program, but one that worked through a principle of totality, and hence total adherence, rather than a principle of rationality, and hence rational application.

The juxtaposition of totality and rationality as cognitive categories parallels the elusive heuristic distinction between ideology and science. In a more specific and more specifically German and Austrian intellectual context, it parallels the no less crucial distinction between practices of cultural criticism and of social theory. Cultural criticism, at least in the German context, has tended toward a utopian posture that defines culture as an essential totality which must be either preserved or regained. The major trajectory of this kind of German cultural criticism is that of *völkisch* ideology and post-Nietzschean criticism from Paul de Lagarde to Julius Langbehn, Moeller van den Bruck, Ernst Bertram, and Rudolf Pannwitz (post-Nietzschean; Nietzsche does not fit in here and was fundamentally misread by his epigones).[40] Such a posture is not surprising when taken by explicitly conservative thinkers, but non, or even anticonservative, thinkers (Hermann Brach and Karl Kraus are two examples) engage it as well. Social theory is, in the German context, to a great extent a reaction against the totalizing and ideological tenets of cultural criticism. The major trajectory of German social theory is the anti-totalistic reaction begun by Max Weber, the intellectual and political fight to understand and represent society as a nonorganic system that is no more than the sum of its parts. Cultural criticism uses the category of community—*Gemeinschaft*—normatively, to define, represent, and judge society; social theory the category of society, *Gesellschaft*. Weber and German Weberian social theory project a reaction against Nietzscheanism, if not against Nietzsche.

Hofmannsthal was, at least by 1918, a conservative cultural critic; Salzburg, a product of cultural criticism. As an exercise in cultural planning, Salzburg is thus fundamentally different from the cultural planning of a Weberian social theorist such as Karl Mannheim, who actually made the expression current. For Mannheim cultural planning was a necessary rational policy tool in a mass society, and mass society is precisely the social category not acceptable to conservative cultural theorists, Hofmannsthal among them, who replaced it with the notion of the *Volk*. For Mannheim, planning was the «rational mastery of the irrational,» against the grave danger which, he thought, could not be prevented by unplanned, uncontrolled democracy, the «eruption of crowd behavior.» Mannheim's concept of cultural planning is foreign to a sense of liberalism in the Anglo-American, pluralistic sense, which might decry any notion of cultural planning, but it is rationalistic and antitotalitarian.[41]

In Hofmannsthal's intellectual milieu, the Salzburg ideology grew in the ferment of a vital new spurt of Nietzscheanism in post-World War I Germany and Austria. As an exercise in cultural planning, Salzburg is a romantic redefinition of society as a community, an aesthetic totality. It stands between, on the one side, the rationalistic planning of Mannheim, and, on the other, the de-romanticized, de-aestheticized politics of totality of Carl Schmitt, for whom totality was purely a situation created and enforced by power. There is, however, an intellectual continuity between the aestheticizing totality of the Salzburg ideology and the de-aestheticized totality of Schmitt and Nazism in general.[42]

The testimonial that caused Hofmannsthal to be embraced by conservatives (including, some years later, some Austrian Nazis) and rejected by some moderates (including Thomas Mann) was his famous 1927 address «Writing as the Spiritual Space of the Nation,» in which he coined the phrase and proclaimed the goal of a «conservative revolution.»[43] The piece itself, and especially the notion of conservative revolution, constitutes a companion position to the Salzburg ideology. Of immediate interest and importance is Hofmannsthal's metaphor of the nation's *geistiger Raum* (spiritual space). This image is imbued with his

sense of baroque form as a static representation of cultural totality. It is the same sense of space that informs the cosmology of the Karlskirche and the image of the stage as «world-theater.»

The essay is an affirmation of the unity of the German intellectual and spiritual tradition, a unity that provides a sense of *Gemeinschaft* fundamental and unique to the German national spirit. The fact that the address was delivered in Munich no doubt contributed to its pan-German tone, yet there is no contradiction between this and Hofmannsthal's earlier, explicitly Austrian definitions of the German spirit of the pre-Salzburg years. The legacy of the German spiritual *Gemeinschaft* Hofmannsthal discusses here was still, for him, the spiritual possession of the Austrians. The essay calls for an extension of the Salzburg process, the redefinition of a unified German spirit from the legacy of German letters. He concludes: «The process of which I speak is nothing other than a conservative revolution of an import unknown by European history. Its goal is form, a new German reality, in which the entire nation can participate.»

Throughout the essay, Hofmannsthal posits the image of the cultivated German against that of the cultural philistine (*Bildungsphilister*), an image he accurately, if somewhat prosaically, credits to Nietzsche. Hofmannsthal does a profound injustice to Nietzsche, however, in positing a (German) national type as the necessary counterpart to the cultural philistine. Hofmannsthal's misreading of Nietzsche as a nationalist is in the tradition of the contemporary Nietzscheanism by which he was affected. Between 1917 and 1920, works of Ernst Bertram and in particular Rudolf Pannwitz bore heavily on Hofmannsthal and hence an the cultural ideology he was then producing. The book of Bertram's in question was his August 1918 bestseller *Nietzsche: In Search of a Mythology*. It began with an explicit rejection of the Rankean concept of scientific history and proposed instead a revitalized mythology as a national imperative. Germany must rediscover a national mythology, Bertram argued, and Nietzsche had defined all the major principles of that new national mythology.[44] Hofmannsthal and Bertram had known of each other since at least 1907, when Bertram wrote a pamphlet titled «On Hugo von Hofmannsthal,» in which he relied heavily on Nietzsche's will to power to argue for the continuity between baroque style and musical structure as the hallmark of Viennese culture.[45]

There is, however, no evidence of a personal relationship between Bertram and Hofmannsthal. It is otherwise with Rudolf Pannwitz, who between 1917 and 1920 played the monster to Hofmannsthal's Dr. Frankenstein, and held him as well as Bahr and Redlich under a personal and intellectual spell. Pannwitz was twenty-six years old in 1917 and had apparently been an admirer of Hofmannsthal for some years. In that year he published his first and most famous book, *The Crisis of European Culture*, and sent Hofmannsthal a copy. Hofmannsthal's reaction was intensely enthusiastic, and he wrote to Leopold von Andrian that «a new figure has entered my life.»[46] In October Hofmannsthal wrote to his fellow morality playwright Max Mell about his discovery of Pannwitz in tones that suggest the coming of a prophet: «What I expect from him seems incalculable, not for me, but for the spiritual life of the epoch. I would dare to risk invoking the name of Herder as a comparison.»[47]

Hofmannsthal's first letter to Pannwitz is dated July 31, 1917; it expresses his «extreme passion and agreement» with Pannwitz's book and ends with the plea, «Again, forgive me for writing as if to an acquaintance; perhaps you will accept this as an expression of the effect of your writing.«[48] Indeed, Pannwitz entered Hofmannsthal's life at the appropriate moment to be influential on two fronts: the formation of a conservative cultural theory and the formation of a cultural and political attitude toward the Czechs.



On November 9, 1917 Pannwitz informed Hofmannsthal of a manuscript he was planning called «Österreichische Kulturpolitik,» with the projected subheadings «The State of the Future,» «Austria's Eternity,» «Spirit,» «Politics,» and «Church.» There is no evidence that the work was ever written. Pannwitz also informed Hofmannsthal that although he was German-born, he wanted to live the rest of his life in Austria, the only potential soil for a viable German culture.[49] He found «much more vitality in the people than in Germany,» and found it possible that «Germany has suddenly come to an end, while Austria has taken over its old role; and removed it to another plane ... everything depends on finding the right direction now. The Austrian is more elastic than the German.»[50] The Prussian domination of central Europe was an «intermezzo» for Pannwitz. Prussian power would give way to Austrian power as Babylon gave way to Egypt and the Western to the Eastern Roman Empire.[51]

Pannwitz's cultural criticism rested on several fundamental principles: organic culture, antidemocratic (anti-Wilsonian) politics, a recognition of an organic Austria out of the union of the German Austrians and the Czechs, an antipathy to anything Prussian and hence to the German state (where he held organic culture to be impossible), and—ultimately a factor in his break with Hofmannsthal—an antipathy toward cultural spectacles and performers, categories that came to include Salzburg, Strauss, and Reinhardt. Pannwitz considered Salzburg a rationalization and falsification of «organic» Austro-German culture and stated that it had been the German equivalent of the Salzburg *Gründerjahre* (a pun on the German *Gründerzeit* or «take-off» period of Bismarck days) that caused him to leave his native Germany. He warned Hofmannsthal that Strauss «doesn't belong in Vienna, let alone Salzburg,» but should rather «go to Budapest unless he prefers the pseudo-mozartification of the Yankees.»[52] As far as Reinhardt was concerned, Pannwitz wondered whether his enthusiasm for Salzburg was the result of honest and new ideas or of a lack of financial remuneration in Berlin.[53] Pannwitz thus provided Hofmannsthal with many of the Salzburg metaphors, but turned away from Salzburg itself because its theatricality rendered it an impure manifestation of its cultural-political principles. In October 1920, Pannwitz reproached Hofmannsthal for having allowed *Jedermann*, «which I love and revere as a religious work,» to be profaned by having it performed in Salzburg.[54] For Hofmannsthal, however, the Salzburg Festival embodied that conception of conservative revolution and cultural reconstruction, and he was not about to entertain Pannwitz's criticisms of it. The 1922 elevation of *Das Salzburger grosse Welttheater* to the central position in the festival repertory reinforced the metaphor of the festival as the mirror of an idealized social totality. The Catholic world theater represented onstage mirrored the *Gottesstaat*, or godly state, that was held out as the image of Austria's future.[55]

Abridged version of chapter 2 in: Michael P. Steinberg, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival. Austria as Theater and Ideology, 1890–1938*, Cornell University Press, 1990.

1 Hermann Broch suggested that the wearing of the «medieval costume» was intended to reinforce the morality-play ambience, especially at performances of *Jedermann* and *Das Salzburger grosse Welttheater* (Broch, 177). His son, Hermann Friedrich Broch de Rothermann, who attended, confirmed to me that Broch was referring to Austrian folk clothing.

2 See Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, aphorisms 240, 245.

3 Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Philosophy of History*, trans. J. Sibree (New York, 1956), 419.

4 Although this particular enterprise contains no explicit political references, the year 1870 obviously rings with the context of an emergent *kleindeutsch* German empire against which a recently humiliated Austria might wish to assert itself.

5 *Das Mozart-Festspielhaus in Salzburg* (Salzburg: Selbstverlag des ActionsComité, 1890), 1.

6 Hermann Bahr, «Die Hauptstadt von Europa: Eine Phantasie in Salzburg,» in *Essays* (Leipzig, 1911) 235–41, esp. 235.

7 Oskar Holl, «Dokumente zur Entstehung der Salzburger Festspiele: Unveröffentlichtes aus der Korrespondenz der Gründer,» in *Maske und Kothurn 13* (1967): 151, 159.

8 The correspondence was published in Holl, 1967, 148–79.

9 Quoted in ibid, 152.

10 Quoted in ibid, 173.

11 Hugo von Hofmannsthal, «Die Salzburger Festspiele,» in *Gesammelte Werke in 10 Einzelbänden*, vol. IX, *Reden und Aufsätze II. 1914–1924* (Frankfurt am Main, 1979), 258–264.

12 Michael P. Steinberg, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival. Austria as Theater and Ideology, 1890–1938* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1990), chapter 3.

13 See J. L. Styan, *Max Reinhardt*, (Cambridge, 1982 ), 55. In an article called «The Magician of Leopoldskron,» Reinhardt's supporter and colleague Rudolf Kommer wrote of the 1905 premiere of the production: «it seemed a new play entirely … it had a message that did away in one evening with all the voluptuous pessimism and sordidness of the preceding fifteen or twenty years of naturalism.» See Oliver Sayler, ed., *Max Reinhardt and His Theatre* (New York, 1924), 1–15.

14 Erwin Piscator himself, in *Das politische Theater* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg, 1979 [1929]), 32, referred tot he pre-1918 Berlin theater world—the period before his own arrival there—as Max Reinhards's heyday. Piscator's point was that, contrary to much assumption, je was neither influenced by nor interested in Reinhardt's theater.

15 Hermann Broch, *Hugo von Hofmannsthal and His Time: The European Imagination, 1860–1920*, Michael P. Steinberg, ed. and trans., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 102.

16 Unpublished pamphlet, Festspielhausarchiv, Salzburg. The italics are in the original. This is an uncatalogued archive. At one time two festival halls—a small one and a large one—were envisaged. Both were to be built in the park where in 1618 the first opera was performed in a German-speaking county, a crucial event in the Salzburg history-mythology.

17 The first series of Mozart operas presented in Salzburg, in 1921, were productions imported from Vienna. But this was the result of temporary circumstance rather than plan.

18 «Festspielhaus in Salzburg,» unpublished pamphlet of the Verein der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde, Festspielhausarchiv, Salzburg.

19 Unlitled, unpublished pamphlet of the Verein der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde, Festspielhausarchiv, Salzburg.

20 Copies of the newsletter, *Mitteilungen der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde*, are held in the archive of the Musikverein, Vienna.

21 *Mitteilungen*, I, 4.

22 «Das Erste,» reprinted in the *Mitteilungen der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde*, 2 (February 1919): 8–9. Archive of the Musikverein, Vienna.

23 See the *Deutsches Biographisches Archiv*, ed. Bernhard Fabian (Munich, 1982).



24 Paul Marsop, «Auf dem Wege zum Salzburger Festspielhause,» in *Mitteilungen*, II, 2 (February 1919), 1–8 (part I); *II*, 9 (September 1919), 1–8 (part II); *II*, 11 (November 1919) (part III, unavailable).

25 *Mitteilungen* II, (January 1919), 1–5.

26 Alfred Roller, «Festspielhaus in Salzburg,» in *Mitteilungen II* (June 6, 1919): 1–4; Hans Poelzig, «Festrede anlässlich der III. ordentlichen General-Versammlung der Salzburger Festspielhausgemeinde in Salzburg,» in *Mitteilungen III*, 9–10 (September/October 1920): 1–10.

27 «Aufruf,» and «Die kulturelle, volkswirtschaftliche und politische Bedeutung des Festspielhauses in Salzburg,» in *Mitteilungen II*, 10 (October 1919): 1–7.

28 *Salzburger Wacht*, (August 23, 1920): 4, report on the August 21st meeting of the *Festspielhausgemeinde*. Also, *Salzburger Volksblatt* (August 23, 1920), 2–3.

29 *Neue Freie Presse* (August 18, 1921), 3.

30 A copy of this parchment is held in the Theatersammlung, Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.

31 Michael P. Steinberg, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival. Austria as Theater and Ideology, 1890–1938* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1990), chapter 3.

32 *Salzburger Volksblatt*, August 17, 1920: 1.

33 Ernst Hanisch, «Franz Rehrl-Sein Leben,» in *Franz Rehrl, Landeshauptmann von Salzburg*, 1922–1938, ed. Wolfgang Huber (Salzburg, 1975), 5–42; quote: 5.

34 Quoted in ibid, 5.

35 Hans Spatzenegger, «Erzbischof Rieder und Max Reinhardt,» unpublished account, Konsistorialarchiv, Salzburg.

36 Rieder to Hofmannsthal, January 16, 1922, Hofmannsthal archive, Freies Deutsches Hochstift, Frankfurt.

37 Hofmannsthal to Georg von Franckenstein, February 6, 1922, Konsistorialarchiv, Salzburg; published in *Salzburger Nachrichten* (July 25, 1970): 3.

38 Ibid.

39 Steinberg, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival*, 1990, chapter 1.

40 The first three are treated in Fritz Stern's *Politics of Cultural Despair* (Berkeley, 1961). Ernst Bertram and Rudolf Pannwitz will be introduced later in the essay.

41 See Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, trans. Edward Shils (London, 1940), especially 265, 344. It is interesting to note that the drive to understand mass society and the character of mass hysteria led three Austrian novelists to turn to the writing of social theory: Broch in *Massenwahntheorie*, Canetti in *Massen und Macht* (translated as *Crowds and Power*), and Musil in several short essays.

42 This hypothesis is likely to offend many contemporary Austrian observers who retain the long-standing idea of the separation of (sacred) culture from (profane) politics, and especially the separation of Austrian culture from German, and Nazi, politics. Yet their association was frequently maintained (of course with a different agenda) between 1933 and 1945. It can be observed that Heinz Kindermann, the longtime director of the Institut für Theaterwissenschaft of the University of Vienna, wrote an essay in 1933 called «*Des deutschen Dichters Sendung in der Gegenwart*» (the mission of the contemporary German poet), in which he extolled the continuity from Moeller van den Bruck through Stefan George and Hofmannsthal to National Socialism (Leipzig, 1933). Kindermann suggested that Moeller's idea of the «third Reich,» George's idea of the «new Reich,» Hofmannsthal's «conservative revolution,» and Hitler's «German renewal,» all combined ideals of religion, art, and economy into an image of the «spiritual organic totality (*Gesamtorganismus*) of our nation.» Kindermann (whose career stretched into the late 1980s) is himself an embodiment of the continuity between Austrian Catholic conservatism and Austrian National Socialism, but this continuity must in no sense be taken to imply either a universal relationship or an implied determinism or causality that may have led one form of cultural allegiance to the other.

43 Hugo von Hofmannsthal, «Das Schriftum als geistiger Raum der Nation,» an address given at the University of Munich, January 10, 1927, Prosa IV, 390–413.

44 See Ernst Bertram, *Nietzsche: Versuch einer Mythologie* (Bonn, 1918).

45 Ernst Bertram, *Über Hugo von Hofmannsthal* (Dortmund, 1907), 343.

46 Hugo von Hofmannsthal to Leopold von Andrian, September 27, 1917, 252.

47 Letter from October 3, 1917, in *Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Max Mell, Briefwechsel*, ed. Margret Dietrich and Heinz Kindermann (Heidelberg, 1982), 139.

48 Hofmannsthal-Pannwitz correspondence, Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Marbach: Hofmannsthal's letters to Pannwitz are filed under the heading «H:Pannwitz,» file numbers 70.630 to 70.634. This is a sealed file. Pannwitz's letters to Hofmannsthal are filed under heading «P:Hofmannsthal,» file numbers 60:742a–d. This file is open. All subsequent quotations from this correspondence are drawn from these files and no further references will therefore be given.

49 Pannwitz to Hofmannsthal, August 1, 1917.

50 Pannwitz to Hofmannsthal, August 11, 1917.

51 Pannwitz to Hofmannsthal, October 24, 1917.

52 Pannwitz to Hofmannsthal, November 4, 1919.

53 Pannwitz to Hofmannsthal, February 28, 1920.

54 For a contextualization of the *Welttheater* theme with Austrian conservative political and literary theory of the time, see Walter Weiss, «Salzburger Mythos? Hofmannsthals und Reinhardts Welttheater,» in *Zeitgeschichte 2* (February 1975): 109–19.





# Between Reactionary Traditionalism and Radical Modernism
## The Salzburg Establishment of the ISCM as a Setting for Musical Antagonism

«Nothing is more important now than showing these pigs that you won't let yourself be intimidated.»[1] These words were penned by Anton Webern in a letter to Arnold Schönberg mere days before the debut of the latter's *String Quartet No. 2 in F–Sharp Minor, Op. 10*, and the impending scandal it would cause on December 21, 1908 at Vienna's Bösendorfer Concert Hall. From a musicological perspective, this concert, in its deliberate departure from predominant aesthetic norms and traditions set into motion by the transition to atonality and the emancipation of dissonance, marks the definitive split of modern music into contemporary music.[2] Represented by Arnold Schönberg and the extended circle of the Second Viennese School in one camp, the other camp was made up of the supporters of the classical tradition surrounding Joseph Marx.[3]

Increased incidents of public hostilities by objectors during atonal concerts led Arnold Schönberg to found the Society for Private Musical Performances, of which he was also at the helm, on November 23, 1918. The society advanced to become a concert platform for the highest quality musical standards. Its primary goal was to provide «artists and art lovers a true and precise introduction to contemporary music» without regard for aesthetic preconceptions and free from public outbursts of acclaim or displeasure. Because of the deteriorating economic circumstances, however, the society was forced to cease all activities in the year 1921.[4] « Then the ... recently formed International Society for Contemporary Music [ISCM] ... took over the legacy of the Society for Private Musical Performances, a legacy that essentially embodied the quintessence of the spirit of Schönberg's circle,» wrote Friedrich Wildgans, who would later become the president of the ISCM's Austrian section.[5]

International initiatives that had substantial influence on the establishment of the ISCM's guiding principles beyond the Society for Private Musical Performances included the International Composers' Guild, founded in 1921 by the composer Edgar Varèse in New York, and the first festival for contemporary music to successfully take place in Donaueschingen, Swabia the same year—the *Kammermusik-Aufführungen zur Förderung zeitgenössischer Tonkunst* (chamber music performances for the promotion of contemporary musical art), known today as the Donaueschingen Music Festival.

Increased demand for international networking in the sense of a «musical league of nations» drove young underrepresented composers to establish the International Society for Contemporary Music as a performance platform for their own works.[6] Swiss musicologist Anton Haefeli, whose dissertation represented the first comprehensive art historical evaluation of the society, refers to the ISCM as a «self-help enterprise.»[7]

Between August 7th and 11th, the *Internationale Kammermusik-Aufführungen* (a modern chamber music festival) was held as part of the 1922 Salzburg Festival, and represented works by attending composers including Anton Webern, Arthur Honegger, Darius Milhaud, and Ethel Smyth.[8] «The intentions of the *Internationale Kammermusik-Aufführungen* are simple to explain. Because Donaueschingen, a laudable new undertaking by a traditional music site, only hosts German chamber music, we have invited musicians from England, France, Italy, Holland, Sweden ... to Salzburg. Borders will once again dissolve into thin air.»[9] The International Society for Contemporary Music was founded on the last day of the event in Salzburg's Café Bazar. The Society saw itself as an international network for the appreciation of recent musical developments. Founding members included the composers, musicians, musicologists, and patrons Rudolf Réti, Egon Wellesz, Cesar Saerchinger, Arthur Bliss, Edward Dent, Edwin Evans, Willem Pijper, Francis Poulenc, Werner Reinhart, and Jean Wiéner.[10] *Salzburger Idee* (Salzburg idea) was the title of Rudolg Réti's reflections on the founding of the society, which was to manifest itself in a simple kind of celebration with the most talented composers of each country present, «not once free from disquietude, from tentative seeking and doubting ... immediately overtaking itself.»[11]

Individual country sections of the ISCM took shape for the promotion of contemporary music, «without regard for aesthetic views, nationalities, race, religion, or political preferences,» and in order to promote and perform contemporary music on a national level that was independent from the annual World Music Days Festivals and showcased the most recent developments beyond national borders.[12] In its first year 16 member countries had joined the International Society for Contemporary Music.[13]

The fact that the ISCM was founded in Salzburg rather than in Vienna was a result of the unfortunate situation facing young composers in the capital city. They found it difficult to procure performances within Vienna's music scene, which was dominated by Joseph Marx's circle of traditionalists—«more difficult than all of their European colleagues.»[14] A scandal in Salzburg over Anton Webern's *Five Movements, Op. 5* evidenced the ideological battles that arose in the conflict between traditionalists and modernists: There were disturbances during Webern's performance. One of these, which caused Webern to flee the concert hall, included a violent confrontation between architect Adolf Loos, an advocate of Webern's music, and composer Wilhelm Grosz, a distinguished troublemaker.[15]

In light of these heated controversies it is all the more surprising that the *Internationale Kammermusik-Aufführungen*—described by Anton Laefeli as the ISCM's «zeroth World Music Days Festival»—were held under the patronage of Richard Strauss. Strauss agreed to be named honorary president of the ISCM founding committee, yet made his aversion to contemporary music apparent in the duties accompanying his position: «When I attend performances I cannot be expected to applaud conventionally when I am in fact infuriated on the inside. I want to have the freedom to be able to say, ‹that was terrible› whenever I want to.»[16]

Regardless of his position, the *Internationale Kammermusik-Aufführungen* were generally regarded as very successful. Salzburg became the location for the International Society for Contemporary Music's first official World Music Days Festival, which took place from August 2–7, 1923. This event offered many composers from the Second Viennese School's extended circle, including Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg, and Paul Amadeus Pisk, a platform to perform their works.[17]

The reactionary circle surrounding Joseph Marx organized a counter festival in Vienna initiated by the *Österreichischer Kulturbund* immediately following the first World Music Days Festival. By primarily performing works by composers such as Richard Strauss,



Joseph Marx, Wilhelm Kienzl, Julius Bittner, and Karl Weigl—all of them aesthetic counterparts to ISCM members—the program adopted a decidedly contrarian, and deliberately nationalistic, counter position to Salzburg's World Music Days Festival.[18] That notwithstanding, the ISCM, with its annual World Music Days Festivals that took place in cities including Amsterdam, Brussels, Paris, Prague, Venice, and Zurich, experienced its heyday during the interwar period. The Austrian section of the ISCM in particular was able to establish itself as an important institution within the Austrian cultural scene under the presidency of Anton Webern from 1932 onward.

As a reaction to the ISCM's success, Richard Strauss initiated the *Ständige Rat für die internationale Zusammenarbeit der Komponisten* (permanent council for the international cooperation between composers), which was to be a «musically conservative, politically opportune counter position» to the unpopular International Society for Contemporary Music.[19] The Permanent Council's aesthetic counter position to the IGNM was, in turn, illustrated by an international music festival in Vichy, France. Tonal compositions made up the entire program.[20] This music festival was, moreover, held almost simultaneously to ISCM's Prague World Music Days Festival in September of 1934.[21] Ernst Krenek pointed out this provocation in an article for the Viennese music journal *23*.[22] In light of these developments, it was perhaps not surprising that Richard Strauss's honorary membership to the International Society for Contemporary Music was revoked in 1945.[23]

The Austrian section of the ISCM was disbanded by National Socialists in 1938 due to the society's large number of Jewish members. Society members were forced into exile, went into hiding, or were arrested.[24] As early as April 20, 1945, however, the Austrian section of the ISCM picked up where it left off, one of the first Austrian art and culture institutions to do so. Its first event took place as early as mid May in Vienna's Konzerthaus—void of windows and severely damaged by bomb strikes.[25] The climate in post-war Austria, however, was by no means any more friendly towards a reprise of the Second Viennese School. Hannes Eisler's son Georg reported of his father: «Communist and Schönberg student who exceeded the tolerance of the local arbiters of culture, not a small number of them relics of the immediate past.»[26] As a result, the aesthetic conflict between traditionalists and modernists prevalent in Vienna since the turn of the century erupted anew with the 1949 establishment of the *Österreichische Gesellschaft für zeitgenössische Musik* (ÖGZM, or Austrian Society for Contemporary Music).

The leading actor in the establishment of the ÖGZM, which clearly positioned itself as a counter society to the ISCM, was once more Joseph Marx, characterized by composer Friedrich Cerha as a «romantic idealist» who, «as president and advisor of many institutions—has deliberately and emphatically steered them in a conservative direction».[27]

In July of 1952, on the occasion of the ISCM's thirtieth anniversary, the World Music Days Festival returned to Salzburg—the city in which the ISCM was founded—one last time. Its program included an orchestra concert by the Austrian section entitled, «Modern Austrians.»[28] The performances included works by composers Sophie–Carmen Eckhardt-Gramatté, George Gruber, Friedrich Wildgans, and Gottfried von Einem. The death of conductor Herbert Häfner, however, who collapsed during a concert, shed a pall over the event. Poor event organization, performances by participating interpreters, programing, and insufficient media coverage, led that particular World Music Days Festival to go down in history as the ISCM's worst.[29] In the 1950s these circumstances, in combination with the establishment of rival institutions such as the ÖGZM, and new musical stimulus that originated from the *Internationalen Ferienkursen für Neue Musik in Darmstadt* (international summer camps for contemporary music in Darmstadt), led to increased stagnation within

the ISCM. Nonetheless, the society, which has organized annual World Music Days Festivals since its founding in 1922 to this day, is recognized as one of the most significant international institutions for the promotion of contemporary music and today sections of the ISCM have been formed in more than fifty countries throughout the world.

1 Translated for this essay from Martin Eybl, ed., *Die Befreiung des Augenblicks: Schönbergs Skandalkonzerte 1907 und 1908. Eine Dokumentation* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2004), 199.

2 Carl Dahlhaus, *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Athenaion, 1980), 281–282.

3 Martin Eybl, ed., *Die Befreiung des Augenblicks: Schönbergs Skandalkonzerte 1907 und 1908. Eine Dokumentation* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2004), 13–36.

4 Translated for this essay from Hartmut Krones, *Arnold Schönberg. Leben und Werk* (Vienna: Steinbauer, 2005), 45.

5 Translated for this essay from Friedrich Wildgans, *Anton Webern. Eine Studie* (Tübingen: Wunderlich, 1967), 79.

6 Anton Haefeli, *Die Internationale Gesellschaft für Neue Musik (IGNM). Ihre Geschichte von 1922 bis zur Gegenwart* (Zurich: Atlantis, 1982), 73–87.

7 Ibid., 22.

8 Ibid., 47–48.

9 Translated for this essay from Anonymous, «Internationale Kammermusikaufführungen in Salzburg,» in *Musikblätter des Anbruch*, vol. 4, no. 3–4 (1922): 34.

10 Haefeli 1982, 52.

11 Translated for this essay from Rudolf Réti, «Die Salzburger Idee. Worte zum Beginn,» in *Musikblätter des Anbruch*, vol. 4, no. 13–14 (1922): 194–195.

12 www.ignm.at (last accessed March 30, 2016).

13 Haefeli 1982, 70.

14 Translated for this essay from ibid., 39.

15 Ibid., 48–50.

16 Translated for this essay from ibid. 44.

17 Ibid., 480.

18 Ibid., 69.

19 Gerhard Splitt, *Richard Strauss 1933–1935. Ästhetik und Musikpolitik zu Beginn der nationalsozialistischen Herrschaft* (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus, 1986), 176.

20 Ibid., 155–156.

21 Haefeli 1982, 236–237.

22 Ernst Krenek, «Eau de Vichy auf unsere Mühle,» in *23. Eine Wiener Musikzeitschrift*, no. 3 (1935): 22–29.

23 Splitt 1986, 189.

24 Monika Voithofer, *Die Rolle von Komponistinnen, Interpretinnen und Musikwissenschaftlerinnen in der Institution Internationale Gesellschaft für Neue Musik (IGNM)*, (unpublished Master's thesis: Graz, 2015), 62.

25 Ibid., 72–73.

26 Translated for this essay from Georg Eisler, *Skizzen: Schriften und Zeichnungen* (Vienna: Compress, 1990), 22–23.

27 Translated for this essay from Friedrich Cerha, «Komponist sein in Wien,» in ders., *Schriften: ein Netzwerk*, edited by Friedrich Cerha (Vienna: Lafite, 2001), 49.

28 Haefeli 1982, 508.

29 Ibid., 310.





# National Socialist Looted Art and the Attendant Politics in Gau Salzburg

## Salzburg's Expectations

Following the *Anschluss* (annexation) to the German Reich, the state of Salzburg hoped to finally free itself from the metropolis of Vienna. Now rendered the political equal of Vienna, Salzburg likewise sought a balance in cultural concerns. The latter believed itself to have a special claim on the restitution of art and cultural heritage that had been transferred to Vienna at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in the wake of the secularization of Salzburg.[1] The 1938 appointment of Salzburg native Kajetan Mühlmann as commissioner for public art affairs in Austria, seemed to indicate that the signs pointed in the city's favor. Mühlmann was an art historian and had been part of the organizational team of the Salzburg Festival since 1926. In 1938 he joined the NSDAP, later became a member of the SS, and in October of 1939 began leading Nazi art thefts in Poland and the Netherlands.

Mühlmann's half-brother, Joseph, also an art historian, had organized the exhibition *Salzburgs bildende Kunst* in an effort to assess and display works of art housed in Viennese museums that had been «stolen» from Salzburg. The exhibition was staged in Salzburg in August of 1938, and again in Vienna at the end of that year. The second exhibition, which was a slight variation on the first and held at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, was comprised of the most important artworks and supplemented by several significant pieces of Salzburgensia in Viennese ownership.[2] By July, and in preparation for the show, art historian Franz Kieslinger was expected to «identify and secure» all relevant «artistic treasures originating from Salzburg» that were located in Vienna.[3] The drastic safe-guarding measure never came to fruition, Vienna native Arthur Seyß-Inquart, head of the Austrian state government in existence until April 1939, pursued a museum policy that aimed at preserving Vienna as a cultural center.[4]

Salzburg nonetheless continued to pursue its restitution agenda. *Gauleiter* Friedrich Rainer urged Josef Bürckel, *Reichskommissar* for the *Wiedervereinigung Österreichs mit dem Deutschen Reich* (Reincorporation of Austria with the German Reich), to «return» to Salzburg vast collections from the Kunsthistorisches Museum, the Austrian National Library, the University of Vienna's Institute for Prehistory, the Austrian Museum of Folk Life and Folk Art, the Natural History Museum, the Austrian Gallery, the Library of the Academy of Fine Arts, and the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchive.[5]

Bustling art historian and numismatist Fritz Dworschak, who had been named director of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in the wake of the *Anschluss*, was the driving force

behind Seyß-Inquart's centralized museum policy. As a result of ongoing restitution appeals from provincial museums following the collapse of the monarchy, Dworschak presented the relevant ministry with plans to restructure the Austrian museum landscape shortly after the *Anschluss*. This is central to understanding his August 1938 plan to establish a Kunsthistorisches Museum satellite gallery in the Salzburg Residenz.[6] In March of 1938 Seyß-Inquart, Mühlmann, and Dworschak began planning and organizing the expansion of the Vienna collections to include art that was acquired and seized from Jewish collectors. In the fall of 1938 a central depot was established in Vienna's Hofburg to house the art collections of Alphons and Louis Rothschild, Oskar Bondy, Rudolf Gutmann, and many other Jewish collectors. Fritz Dworschak put together a distribution plan that sought to claim artwork for museums that were primarily located in Vienna. In order to compensate for an imbalance in museum policy that was further aggravated by this plan, the Vienna state collections were to disperse many thousands of art objects housed in its depots to the provinces. Salzburg's Museum Carolino Augusteum (today Salzburg Museum) was promised an unspecified number of «works by Salzburg gunsmiths» from the Vienna *Waffensammlung* (collection of arms), as well as four works by Hans Makart from the Austrian Gallery.[7]

On May 1, 1938 the law pertaining to the formation of the Ostmark administration (*Ostmarkgesetz*) came into effect. Seven *Reichsgaue* took the place of the former federal states, and the Austrian state government was dissolved. Vienna lost its position as capital city, and Seyß-Inquart lost his position as Austrian head of state. Two days prior to this Seyß-Inquart met Hitler in Berlin and presented his distribution plan. They also discussed Seyß-Inquart's plan to establish a unified administration under the name of the *Wiener Kunst- und Kulturstätten*, which would be responsible for the Viennese state museums, state theatres, archives, and various palaces, as well as integrating the Salzburg Festival, the Salzburg Residenz, and the Schloss Leopoldskron.[8] Hitler announced that he would personally travel to Vienna to decide on the distribution of art.

## Accessing Confiscated Jewish Art Collections

In May of 1938 Hitler had begun to show a great deal of interest in the Jewish art collections in Vienna. After a state visit to Italy, where he had taken a tour of the Uffizi in Florence, he came to the conclusion that he would endow his hometown Linz with a picture gallery. On June 18, 1938 Hitler decreed the *Führervorbehalt* (Führer's prerogative), which granted him the right to personally delegate the dispersal of Jewish art collections seized in Austria throughout museums in smaller Austrian cities and towns.[9]

Contrary to Seyß-Inquart's centralized «Austrian» art policy, Hitler pursued a decentralized Ostmark variety and, making use of his *Führervorbehalt*, had already instructed Berlin art dealer Karl Haberstock to distribute the looted art among museums.[10] Haberstock had been an active art dealer and advisor to Hitler for some time, and had played a central role in the sale of «degenerate» art seized from German museums. In preparation for his mission, Haberstock travelled to Vienna in February of 1939 to inspect the central depot of looted art. He presumably stopped in Salzburg as well; or at least he reported to the Reich Chancellery in Berlin that the Salzburg Residenz was, «expected to become an administration office by the *Gauleiter*,» and he strongly recommended that it be preserved as a museum.[11]

On March 30, 1939 the Reich Chancellery officially appointed Haberstock to support Hitler in the dispersal of the looted art. Now fully authorized, the art dealer returned to



Vienna in early May. Once there, he was met with much resistance from Mühlmann and Dworschak, who insisted on their own distribution plan. Only after intervention from the Reich Chancellery was he granted access to the central depot, where he drafted a directive for artworks seized in Ostmark. He sent this to Berlin on June 6, 1939.[12] Salzburg was to play a prominent role in his plan: The directive envisioned the establishment of a baroque museum in the Mirabell Palace. This would also house the city's collection of *Trachten* (folk costumes), and supply several exhibition halls dedicated to nineteenth century painting, especially that of Salzburg's own Hans Makart. According to Haberstock, the Hohensalzburg Castle should be used to display fine and decorative art from the Gothic and Renaissance periods.

By early June of 1938 there were two contradicting distribution plans: Dworschak's plan for Seyß-Inquart, and Haberstock's plan for Hitler. Hitler traveled to Vienna and, accompanied by Kajetan Mühlmann and Fritz Dworschak, visited the central depot on June 11, 1939.[13] Once there, a heated argument ensued before Alphons Rothschild's Rembrandt paintings. Hitler wanted them for Linz, Mühlmann for Vienna. The fact that Mühlmann claimed the Jewish art collections for Vienna after the city had already been deprived its status as metropolis cost him his political office. He was dismissed shortly after the incident at Hitler's request. Hitler also replaced art dealer Haberstock with renowned museum professional and long-standing director of the Dresden Gemäldegalerie, Hans Posse. Posse had been forced into retirement in early 1938 after purchasing so-called, degenerate art, however, Hitler personally reinstated him after visiting the Dresden Gemäldegalerie in June of 1938.[14]

## Special Representative Hans Posse

In Obersalzberg on June 20, 1939 Hitler entrusted Posse with the establishment of a picture gallery in Linz. According to the directive, the base of the collection should stem from Hitler's own painting collection as well as that of the art seized from Jewish collectors in Vienna. In early July, special representative Posse travelled to Vienna with to get an idea of the loot housed in the central depot; he would later report back to Hitler that the works were of a consistent high quality, and suitable for both the establishment of a picture gallery in Linz and the implementation of the issued distribution plan. As a result, the gallery director from Dresden was assigned the distribution of looted art throughout all of Ostmark.[15]

During 1939 Hans Posse took two inspection trips to various museums in the Ostmark. In August he visited Graz and Klagenfurt, and in October Innsbruck followed by Salzburg, where he arrived on the morning of October 12th. After settling into a room at Hotel Österreichischer Hof (today Hotel Sacher), he visited the Mirabell Palace and park, and the old town's churches in the afternoon. On the following day he inspected the state rooms at the Residenz and the Residenzgalerie. Posse then met with Max Silber, the director of Museum Carolino Augusteum, who took him on a private tour. That evening, after a visit to the Hohensalzburg Castle, the place where Karl Haberstock had suggested a Gothic and Renaissance museum, Posse continued his travels to Munich.[16]

On October 20, Posse sent Hitler his *Bericht über die Landesmuseen der Ostmark* (report on the federal state museums of Ostmark) along with his *Vorschlag zur Verteilung der in Wien beschlagnahmten Gemälde* (recommendation for the distribution of the paintings seized in Vienna).[17] The report included an order of preference for the distribution of paintings. As per Hitler's wishes, Linz was listed at the very top, followed by Innsbruck.

Posse listed Graz third, Klagenfurt fourth, and Salzburg last. The Residenzgalerie was not included in the distribution plan, *Gauleiter* Friedrich Rainer had claimed the space for administrative use and closed the gallery. Only the city museum had made it into the plan. Posse's assessment that it possessed a «purely local character,» and an «insignificant» collection of paintings disqualified it from an imminent dispersal of paintings. He wanted to make sure, however, «that Salzburg's native son, Hans Makart, be honored with a significant collection of his art in his hometown.» Furthermore, Posse led the museum to believe that they would be allocated Salzburg objects from the yet-to-be distributed stock of seized decorative arts.

Meanwhile in Vienna, architect of the Salzburg federal state government Otto Reitter was granted access to the central depot by agency of Josef Mühlmann in August of 1939. He was to pick out furnishings for the seized Klessheim and Leopoldskron palaces and the Salzburg Residenz. Reitter was in charge of upgrading and furnishing the properties. The «List of Objects from the Jewish Collections suggested for *Reichsgau* Salzburg,»[18] which he had sent to Vienna on September 29, 1939 with the request they be delivered to him, included not only decorative art and furniture but paintings from the Rothschild collection as well. The Viennese administration was exasperated, Hitler's *Führervorbehalt* had banned the use of seized artwork for «furnishing the offices of administrative bodies or senior officials.»[19] Rainer subsequently turned to the Führer himself by way of the Reich Chancellery, arguing that suitable furniture from the baroque period was necessary, as the majority of furnishings had been carried off from the Residenz, in part to Vienna. A repeated inquiry at the Vienna ministry in May of 1940 was met with a curt response: His initiative was futile, the Führer had reserved the right to dispose of the objects as he desired.[20]

The *Führerentscheid* (Führer's decision) came in early August of 1940. The Museum Carolino Augusteum would be the only Salzburg museum to receive objects from the Vienna Jewish collections.[21] As described by Hans Posse in his work diary, Hitler had decided to deny access to the Salzburg objects housed in the Vienna collections as early as of July 23, 1939: «Based on my account of the Austrian circumstances, and the claims of the *Gauen* to Vienna for its art collections, the Führer expressed that he is against any action that would somehow diminish the collections of art that came into being throughout the ages. He later explicitly confirmed to me that Vienna's art collections must be maintained as is.»[22]

Friedrich Rainer's efforts to acquire objects from the seized Jewish art collections in Vienna for Salzburg's palaces remained unsuccessful. Posse allocated merely 81 items, including paintings, sculptures, furniture, rugs, and garden sculptures from the collection of Max Reinhardt's Schloss Leopoldskron as palace furnishings.[23] On behalf of Rainer, Salzburg art dealer Friedrich Welz travelled to the occupied French capital in September of 1940 with the intention of purchasing artwork to decorate Salzburg's palaces.[24] For Rainer, the failure to allocate five items from the treasury of St. Peter's Abbey (which the abbey had had to sell in the 1920s and consequently ended up in Oskar Bondy's Vienna collection) was a bitter defeat. Rainer was sorely discontented. He inquired why the «aforementioned objects were not being returned to Salzburg in the spirit of the Ostmark Administration Act,» and received the reply that Hitler himself had assigned the objects to the Kunsthistorisches Museum.[25]



## The *Landesgalerie* Salzburg

Up until 1940, the focus of *Gau* Salzburg officials had been set on the past; on the restitution of art and cultural heritage—as represented by works from the Middle Ages and the Baroque period—from the «Viennese art theft» that had taken place following the secularization of Salzburg. These endeavors faltered, however, because Hitler denied access to the Vienna collections. After the first large-scale dispersal of looted art, which occurred in 1940, it became clear that shutting down the Residenzgalerie had significantly reduced Salzburg's prospects for acquiring allocated art. The decision to introduce a *Landesgalerie* that would present nineteenth and early twentieth-century art into Salzburg's museum landscape
was arguably influenced by this predicament. Rainer entrusted this task to Friedrich Welz, whose his business connections to leading National Socialists, including Hitler himself, allowed him to quickly obtain a key position within Ostmark's cultural-political circle.[26]

A chance at modernization presented itself in the year 1940, when Salzburg celebrated Hans Makart's 100th birthday with a large-scale memorial exhibition located at the Residenz.[27] Welz was charged with realizing the exhibition, and was also its largest lender. The foundation for a Salzburg Makart collection was presumably to be laid from this exhibition, something that both special representatives Haberstock and Posse were in favor of. Hitler, however, also laid claims on Makart: The artist was so exemplary as a role model for Hitler's understanding of art, his self-perception as a «misunderstood genius,» and his early biography, that Makart had to be well represented in the Gemäldegalerie Linz.[28] Hitler had long been compiling a Makart collection of his own for these very reasons. The fact that Hermann Göring—who had loaned the painting *Die Falknerin* (The Falconer, ca. 1880)—acted as patron of the Salzburg exhibition was a sort of a red herring. The exhibition catalog stated that *Die Falknerin* had in fact been a gift from Hitler for Göring's 45th birthday in 1938. What was kept secret, however, was the fact that Hitler had also loaned artworks, namely the diptych, *Abundantia*: *Die Gaben der Erde und die Gaben des Meeres* (Abundance: the Gifts of the Earth and the Gifts of the Sea, 1870), and the oil sketch, *Jagd der Diana* (Diana as Huntress, 1879). The catalog lists the NSDAP Munich as the owner of these works. Hitler remained anonymous, as he didn't want to identify himself as directly rivaling Salzburg's interests. Nonetheless, he in fact added items from the Salzburg Makart show to his Linz collection with the help of Friedrich Welz. Hitler purchased eleven of the exhibited paintings and a set of 200 drawings, 33 of which had been on display. The works on display in the exhibition's main hall were, by and large, already or soon-to-be owned by Hitler, including the large painting, *Venedig huldigt Caterina Cornaro* (Venice Pays Homage to Caterina Cornaro, 1872/73), which was bought by the National Gallery Berlin in October of 1940.

Friedrich Welz, who had been appointed by Friedrich Rainer, purchased modern paintings for the Landesgalerie including works by Gustav Klimt, Egon Schiele, Anton Faistauer, and contemporaries such as Sergius Pauser, Herbert Boeckl, and Anton Kolig. On his numerous trips to occupied France, and particularly to Paris, he also procured French art ranging from the nineteenth century to impressionist period. Considering that Welz cooperated with art dealers and agents who dealt with forced sale and seized works of art, the conditions surrounding these purchases are highly dubious from today's perspective.[29]

Welz «de-nazified» himself after the war, and claimed that these purchases made him a quasi resistance fighter. The kind of moderate modernism rooted in tradition Welz favored, however, was in no way contrary to the Austrian National Socialist outlook on art.

It is well known that the art policy of the Ostmark was more liberal than that of the *Altreich* (German Reich).[30] Vienna *Gauleiter* Baldur von Schirach pursued an exhibition and acquisition policy that was quite open to modernism. Hitler's special representative Hans Posse was also a friend of modernism; in the 1920s he had collected avant-garde art for the Gemäldegalerie Dresden, and was a close friend and significant patron of Oskar Kokoschka during the artist's tenure as a professor at the Dresden Art Academy (1919-1923).[31] Posse had intended to allocate paintings by members of the Nötscher Circle surrounding Anton Kolig, including contemporaries Franz Wiegele and Herbert Boeckl, to Klagenfurt.[32] With Hitler's approval, he dispersed expropriated artworks by Gustav Klimt, Albin Egger-Lienz, and Boeckl between museums in Klagenfurt, Innsbruck, and Graz.

In November of 1941, *Gauleiter* Rainer was replaced by Gustav Adolf Scheel, who drove the gallery project forward with concrete results: On February 13, 1942 he established *Reichgau* Salzburg's public art collection. Welz's influence waned with this change of office, yet he would remain involved until late 1944. Scheel, who did not aspire to modernize museum inventories, was more concerned with securing seized art collections from the Salzburg monasteries and convents for the *Gau* Salzburg. As these also fell under the umbrella of *Führervorbehalt*, Posse was expected to present Hitler with suggestions for their dispersal. Posse's numerous acquisition trips, however, left him unable to attend to the matter until mid-1942. In the summer of the same year, progression of Posse's cancer forced him to stop traveling, and left him time to tend to the matter: he orchestrated the dispersal of monastery collections from his sickbed. Meanwhile, the agenda of *Gau* heritage conservationists had expanded to include the use of monastery buildings for cultural activities. They attempted to preserve art historically significant monastery wings, festivity halls, and libraries from improper usage, which included sleeping quarters for those that had been resettled, use as boarding schools, and SS barracks.

Agent Gottfried Reimer travelled to Salzburg twice on behalf of special representative Posse—once in November 1942, and again in early 1943. His task was to prepare an edict for the Führer regarding the repurposing of St. Peter's Abbey in Salzburg and the Michaelbeuern Abbey in the surrounding countryside. Reimer drafted a report based on documents presented him by Gustav Scheel and *Gau*-conservator Eduard Hütter, which recommended Hitler the use of St. Peter's Abbey as a museum to display the *Gau's* collection of seized church art.

## Summary

Hitler's plan for the distribution of looted art caused *Gau* museums to either establish, or upgrade their picture galleries. These museum collections experienced a varying degree of modernization. *Gau* Carinthia, which acquired comprehensive collections of paintings by Albin Egger-Lienz for the Egger-Lienz-Museum in the painter's hometown, got the most out of the first distribution phase in 1940. In the second 1943 distribution phase, Hitler's Viennese *Gauleiter* Baldur von Schirach who had successfully propagated Vienna as a cultural capital, was able to negotiate a more prominent position for Vienna's collections. In the 1940 distribution they had been at a disadvantage to other *Gau* museums, especially those of Linz (the *Gau* museum and *Führermuseum*). The Austrian Gallery in Vienna, which had been left empty handed in 1940, was allotted an extensive collection in 1943. That same year the Neue Galerie in Graz received nearly fifty objects, primarily nineteenth century paintings and miniatures, including one Herbert Boeckl painting from 1928.[33]



Of all *Gau* capitals, Salzburg profited the least from the looted art allotments. The distribution proposal for the extensive «remaining stock» of seized Jewish art collections as approved by Hitler on May 17, 1943, again only mentioned the Museum Carolino Augusteum—this did not result in the same extent of modernization from which other *Gau* museums had benefited.[34] Nevertheless, in June of 1944 a structural modernization was in the works. This included the allocation of St. Peter's Abbey and the consolidation of city and state collections into the *Zweckverband Salzburger Museen* (administration union of salzburgian museums), but, due to the advanced state of the war, never came to fruition. Friedrich Welz, who began working on his Galerie der Moderne during the era of National Socialism, would not be able to realize his vision until long after the war, when a 1976 donation laid the foundation for the Salzburg Museum of Modern Art and Graphic Collection.

## Works of Art inside the Altaussee Salt Mine

During the last stages of the war, museums moved looted art that had been allotted to them from Vienna to off-site depots to protect the works from air raids. The repository of the Salzburg museum was located in Henndorf am Wallersee. On November 7, 1944 the Vienna Institute for Historical Preservation informed Lothar Pretzell, the director of the Salzburg Museum, that his allotted works of art were still in Vienna, and could not be delivered to the museum because of the railroad had been shut down. They would be transferred to a salt mine in Altaussee, *Gau*-Oberdonau.[35] The Altaussee salt mine was the safe spot for the Führer's collection. The stored works of art were intended for the *Führermuseum*, and other museums throughout the German Reich. The most famous painting housed there was Jan van Eyck's early fifteenth century *Ghent Altarpiece,* a key work of European art history.[36]

In the last days of war the artworks came close to being destroyed by the *Gauleiter* of Oberdonau, August Eigruber himself. In April of 1945, he had eight aircraft bombs placed into the salt mine to blast the art in case the enemy should approach. When Hitler found out about this, he forbade their destruction; instead arrangements were to be made to keep the enemy away from the art as long as possible. Following Hitler's death, the situation became increasingly tense, Eigruber no longer felt obligated to Hitler's request that the art not be destroyed. Thanks to an initiative put in motion by salt miners who feared the destruction of their job site, Ernst Kaltenbrunner, one of Austria's highest ranking National Socialists, was contacted about the matter. Kaltenbrunner, who agreed that the artworks should be kept from destruction, phoned Eigruber, who caved after a heated discussion. The bombs were removed from the mine on May 4, at around 4am. Following this, and as per Hitler's instructions, all access points were cut off using controlled explosive charges.

The US Army reached the mine on May 8, 1945. During the following two days the entrances were cleared, and on May 10, the Americans were able to enter the tunnel system. The lengthy process of restituting the art to its lawful owners—a process that remains incomplete to this day—could then commence. In 2011, the Museum der Moderne Salzburg restituted Gustav Klimt's *Litzlberg am Attersee*, a painting that was purchased by Welz in 1941 and sold to the Landesgalerie in 1944. Amalie Redlich, who was deported to and murdered at the Litzmannstadt concentration camp (in today's Łódź), was the original owner of that work.

I would like to thank Roswitha Juffinger, in Vienna, and Anita Stelzl-Gallian, at the Commission for Provenance Research, in Vienna, for their constructive edits and notes.

1 The majority of paintings went to Vienna in 1807, see: Imma Walderdorff, «Rekonstruktion der Gemäldesammlung des Erzstiftes Salzburgs,» in *Erzbischof Guidobald Graf von Thun 1654–1668. Ein Bauherr für die Zukunft*, ed. Roswitha Juffinger et al., exh. cat. (Salzburg: Residenzgalerie, 2008), 327-328.

2 *Salzburgs bildende Kunst. Vorgeschichte bis 18. Jahrhundert*, exh. cat. (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien: ABZ-Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1938).

3 Josef Mühlmann [?], Letter to Kajetan Mühlmann, July 13, 1938: Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Vienna, AdR, RStH III 1938, 200.103/38.

4 Oliver Rathkolb, «Nationalsozialistische (Un-)Kulturpolitik in Wien,» in *Im Reich der Kunst. Die Wiener Akademie der bildenden Künste und die faschistische Kunstpolitik*, eds. Hans Seiger, Michael Lunardi, Peter Josef Populorum (Vienna: Verlag der Gesellschaftskritik, 1990), 260–265.

5 Cf. the letter from *Gauleiter* Friedrich Rainer to the head of the Reich Chancellery Hans Heinrich Lammers, January 13, 1940: Bundesarchiv Koblenz B 323/183, 65–66, and *Gau* Salzburg's lists of demands from the Vienna art collections: ibid., 67–72.

6 Fritz Dworschak, *Sofortprogramm zur Neugestaltung des Wiener Museumswesens*, Vienna, April 19, 1938 (excerpt), reprinted in Herbert Haupt, *Das Kunsthistorische Museum. Die Geschichte des Hauses am Ring* (Vienna: Christian Brandstätter, 1991), 238–240; Gerhard Plasser, «Zur Geschichte der Salzburger Landessammlungen 1939–1955,» in *Salzburger Landessammlungen 1939–1955*, eds. Roswitha Juffinger, Gerhard Plasser (Salzburg: Land Salzburg, 2007), 19–20.

7 Institut für Zeitgeschichte München, MA 597, 1402–1408.

8 Arthur Seyß-Inquart, letter to Hitler, May 4, 1939: ibid., 1435–1442.

9 Birgit Schwarz, *Auf Befehl des Führers. Hitler und der NS-Kunstraub* (Darmstadt: Theiss, 2014), 16–18, 39–55.

10 Ibid., 29–38, 78–79; Birgit Schwarz, *Hitlers Museum. Die Fotoalben Gemäldegalerie Linz. Dokumente zum «Führermuseum»*, (Vienna: Böhlau), 2004, 38–39.

11 Karl Haberstock, letter to the Reich Chancellery, February 27, 1939: Bundesarchiv Berlin R 43 II/1269a, 162; memorandum from the Reichskanzlei, March 1, 1939: ibid., 166.

12 Karl Haberstock, letter to the head of the Reich Chancellery Hans Heinrich Lammers, June 6, 1939: Bundesarchiv Berlin R 43 II/1269a, 191; idem., «Vorschläge für die Verteilung der beschlagnahmten jüdischen Kunstsammlungen an die ostmärkischen Museen,» in ibid., 192–196.

13 Birgit Schwarz, *Geniewahn. Hitler und die Kunst* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2009), 243–244; Schwarz, *Auf Befehl des Führers*, 80–81.

14 Schwarz 2014, 47–55.

15 Ibid., 83–86.

16 Germanisches Nationalmuseum Nürnberg, Deutsches Kunstarchiv, the estate of Posse, Hans I, B-2, entry from October 12, 1939.

17 Bundesarchiv Koblenz, B 323/229, B 323/230.

18 Archiv of the Bundesdenkmalamt Vienna, restitution materials, box 4–3, folder 15, 88–89, letter from Salzburg's district president to state commissioner Friedrich Plattner in Vienna, September 29, 1939.

19 Ministry memorandum, December 9, 1938: Archiv of the Bundesdenkmalamt Vienna, restitution materials, box 4–3, folder 15, 89.

20 On Rainer's letter to the Reich Chancellery see endnote 5. Letter from The cultural advisor of the Reich propaganda office Salzburg Karl Windischbauer to state commissioner Friedrich Plattner, Vienna, May 16, 1940: Archiv of the Bundesdenkmalamt Vienna, restitution materials, box 4–3, folder 15, 81; letter from Plattner to Windischbauer, May 18, 1940: ibid., 80.

21 Germanisches Nationalmuseum Nürnberg, Deutsches Kunstarchiv, estate of Posse, Hans I, B-2, entry from July 23, 1939.

22 Artworks from the seized Viennese collections for the Museum in Salzburg: Bundesarchiv Koblenz B 323/117, 801.



23 Inventory of the seized artworks from Max Reinhardt's Schloss Leopoldskron in Salzburg: Bundesarchiv Koblenz B 323/117, 803.

24 Plasser 2007, 21–22; on financing: Fritz Koller, *Das Inventarbuch der Landesgalerie Salzburg 1942–1944* (Salzburg: Salzburger Landesarchiv, 2000), 22–24.

25 The Reichsstatthalter of Salzburg, letter to the Institut für Denkmalpflege, Vienna, August 21, 1940: Archiv of the Bundesdenkmalamt Vienna, restitution materials, box 8, folder 6; letter from Herbert Seiberl, Institut für Denkmalpflege, to the Reichsstatthalter in Salzburg, August 28, 1940: ibid., 1.

26 Gert Kerschbaumer, *Meister des Verwirrens. Die Geschäfte des Kunsthändlers Friedrich Welz* (Vienna: Czernin, 2000). Koller, «Die Landesgalerie Salzburg,» in: idem. 2000, 11–43. Susanne Rolinek, «‹Eine moderne Galerie …›. Zur Vorgeschichte des Museums der Moderne Salzburg und zur Rolle des Kunsthändlers Friedrich Welz,» in *Vom Tafelbild zum Wandobjekt. Museum der Moderne Salzburg* (Weitra: Bibliothek der Provinz, 2005), vol. 1, 8–13, esp. 9.

27 Schwarz 2009, 253–254; Roswitha Juffinger, «Salzburger Landessammlungen: Dokumentation zu den Beständen und Provenienzforschung zu den Ankäufen des Zeitraumes 1939–1945,» in Plasser 2007, 82–86.

28 Schwarz 2009, 41–43, 53–57.

29 Plasser 2007, 20–22.

30 Jan Tabor, «Die Gaben der Ostmark. Österreichische Kunst und Künstler in der NS-Zeit,» in *Im Reich der Kunst. Die Wiener Akademie der bildenden Künste und die faschistische Kunstpolitik*, eds. Hans Seiger, Michael Lunardi, Peter Josef Populorum (Vienna: Verlag der Gesellschaftskritik, 1990), 277–296.

31 Birgit Schwarz, «Rittmeister und Excellenz. Oskar Kokoschka und Hans Posse 1919 bis 1923,» in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 62 (2013): 231–254; Birgit Dalbajewa, «‹… selbst auf die Gefahr einzelner Irrtümer hin …› —Die ‹Sammlung modernster Malerei› in der Gemäldegalerie unter Hans Posse 1918–1933,» in *Kennerschaft zwischen Macht und Moral. Annäherungen an Hans Posse (1879–1942)*, eds. Gilbert Lupfer und Thomas Rudert (Cologne: Böhlau, 2015), 239–270.

32 The author bases this and the following on results of a research project on the dispersal of National Socialist looted art to Austrian museums carried out under the *Führervorbehalt*. This research was carried out at the University of Vienna with financial support from the National Fund for Victims of National Socialism and the Future Fund of the Republic of Austria, in cooperation with the Commission for Provenance Research. The results will be published in book form as part of the publication series of the Commission for Provenance Research in 2017.

33 Gottfried Reimer, letter to the Reichsstatthalter of Salzburg and to *Gau*-conservator Hütter, April 5, 1943: Bundesarchiv Koblenz B 323/117, 797.

34 Hans Riehl, Neue Galerie Graz, letter to the Institut für Denkmalpflege, Vienna, June 30, 1944: Archive of the Bundesdenkmalamt Vienna, restitution materials, box 8-1, folder 6, 34.

35 Institut für Denkmalpflege, letter to the director of the Salzburg Museum, Dr. Lothar Pretzell, November 7, 1944, ibid.

36 George Clooney's film *The Monuments Men* (2014), for example, portrayed events in this way. The *Ghent Altarpiece* should have been moved to the Gemäldegalerie in Berlin

ELIZABETH CRONIN

# Traditional Modern becomes a Modern Tradition
## Heimat Photography in Austria

In 1925 *Die Bühne: Zeitschrift für Theater und Gesellschaft* (the stage: magazine for theater and society) began producing an August issue that featured Salzburg on the occasion of the festival. The issues focused on topics such as the operatic bass-baritone Richard Mayr, actresses arriving in Salzburg, beer in Salzburg, the cathedral, the festival, locals and landscape, and so on. While they primarily advertised the festival, they also promoted and defined Austria, and did so through photography.

In 1934 the August issue featured a photograph on its cover. It depicted a rather touristy view of Salzburg in which three women dressed in *Dirndl* ascended the palatial garden stairs of the seventeenth-century Schloss Mirabell before the backdrop of Hohensalzburg castle. The photograph presented the city as medieval, baroque, and traditional. The subject matter is conservative, and so too is the composition. The view is balanced and centered, with a foreground, background, and middle ground. The three women serve as a staffage, establishing the scale of the landscape. While the cover image depicts Salzburg as traditional, other photographs within the issue present a more modern city. The most notable of these is by German photographer Umbo (Otto Umbehr), who had studied at the Bauhaus. His photograph, *Nächtliches Salzburg* (Salzburg at night, 1930) shows a modern city with brightly lit streets and car traffic at night, a dramatic and abstracted view of the narrow streets from a bird's eye perspective. Umbo's photograph reflects trends in modern and avant-garde photography: unconventional points of view and abstraction through stark contrasts in light and shadow. These two types of photographs, which defined Salzburg and Austria as both modern and traditional, are characteristic of those reproduced within the pages of *Die Bühne*.

*Die Bühne* reported on society, culture and leisure, profiling film stars, celebrities, and modern trends. The photographs within varied in both subject matter and style. Some are clearly representative of the New Vision aesthetic, showing daring perspectives and modern forms, while others represent in the outdated Pictorialist aesthetic that made photographs appear painterly. The cover of issue 379, for example, features an up close photograph of a girl with a stylish bob haircut. The cover of issue 396, in contrast, depicts a woman dressed in folk costume who appears old-fashioned in hazy, soft lighting. Other covers and photographs within the magazine are not so easily categorized. While the subject matter is traditional, they appear slightly modern. Or they depict a modern subject photographed in a banal or traditional way. One such work is by Viennese photographer



Trude Fleischmann. The theme is traditional: a pious elderly peasant woman on All Soul's Day. The woman, however, has a striking presence. Fleischmann photographed her from a low point-of-view to render her tall and monumental, and her dark dress sets her apart from the abstracted background of shadows. The photograph is undoubtedly modern in style, but as a result of the subject matter the work can be classified as a *Heimat*, or homeland, photograph. *Heimat* as an idea can be manifest in the people, landscape, local traditions, customs and values. In 1930s Austria the term largely and idealistically referred to the Alps, the peasants, and Catholicism. Despite its modern form Fleischmann's photograph of the peasant woman in her native dress on a holy day of obligation represented the Austrian *Heimat* and its traditions.

Fleischmann's choice of subject matter was not uncommon. *Heimat* photography had a persistent visual presence in 1930s Austria. It functioned to assert Austrian-ness. Denigrated by the World War I, fragile governments, and a bad economy, Austria sought to define itself through pride in what was known—its «successful» history, the beautiful Alpine lands, Catholic values, rich local customs, and tradition. During the 1930s the newly formed government used the concept of *Heimat* to propagate this idealized vision of the country.[1] *Heimat* photography was appealing and popular because its subject matter was familiar but also because, far from presenting banal touristy images, *Heimat* photography looked new and modern. It signaled a modern future for Austria, but one tied to its proud past.

Earlier in the 1920s *Heimat* photography was primarily understood as a straightforward means of documenting objects of cultural heritage, such as specific landscape features, gravestones, folk costumes, traditional crafts, regional architecture, and et cetera. As the form continued to develop in Austria it had turned into something more than a visual document by the 1930s.[2] It was exercised by artist-photographers, and became a distinct genre that was intended to visually record the *Heimat* and invoke feelings relating to *Heimat* by way of its artistry. By the 1933, Hugo Haluschka, president of the Graz Art Photography Club, was discussing the merits and future of artistic [*bildmäßige*] *Heimat* photography.[3] He believed that *Heimat* photography was superior because it conveyed meaning. Unlike the fashionable photographs of New Objectivity, a style that depicted modernity with an almost scientific exactness, *Heimat* photography was intimately bound with the homeland. Its associations could evoke feelings of pride, belonging, nostalgia, and a sense of home. Its aesthetic and emotional qualities allowed *Heimat* photography to speak to a broad audience. The political failures of the previous decades aside, the idealizing lens of *Heimat* photography showed people what it meant to be Austrian. Austrians were receptive to the genre because it pictured the ideal and beautiful land they wanted to see, and as a photograph served as a document to be believed. *Heimat* photography reigned in Austria from 1933–1938. Its popularity demonstrated the complex cultural and political ideology of the country as it sought to be both modern and traditional.

*Die Bühne*, of course, was not the only magazine to showcase the Austrian *Heimat*. The monthly magazine *Moderne Welt: Almanach der Frauen*, which contained more text than *Die Bühne*, likewise included a fair number of photographs. It reported on fashion, literature, beauty, sports, society, and modern lifestyles [*neues Wohnen*]. Included within these topics were references to the *Heimat*. *Moderne Welt*, for example, regularly devoted a section to the latest fashion trends. The fashions often included elements of both the old and new, such as a knitted top that combined the idea of a dirndl blouse with a vest. In one issue there was even a page describing outfits that had been specifically influenced by Alpine customs.[4] An article by the vociferous *Heimat* activist Guido Zernatto offered a detailed explanation of

how variations on the folk costume were becoming more and more fashionable.[5] Acknowledging that more and more people were becoming inclined toward a love of nature, he pointed out that urbanites in particular longed to somehow make visible their sense of national allegiance. Drawings by Erni Kneipert and three photographs by Rudolf Koppitz, each of which shows women in folk costume serve as illustrations for this article.

Koppitz was well-known, and his photographs of the Austrian *Heimat* appeared often in *Moderne Welt* as well as in other magazines including *Der Bergsteiger*, *Die Bühne*, *Der Lichtbildner*, Österreichische *Rundschau* and *Die Pause*.[6] They could also be found in photo books dedicated to the *Heimat*, such as *Menschen der Berge*, and *Kinder in Tracht*.[7] In 1936 the Museum für Kunst und Industrie exhibited his work in a solo show entitled *Land und Leute* (land and people). The exhibition showed 504 of Koppitz's photographs, most of which depicted *Heimat* subjects. Receiving laudatory reviews, the press praised his work for showing the state of modern photography and for depicting the people and landscapes simply and naturally.[8] Indeed, Koppitz's preference for clear, straightforward depictions reflected modern trends in photography and the belief that the mechanical precision of the camera could render subjects more objectively, thus revealing something otherwise unseen. In Koppitz's *Bäuerin in Tracht* the peasant's bright white lace hat and dark dress draw the viewer in to look more closely. The dappled light across her nose highlights a pensive expression. The intimacy with which Koppitz depicted his subjects rendered their invocation of *Heimat* even more powerful.

As the highly influential head of the Graphische Lehr- und Versuchsanstalt (graphic institute) in Vienna, Koppitz's photography of the *Heimat* no doubt inspired other photographers. While the majority of *Heimat* photographers were less high-profile than Koppitz, their work was shown in the illustrated press, and local and national exhibitions throughout Austria. In 1932 Salzburg photographer Robert Traub suggested that the *Fachverbände der Fotografengenossenschaften Österreichs* (union of Austrian photographic associations) stage an exhibition showcasing the different Austrian states.[9] That following year, thanks to the help of the national and state departments of trade and commerce the exhibition, *Österreichs Bundesländer im Lichtbilde* (Austria's states in pictures), was realized.[10] That same year *Heimat* photography became a separate exhibition category at the annual exhibition of the *Verband Österreichischer Amateurphotographen Vereine* (league of amateur Austrian photography clubs) and 178 works were exhibited in that section.[11] Many *Heimat* photographers also produced postcards and either contributed to, or published their own, photo books.[12] Well-known poet and author Franz Karl Ginzkey published a photo book on Salzburg with photographs supplied by the *Postkarten-Industrie* in Vienna and different *Heimat* photographers including Gebhard Roßmanith and Salzburg photographers Traub and Karl Jurischek.[13] The visible presence of *Heimat* photography in all these forms contributed to the development of a widespread popular conception of Austria as a simultaneously traditional and modern country.

After annexation to Germany in 1938, Austrian *Heimat* photography became a way of defining Austria's Germaness. Many Austrians greeted National Socialist politics and adjustments to Austrian cultural life enthusiastically. They benefited economically, believed in a greater German nation, and or saw this as a better alternative to their current situation. *Heimat* photographers fit into this category by and large. They continued portraying Austria, only now it depicted the Reich's eastern march (Ostmark). Photographs that were exemplary of the Austrian *Heimat* were transferred into another, albeit similar, political program. There were also of course quite a few notable photographers who could not work because they were in danger. Trude Fleischmann, Hans Hannau, and Robert Haas all took *Heimat*



photographs and participated in propagating the image of Austria during the 1930s but were forced to emigrate.[14]

Stefan Kruckenhauser was one successful *Heimat* photographer who simply tolerated the National Socialists. In 1935 he began to work on a photo book that would document his Austrian *Heimat*. Finally published with Otto Müller in Salzburg in 1938, *Verborgene Schönheit* showcased Austrian architecture and sculpture. Salzburg artist Alois Schmeidbauer wrote the introduction to the book, proclaiming that it spoke to the heart and would bring joy to the reader's life.[15] Schmeidbauer also recalled the blood bonds that tied the Ostmark to the Reich and the states. He stressed that the art included within the book was, above all else, Germanic.[16] Kruckenhauser took a different tone. He considered the main purpose of the book as showing «how unusually beautiful the Ostmark, in her quiet corners that are easily overshadowed by the grandeur of the mountainous land, could be.»[17] This statement shows that Kruckenhauser was primarily interested in beauty and artistry. This interest induced him to be complacent, simply going along with the political situation. In January of 1940 he joined the NSDAP.[18]

In the wake of the war, the embrace of *Heimat* as Alpine Austria was a rejection of a Germanic *Heimat* and a manifestation of Austria's new status as a neutral country, but this was a sentimental and idealistic view of reality. The majority of the *Heimat* photographers carried on with their photography. The change in politics had little effect on their subject matter or compositions. The *Heimat* remained an Alpine Austrian ideal, visibly palpable in the landscape, architecture, customs, and people.

Kruckenhauser produced a fifth edition of his highly popular *Verborgene Schönheit*.[19] The popularity of this heavily revised and expanded edition led to an English translation with a forward by Ernst Gombrich in 1965.[20] The post-war editions maintained the thematic divisions presented in the original 1938 edition. The depictions were by and large the same, though many of them had needed to be reshot due to the destruction of Kruckenhauser's negatives during the war. The sole addition was a separate list of pictures in German, English, French, and Italian that briefly detailed each photograph. Kruckenhauser's book, and his attitude toward it, are emblematic of post-War Austria as a whole. He essentially attempted to continue his past work. Austria tried to reclaim its past and present it anew, just as Kruckenhauser re-photographed the same architecture and sculptures.

Many notable *Heimat* photographers, including Kruckenhauser, contributed to *Österreich: Landschaft, Mensch, Kultur*.[21] The book also appeared in an English edition. Focusing primarily desirable tourist destinations within the *Heimat*, this photo book presents Austria as a vacation destination. Like *Verborgene Schönheit*, it used some of the same *Heimat* photographs that had been published in twenty years earlier. It also went through many editions, the last of which was printed in 1968.[22] The photographs therein depict peasants, populated towns, ski slopes with gondolas, rock climbers, hikers, picturesque Alpine views, medieval castles, impressively situated churches, the Grossglockner Street, and hiking paths. Yet again, tradition and modernity are both present.

During the post-war era *Heimat* photography held onto to its past. Pre-war photographs surfaced and were used again. Similar views were retaken and published anew. At the same time *Heimat* photography also attempted to modernize and present an even more powerful advertisement for the revival of the pre-war tourist industry. In this sense, *Heimat* photography encouraged Austrians to escape to their ideal of *Heimat*, left unscathed by the war. *Heimat* was where they could relax, and ignore the recent past. *Heimat* photography also encouraged foreigners to visit the democratic country. Kruckenhauser's photograph of a narrow medieval street in Salzburg exemplifies the post-war *Heimat*. It depicts a business-

man walking with briefcase in hand, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The caption for this image informs us that Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was born on a similarly narrow street in Salzburg in 1756. Austrians go about their daily business and modern lives, but we as viewers are invited to see something more, the historical charm of the Austrian *Heimat*.

1 For more on Austrian politics during the 1930s, see Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka and Alexander Lassner, *The Dollfuss/Schuschnigg Era in Austria: A Reassessment* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2003).

2 For more on the origins of *Heimat* photography in Germany and Austria, see chapter 1 in Elizabeth Cronin, *Heimat Photography in Austria: A Politicized Vision of Peasants and Skiers* (Salzburg: Fotohof, 2015).

3 Hugo Haluschka, «Bildmässige Heimatphotographie,» in *Photo- und Kinosport* (February 1933): 24.

4 «Alpenländer beeinflussen die Mode,» in *Moderne Welt*, no.11 (August 1934): 25.

5 Guido Zernatto, «Volkstrachtmode,» in *Moderne Welt*, no.11 (August 1934): 6–8.

6 For more on Koppitz and his *Heimat* photographs, see Elizabeth Cronin, «Rudolf Koppitz und die österreichische Heimat,» in *Rudolf Koppitz: Photogenie*, ed. Monika Faber (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2013), 44–56. For the issues in which his work was published see the Biobibliografie zur Fotografie in Österreich online database: http://sammlungenonline.albertina.at/#f2cb0641-a5bb-4a80-97f2-1a65984ab719

7 Hans Leifhelm, *Menschen der Berge* (Graz: Styria, 1936); and *Kinder in Tracht* (Königstein: Langewiesche, 1936).

8 «Lichtbildausstellung ‹Land und Leute,›» in *Neue Freie Presse* (February 2, 1936): 18; and «Photoausstellung Rudolf Koppitz,» in *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* (February 7, 1936): 3, W-a.

9 *Allgemeine Photographische Zeitung. Gewerbliches Fachblatt der Photographen Österreichs. Offizielles Organ des «Fachverbandes der Photographengenossenschaften Österreichs»* [...], vol. 14, no. 7 (1932): 14–15.

10 *Fotoausstellung: Österreichs Bundesländer im Lichtbilde* (Vienna: Fiba, 1933).

11 «Ausstellung des Verbandes Österreichischer Amateurphotographen-Vereine,» in *Die Galerie*, no. 4 (June 1933): n.p.

12 For more on *Heimat* photo books, see chapter 4 of Cronin 2015.

13 Ginzkey, Karl Franz. *Salzburg und das Salzkammergut* (Bielefeld/Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing, 1934).

14 Anna Auer, Übersee *Flucht und Emigration: Österreichischer Fotografen 1920-1940 / Exodus from Austria: Emigration of Austrian Photographers 1920–1940* (Vienna: Kunsthalle Wien, 1997).

15 Stefan Kruckenhauser, *Verborgene Schönheit: Bauwerk und Plastik der Ostmark* (Salzburg/Leipzig: Müller, 1938), 7.

16 Ibid.

17 «...durch ein paar Bilder zu zeigen, wie eigenartig schön diese Ostmark auch in ihren stillen, so leicht über den großen Herrlichkeiten dieses Berglandes übersehenen Winkeln sein kann.» Kruckenhauser, 63.

18 Maria Emberger, «Zum Leben Stefan Kruckenhausers,» in *Stefan Kruckenhauser: In weiten Linien-- ; Das fotografische Lebenswerk*, ed. Kurt Kaindl (Salzburg: Otto Müller, 2003), 8–15.

19 Stefan Kruckenhauser, *Die verborgene Schönheit: Bauwerk und Plastik aus Österreich*, 5th ed. (Salzburg: O. Müller, 1954).

20 Stefan Kruckenhauser, Heritage of Beauty: Architecture and Sculpture in Austria, with an introduction by E.H. Gombrich (London: C.A. Watts, 1965).

21 Adalbert Defner, *Österreich: Landschaft, Mensch und Kultur*, with contributions by Karl Heinrich Waggerl and Eduard Widmoser (St. Johann, Tirol: Pinguin/Frankfurt a. M.: Umschau, 1952).

22 Subsequent editions were published in 1954, 1960, 1962, 1964, and 1968.





# (Salzburg) Masquerades of Modern Dance

According to dance scholar Sabine Huschka, modern dance creates a space for personal fulfillment and (self)-recognition in which freedom of physicality works against social and cultural constraints and mechanisms of alienation; it could also be regarded as an esthetic space, in which self-assertion and insight are practiced.[1] I will sketch out the understanding of modernism in its many iterations within the history of twentieth century dance as an ideological and stylistic leitmotiv, specifically «modern dance»—as it was commonly referred to—that occurred after 1900. Dancers and their audiences alike conceived of this style as an ideal and genuine artistic and progressive, innovative counterpart to rigid traditionalism. In 1921 Hans Brandenburg, a influential chronicler of modern dance, summarized this as follows:

«Let's regard dance with fresh eyes—or even as if for the first time—as an independent art form and, as such, still in development. We cannot therefore ... attach a precise definition to dance as art, for the time being, and in the interest of an unbiased, impartial view of the new world that is unfolding before our eyes, we should avoid the temptation of attaching definitions.»[2]

The implementation, however, of the self-assured and unquestioned model that was typical of that period, turned out to be problematic—especially when the utopian, or rather culturally optimistic, potential of dance met with specific relevant social and esthetic orders of theatrical and pedagogical dance practices. We observe tensions and expansions that discretely altered the model of modernization. From today's perspective, this requires confrontational and integrative modifications to the concept of modernism (and the opposite thereof).[3]

Within the current theoretical debate on the erosion of modern categories such as progressive and innovative,[4] the self-conception of modernism (and anti-modernism) loses validity and definitional potential; in terms of dance, modernism generally requires cultural as well as historical differentiation and contextualization.[5] The masquerades of modern dance in Salzburg, or to be precise, the formations and transformations of modern dance within the theatrical environment of the Salzburg Festival during the first half of the twentieth century, offer a selective perspective within these often institutionally justified or supported contextualizations. This is exemplified by the long-term activities of three Salzburg Modernists: Harald Kreutzberg, Grete Wiesenthal, and Margarete Wallmann.

## Institutionalization Debates

The history of modern dance (and ballet) performances in and outside of theaters, remains largely undocumented. Although modern dance dominated the contemporary imagination, the accompanying debates were dominated by discussions of visions and utopias, and less by the presence of modern dance or its function within theaters whose programs at that time were still largely comprised of ballet performances. Until representatives of modern dance began seeking opportunities for its integration into extant institutions during the course of the 1920s, the art form, with the smaller format *Podiumstanz* (podium dance) or *Konzerttanz* (concert dance), initially claimed (or was forced into) alternative venues and theaters. The *Tänzerkongresse* (dancer congresses) in Magdeburg (1927), Essen (1928), and Munich (1930) served as platforms for representatives of modern dance to meet and discuss artistic, pedagogical, social, and organizational concerns. A significant outcome of the first conference was the decision to join the *Deutscher Chorsänger- und Ballettverband* (German choir singer and ballet association). With amendments made to the statutes, the representatives of all styles—regardless of if they were freelance or theatre employees—now belonged under a single umbrella organization. The second congress in Essen made it possible for all ballet masters and dance directors of German-speaking state and city theaters to convene for the first time, and the result of the debate that ensued was a, «clear differentiation and separation of theater dance [*Theatertanz*] and concert dances [*Konzerttanz*].»[6] With this distinction established, modern dance was now regarded as on par with ballet, the attempts made to integrate the two, however, lacked determination and were only in-part successful.

## Esthetic Debates

Professional and organizational matters were not the only issues of debate at the Essen *Tänzerkongress*, there were also, and more importantly, discussions about conceptual esthetic topics, such as the social and esthetic balance between heater dance (ballet) and dance theater (modern dance), and about the relationship between solo and group dance. The topic of interest therefore, was the classification of genres and what this meant for the esthetic perspectives of dance in general, or better yet, about the contextual and structural contributions of modern dance to the dance culture of that time. According to prominent choreographer Kurt Jooss—who attempted to counteract the esthetic niche role of the modern dancers—the term *Tanztheater* should not be limited to modern dance but expanded to summarily include all dance arts.[7] Hans Brandenburg, with his remarks on solo vs. group, argued for a similar integration, and determined that these two presentation forms were not opposites, as solo bases itself on the activities of the ensemble. With this remark Brandenburg rehabilitated the solo—the modern dancer's typical form of expression—as relevant to groups, and established its individual and oft-perceived private dimension within the context of the traditional theater institutions.

## Scenic Realizations—<br>Harald Kreutzberg, Grete Wiesenthal,<br>Margarete Wallmann[8]

Pantomime is related to the solo in its expressiveness, accentuation of gestures, spatial effect, and the way it relates to the body, and was practiced as an innovative modern presentation format by artists including Max Reinhardt on the occasion of the Salzburg



Festival. Reinhardt's Salzburg productions, which were realized in close cooperation with Hugo von Hofmannsthal, featured performances by modern dancers including Harald Kreutzberg in pantomimic roles. In 1926 Kreutzberg performed, for example, Arlequino in Reinhardt's *Servant of Two Masters* (Carlo Goldoni), as well as the master of ceremonies and the dead prince in Reinhardt's stage production of Carlo Gozzi's *Turandot*. The newspaper *Neue Freie Presse* noted the following remarks on his performance:

«Mr. Kreuzberg [sic!] acts in the silent role of the master of ceremonies ... Kreuzberg is one of a very rare species of dance geniuses. Only very few of these are male. Nishinski was one of them. And Kreuzberg has more or less the same high status. The eloquence of his slim body is remarkable. The subtle nuances of his gestures and perfected dances are well balanced and accomplished. The arts of expression, form and continuity are always at play in even in his calm poses.»[9]

One year later, in 1927, Kreutzberg played Puck in Reinhardt's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and performed a solo version of the master of ceremonies in *Turandot* at a *Kammertanzabend* (evening of chamber dance) that he organized with Tilly Losch and Hedy Pfundmayr.[10]

With a representation that focused more on his specific attitude towards life than on the excessive emotion that had been the previous norm for expressive dance, Kreutzberg made dance history for nearly a half century without further altering or developing the art form. His expressive intention was supported by the clear conciseness of his forms and an intelligence of motion that allowed his body to express his vision while balancing notions of preconceived ideas and bodily stereotypes.

Grete Wiesenthal appeared for the first time at the Salzburg Festival as Schöne Perchtin in Richard Billinger's *Das Perchtenspiel*. In addition to this she performed a dance program to the music of Bach, Borodin, Brahms, Chopin, Liszt, Johann Strauss, and others, with Toni Birkmeyer. The ballet-trained Wiesenthal sisters (Grete and her younger sisters Elsa and Berta) made their debut in 1908 in Vienna with interpretations of the Viennese Waltz. Inspired by the music, and accentuating the flow of their motions with loosely swaying garments, the sisters combined classical dance technique with a self-developed technique of swinging the torso, limbs and head, and therewith set out to test the limits of stability and balance with spiral movements, producing, «more than ecstasy or delirium ... as if falling into the melody and rhythm.»[11] Their performance in Salzburg was reviewed as, «very graceful, pleasant, and at times enchanting» and, «Grete Wiesenthal and Toni Birkmeyer are masters of the Viennese style; they unite mimicked expression and painterly rhythm with technical perfection.»[12] Later—in the years 1930, 1939, 1946, 1952, and 1953—Grete Wiesenthal worked as a choreographer and movement director at the Salzburg Festival; between 1954 and 1956 she was in charge of the rhythmic arrangement in Hofmannsthal's *Jedermann*. In addition to her own creations, which frequently consisted of solo dances and pantomimes, these engagements demonstrated another facet of the modern dance repertoire: the group arrangement.

While from the 1930s onward Wiesenthal was primary involved in directing movement for theater actors (and at times dancers as well), Margarete Wallmann was, in keeping with the esthetic-conceptual debates of modernism, interested in the expressiveness and the multidimensional nature of danced group activities. As a former student of Mary Wigman (one of the leading protagonists of modern dance) and director of the Wigman School in Berlin since 1927, Wallmann was actively integrated within the contextual and strategic discussions at the *Tänzerkongresse*. With her own productions she continued to develop the choral principals of choreography with which Wigman had experimented in her *Totenmal* (performed in 1930 during the third *Tänzerkongress* in Munich).[13]

In 1931 Felix Emmel's mystery play *Das jüngste Gericht*, in which Margarete Wallmann presented her own conception of a contemporary «choral movement drama» (as described in the bill), premiered at the Salzburg Festival to the music of Georg Friedrich Händel.[14] The difficult group movements offered no concessions to ballet technique (which Wallmann had also studied) and avoided synchronous effects. Instead they were based on complex configurations that presented each dancer as an individual. The local press had a favorable reaction:

«We have repeatedly hosted outstanding solo dancers in Salzburg, but never had the opportunity to witness group dance as a significant developmental stage of modern expressive dance, and thus lack opportunity to compare it to large-scale mystery play productions that use dance as a means of presentation. Nevertheless, it left an impression, the impression being that Felix Emmel's five act movement drama ... appears lively and in some instances compelling, even without textual explanation.»[15]

*Das jüngste Gericht* reopened in 1932. In the same year Margarete Wallmann developed the choreography for Christoph Willibald's *Orpheus und Eurydike*—an opera she had already staged in 1933 with her own dance company. Between 1934 and 1937 she worked repeatedly as a choreographer in Salzburg, for spoken theater, and for opera productions with the Vienna State Opera Ballet, which she led from 1933 to 1938.[16]

Following the modern choreography of *Das jüngste Gericht*, Wallmann largely avoided experimental and radical innovations within scenic interpretations of the repertoire with which she was entrusted. As a more or less permanent member of those artistic teams (in Vienna and Milan), she felt committed to the directorship and audiences of the opera houses for which she worked, and took on a fairly institutionally and esthetically friendly attitude that influenced her work at the Salzburg Festival: She strived for a «complete theater» that integrated as many artistic forms of expression as possible. «Wallmann had ... a ‹sign-language beyond reality› in mind, in her arrangement of groups she nevertheless she appears to have (consciously or subconsciously) fallen back on the ballet choreographer's tools of the trade, with a more or less eclectic—but nevertheless effective—sampling of the stylistic elements of modern dance.»[17]

## Extra-Theatrical Approaches—<br>The Duncan School in Salzburg

Also to various degrees and over the course of many years, representatives of modern dance helped shape dance at the Salzburg Festival (or at least aligned themselves with its program), the only modern pedagogical institution was located just outside Salzburg,[18] and operated for a comparatively short period—from 1925 to 1935.[19] The Duncan School was, in accordance with original conceptions of modern dance, based on a confrontational reform concept. The decline of social and cultural values caused by industrialization at the beginning of the twentieth century had produced a break in social and cultural constraints and mechanisms of alienation. The motto, «back to nature» was also applied to a body that, undamaged by civilization, was intended to move rhythmically—that is to say mystically-holistically, and in unison with the cosmos. American dancer Isadora Duncan was one of the early representatives that sought to programmatically anchor education in a natural, rhythmic corporeality. Together with her younger sister Elizabeth, Isadora founded a boarding dance school in 1904 in Berlin-Grunewald. After several relocations, the Duncan School settled at a new site at Schloss Klessheim near Salzburg in 1925.[20]

«The school has been located at Schloss Klessheim near Salzburg for one year. It is surrounded by nature so magnificent that even Humboldt mentioned it as being among the world's most beautiful. Enjoying all benefits of a healthy climate in a lush environment, the school has recently put its great objective back to work from scratch; to educate children from a young age—and protected from all harm produced by these challenging times—into strong people, whose perfect notion of humanity is no longer an ideal, but rather made up of experiences that they carry with them in their blood.»[21]

The motion-related foundations of the Duncan School were characterized by simple movements (walking, running, jumping), and by exercises that invoked natural movements such as the motion of waves. Accompanied by classical music, instructors taught flowing movements that originated from the body's core. Students were encouraged to find their own authentic movements rather than simply imitate.[22] Contrary to Kreutzberg, the Duncan School was primarily concerned with the fundamental emotionality that underpinned the enactment of movements. Contrary to Wallmann, the emotional content of music, as experienced in flowing, continuous, physical movement, was prioritized. There was some overlap between the concepts of the Duncan School and of Wiesenthal, including a shared emphasis on a flow of movement carried by music, although the former favored the rhythm of nature while the latter accentuated the rhythm of the body's own swing.

The overview of the examples of dance activities surrounding the Salzburg Festival presented here illustrate the diversity of dynamic and affirmative potentials of the modern dance concepts developed during the first half of the twentieth century: While the idealistic approach that generally characterizes the inception of dance modernity was conserved by the reformatory pedagogy practiced by the Duncan School, those representatives of modern dance that shaped their own practices were apparently ready to act within the political, cultural, and esthetic-artistic developments of the time, as well as within the framework of institutions such as the Salzburg Festival. The utopian program of the Duncan School, which originally propagated progressiveness but had little future, illustrates the complex nature of dance modernity in Salzburg. This is also illustrated by the flexibility of artists whose activities in moving, dancing, and choreography presented modern dance in various disguises and masquerades.

1 Cf. Sabine Huschka, *Merce Cunningham und der Moderne Tanz. Körperkonzepte, Choreographie und Tanzästhetik* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2000), 17–18.

2 Translated for this essay from Hans Brandenburg, *Der moderne Tanz* (Munich: Georg Müller, 1921), 16–17.

3 Cf. Antje Senarclens de Grancy und Heidemarie Uhl, eds., *Moderne als Konstruktion. Debatten, Diskurse, Positionen um 1900* (Vienna: Passagen, 2001), 12.

4 Cf. Werner Suppanz und Heidemarie Uhl, eds., *Moderne als Konstruktion II. Debatten, Diskurse, Positionen um 1900* (Vienna: Passagen, 2006), 13.

5 One central dimension that must be differentiated (and framed within the following statements on selected Salzburg dance phenomena during the first half of the twentieth century) is the relationship between the individual and social that is always present within European (dance) history, and which—because as it is embedded within the consciousness of every dancer—also shaped the concepts and visions of modern dance. French dance historian Laure Gilbert examined this previously little-considered historicization. With her precise study of modern dance in the Third Reich, Gilbert facilitated the reintegration of dance within an equivocal, ambiguous, and perhaps even cryptic history that went beyond the usual polarizations attending the relationship between modern dance and National Socialism generally found in dance historiographies. Cf. Laure Guilbert, *Danser avec le IIIe Reich. Les danseurs modernes sous le nazisme* (Bruxelles: Éditions complexes, 2000).

6 Hedwig Müller and Patricia Stöckemann, eds., *Jeder Mensch ist ein Tänzer! Ausdruckstanz in Deutschland zwischen 1900 und 1945* (Gießen: Anabas, 1993), 90.

7 Kurt Jooss headed the choreography of Emilio Cavalieri's *Rappresentatione di anima, et di corpo* at the Salzburg Festival from 1968 to 1973; in 1968 the Folkwang Balet made a guest appearance with performances that included Jooss' *Der grüne Tisch* (1932).

8 The following performance dates relating to Kreutzberg, Wiesenthal, and Wallmann are based on the chronology by Josef Kaut in *Die Salzburger Festspiele 1920–1981* (Salzburg: Residenz, 1982).

9 Translated for this essay from *Neue Freie Presse* (August 22, 1926).

10 Kreutzberg once again performed a successful solo during the Salzburg Festival, albeit outside of the festival program, in 1932. Cf. Stephanie Schroedter, «Der Tanz bei den Salzburger Festspielen. Zufälle, Zwischenfälle und glückliche Fügungen,» in «*Prima la danza.*» *Festschrift für Sibylle Dahms*, eds. Gunhild Oberzaucher-Schüller, Daniel Brandenburg und Monika Woitas (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2004), 425–474, here 434.

11 Translated for this essay from Gunhild Oberzaucher-Schüller, «Der Freie Tanz in Wien bis 1938,» in *Österreich tanzt. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, eds. Andrea Amort and Mimi Wunderer-Gosch (Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 54–69, here 58.

12 Translated for this essay from *Neues Wiener Journal* (August 22, 1928).

13 Cf. Katja Schneider, «Très chère Wallfrau. Margarethe Wallmann,» in *Tanzen und tanzen und nichts als tanzen. Tänzerinnen der Moderne von Josephine Baker bis Mary Wigman*, ed. Amelie Soyka (Berlin: Aviva, 2004), 220–233.

14 A precise description can be found in Schneider, 2004, 228–229.

15 Translated for this essay from *Salzburger Volksblatt* (August 24, 1931).

16 In 1954 a ballet evening took place at Felsenreitschule, in 1955 Wallmann showed *Szenische Oratorien*, in 1960 she staged the mystery play *Mysterium von der Geburt des Herrn*. During World War II, Wallmann did not work in Salzburg; she emigrated in 1938. The interaction of the representatives of modern dance with National Socialist politics is multifaceted and complex (cf. Guilbert, 2000): Kreutzberg and Wiesenthal continued their careers (in Salzburg). Friderica Derra de Moroda, who could be seen as a young dancer in Salzburg in 1923, took over the leadership of the government-related KdF (*Kraft durch Freude*, or strength through joy) ballet in 1941, performing with the ensemble at the festival theater (but not in the Salzburg Festival) in 1942. Cf. Kreutzberg: Frank-Manuel Peter, ed., *Harald Kreutzberg* (Köln: Deutsches Tanzarchiv, 1995); and Derra de Moroda: http://forum.axishistory.com/viewtopic.php?t=177291 (last accessed March 23, 2016).

17 Translated for this essay from Schneider, 2004, 227.

18 Modern dance artists did in fact teach at the International Mozarteum Foundation; Kreutzberg and Derra de Moroda, for example, taught at the Summer Academy, in 1932 and 1934 respectively.

19 Cooperation with Salzburg institutions was selective: In 1932 Max Reinhardt cast several Duncan students as elves for his performance of *A Mid Summer Night's Dream* in the Klessheim summer palace and garden. Cf. Lore Lindig, «Interessante, etwas abenteuerliche Jahre...,» in *Isadora & Elizabeth Duncan in Deutschland*, ed. Frank-Manuel Peter (Cologne: Wienand, 2000), 144–151, here 149.

20 The sisters agreed that Elizabeth would run the school alone sometime around 1909.

21 Translated for this essay from Ludwig Steinmetz, «Arbeit und Kunst der Elizabeth Duncan-Schule in Schloss Klessheim bei Salzburg,» in *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration: illustr. Monatshefte für moderne Malerei, Plastik, Architektur, Wohnungskunst u. künstlerisches Frauen-Arbeiten*, no. 59 (1926/27): 384–390, here 390. http://digi.ub-uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/dkd1926_1927 (0398 © Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg) (last accessed March 22, 2016).

22 Cf. also: http://www.duncantanz.de/index1.htm (last accessed March 22, 2016).





# Of Outsiders and Emigrants
## Erika Giovanna Klien and Oskar Kokoschka

During the course of the twentieth century totalitarian regimes displaced millions of people. As a result, the state of exile has become an integral component of the experience of the modern and postmodern eras. Can exile be defined as—in addition to the involuntarily flight from your homeland—the experience of becoming marginalized within your own country? What do these two experiences have in common, and how are they dependent on one another? I would like to examine this question through analysis of the biographies of Oskar Kokoschka and Erika Giovanna Klien. I am concerned with both the struggle of emotional *Heimatlosigkeit* (homelessness) that Thomas Mann attributed to all sentient Germans in 1933, and the specific cultural landscape that existed in Austria between the turn of the century and 1938.[1] Last but not least, this text is about the events that led to the two protagonists, who both felt marginalized, into exile. The experiences of these individuals embody those of countless other artists from various fields who found it difficult to find recognition for their work in Austria, and would eventually take a chance at a fresh start in exile. For those who survived, returning after 1945 was in most cases out of the question: Austrian post-war politics, for one, did not encourage the return of expatriates, most individuals had lost too much, and «home» changed too much for them to want to return.

Between 1900 and 1955 the shape of Austrian government changed five times, a circumstance that had a clear effect on Austrian cultural identity. The future expatriates had been raised in vast and multicultural Austria-Hungary: Erika Giovanna Klien was born in 1900 in Borgo Valsugana, Trentino—formerly Austria-Hungary, today Italy. She grew up in various regions, including Salzburg, and eventually settled with her family in Vienna. Oskar Kokoschka's parents were born in Prague and Hollenstein an der Ybbs, Lower Austria, respectively. He himself—born in Lower Austria—was raised in Vienna, where he would later study. The generation born between 1880 and 1900 experienced the 1919 First Republic—chiefly composed of German-speaking Austrians, many of whom dreamed of a *Großdeutschland* (greater Germany)—as adults. In 1934 that government was succeeded by Austrofascism (the co-called *Ständestaat,* or corporate state), which ostracized many artists, musicians, writers, and scientists, and made them feel like foreigners in their own country. Some, like Klien and Kokoschka, fled as early as 1934, or even before. Many however, wouldn't leave until the last minute, in the wake of the 1938 *Anschluss* (annexation) of Austria to National Socialist Germany. After 1945, Austria once again became a republic, but the country wouldn't return to sovereignty until 1955 with the signing of the

*Staatsvertag* (state contract). Austria had changed completely, forfeiting a central component of its identity and cultural diversity with the expulsion and destruction of its cultural and scientific elite.

## Artistic Beginnings

Oskar Kokoschka first exhibited his work at the Vienna *Kunstschau* in 1908. He was, at the time, still a student at the Kunstgewerbeschule (school of arts and crafts) and had received the opportunity to exhibit from his teacher, Carl Otto Czeschka. Kokoschka showed life drawings, the poster design for the *Kunstschau*, *Mädchen unter Weinranken* (Girl under Vine Branches, 1908), and the tapestry design for *Die Traumtragenden* (The Dream Carriers, 1908), a triptych, and his major work at that time. The latter was hung in a prominent position, in a polygonal bay at the end of the exhibition's hall number 16, but did not receive very good reviews. Critic Adalbert Franz Seligmann warned: «People with taste will experience a shock to the nervous system.»[2] Another reviewer wrote: «Kokoschka saw Gauguin, van Gogh, and Röhrich. This created some confusion for him. His gigantic room divider is a ridiculous triptych. A naive ancient Peruvian or American interpretation. Kokoschka's drawing—nothing is more laughable.»[3] Art historian Richard Muther had mixed feelings: «Mr. Kokoschka, your tapestry designs are abominable: Oktoberfest pasture, raw indian art, ethnographic museum, Gauguin gone mad—what do I know. And yet I find myself thinking: It's been years since I've witnessed such an interesting debut ... I must remember the name Kokoschka. For he whose art is so cannibalistic at twenty two, could potentially become an original and serious artist at thirty.»[4] Kokoschka sold *Die Traumtragenden* to the Wiener Werkstätte, which briefly, before losing it, used the piece as decoration for Cabaret Feldermaus. Today, based on a caricature and critics' references to Paul Gauguin, Edvard Munch, Vincent van Gogh, and ethnographic art, we can only imagine what this early major work would have looked like. Similar to the early 1908 work *Die Träumenden Knaben* (The Dreaming Boys), the design for the tapestry presumably consisted of linear drawings of figures with expressive movements, reminiscent in its reduction to symbols, but possessing a different kind of drama than his earlier *Bildgedicht* (visual poem) *Träumende Knaben*.

The following year Kokoschka wrote his first stage plays, and therewith provoked a successful scandal at the 1909 *Internationalen Kunstschau.* That same year, at the suggestion of architect Adolf Loos, Kokoschka also made a number of portraits. Loos supported the young artist, and procured around seventy commissions for him between 1909 and 1914. While the practice of the Wiener Werkstätte, with its focus on ornamental design and handcraft, had been formative to Kokoschka, Loos encouraged him to leave the arts and crafts behind and become a painter. In one of Kokoschka's 1909 letters he expressed the desire to paint a *nervenirrsinniges* (neurally insane) portrait, and—corresponding to emerging psychoanalytic theories—his renderings in-fact seemed more telling of his subjects' mental state than their physical appearances.[5] Kokoschka's subjects were rarely fond of their portraits, and Loos often ended up buying them. Disappointed by the reviews of his presentations at the 1908 and 1909 *Kunstschau*, Kokoschka went looking for new artistic opportunities and audiences. He found them not in Vienna, but in Berlin.

When Erika Giovanna Klien began her career as an artist in the early 1920s, there was a palpable pioneering spirit within Vienna's cultural scene that imbued fine arts, music, philosophy, and the natural sciences. Art historian Dieter Bogner adds: «The twelve-tone method, gestalt theory, structure-based art history, positivist philosophy, constructivism,



and kinetism were all path-breaking contributions to twentieth century Austrian culture and science. The frontrunners of the time all shared an analytic, structure-oriented, or constructivist method of thought and design. They picked up on theoretical and artistic concepts, and the efforts of the first wave of Viennese modernism at the turn of the century. This creative milieu was involved in an intense exchange with the development of the European avant-garde.»[6] At the same time, these frontrunners had to overcome a conservative climate that hung over Vienna. This conservatism was demonstrated by the reception of the work of Franz Čižek—Klien's teacher at the Vienna Kunstgewerbeschule. Having inspired an entire generation of students to experiment with forms using various techniques in his ornamental morphology class since 1911, the course was ordered to take a more general direction in 1924; thereafter Čižek slowly withdrew from his teaching activities.[7]

The work that came out of Čižek's class was not limited to composition exercises on paper, but included designs for fabrics, wallpapers, jewelry, and fashion, as well as concepts for books, menu cards, and illustrations. Switching between arts and crafts, painting and sculpture, and taking an interdisciplinary approach that touched on the fine arts, music, theater, literature, and the sciences, was not unusual in Vienna at that time. The practice of designing free ornamental works led to the development of a kind of a two-dimensional art that was a significant step for the development of non-representational art in Austria.[8] Čižek developed a didactic concept based on turn of the century progressive education in which the notion of rhythm as the basic factor of human existence was of central importance.

Erika Giovanna Klien moved to Vienna in 1918/19 with her family, and soon thereafter began attending Čižek's course at the Kunstgewerbeschule, where at that time expressionist form experiments were being carried out. Beginning in 1920, the class began creating works in a style that was obviously influenced by Cubism and Futurism, and would come to be known as Viennese Kinetism. At the first presentation of the students' work in 1921 at the Museum for Art and Industry, a critic for *Cicerone*, who was still using the term «state school of Expressionism,» estimated the exhibition as the most important artistic event in Vienna at that time.[9] Klien was recognized early on as an outstanding student in the class, yet she came upon few opportunities to exhibit outside of class group presentations. Photographs of Čižek's 1923 and 1924 annual class exhibitions show works by Klien hung along the entire length of the side and back walls, including the now missing frieze *America* (pre 1923), an early example of her Americanism. Like many of her contemporaries, Klien was fascinated by the new world and its (imagined) possibilities. She repeatedly depicted skyscrapers in combination with large advertising typography and constructivist elements such as ladders and construction cranes. Of all Čižek's students, her work was most obviously informed by Constructivism, in part due to having seen work by Hungarian artists such as Lajos Kassák and Béla Uitz in Vienna.

Theater played was of vital importance not only for Kokoschka, but also for Klien. She had ambitions to be an actress, and in 1924 designed a kinetic puppet theater, complete with designs for stages, backdrops, and figures, for which she wrote the now lost play *Der Kirchenmensch* (the church person).[10] Despite her focus on theater—which was shared by other Čižek students including Marianne («My») Ullmann and Elisabeth Karlinsky—Čižek's class did not take part in Friedrich Kiesler's 1924 *Internationale Ausstellung moderner Theatertechnik* (international exhibition of modern theater technology) in Vienna. Čižek had failed to reply to an invitation from exhibition management to take part.[11] For reasons subject to speculation, the work of Klien and her fellow students was likewise absent from

the *Internationale Kunstausstellung* (international art exhibition), which was organized by Hans Tietze and held at the Secession that same year.

## Esthetic Exile: The Outsiders' Position

In 1910, Adolf Loos introduced Kokoschka to Herwarth Walden, who had recently founded the literary magazine *Der Sturm*. This, together with Walden's Sturm-Galerie, which opened in 1912, became a central platform for new art forms that ranged from Expressionism and Cubism, to Futurism and Constructivism. Kokoschka worked alongside Walden from the very beginning, and for a while was even co-editor of the magazine. Between 1910 and 1914 Kokoschka commuted between Vienna and Berlin regularly. He found Berlin society more open to new art, and encountered a stimulating artistic environment there. Kokoschka created countless illustrations for *Der Sturm*, and developed a new pictorial language. His figures became embedded in a crystalline line structure that continues like a rampant into their interiors independent form.

After being severely injured during service in World War I, Kokoschka returned to Vienna to convalesce in August of 1915. He was sent back to the front in July of 1916, and suffered shell shock one month later. This time he was able to convalesce in Berlin, and moved to Dresden a few months thereafter. It was not only Kokoschka who found the dynamism of German cities appealing in comparison to backward-looking Vienna; many authors and musicians, such as Arnold Schönberg, moved to Berlin in the 1920s because their art had failed to resonate in Vienna.[12] Kokoschka found new inspiration in the German capital, where he created several portraits. In early 1916, while in Vienna following his initial injury, Kokoschka created a portrait that demonstrated the shift in style that had been brought on by his wartime experiences: a pastose manner of painting that originated not from a contour drawing, but rather worked its way from the inside out, had replaced his earlier linear depictions. This shift in style began in Vienna and not, as has often reported, in Berlin.[13] The painting *Dame mit Papagei* (Lady with Parrot) depicts journalist and author Maria Lazar, author of several novels under the pseudonym Esther Grenen, who went into exile in Denmark in 1933.

In Dresden Kokoschka found a circle of kindred spirits among a group made up of primarily authors and actors. That year he also signed a lucrative contract with Berlin art dealer Paul Cassirer, and in 1919 became a professor at the Dresden art academy. Kokoschka's new status was evidenced in his art by a new eagerness to experiment—he now, in the vein of Brücke painters and the 1919 Dresden Secession, began to paint more two-dimensionally and with intense, bright colors.

Kokoschka's theatrical plays were performed at venues including the dada stage of the Zürich Cabaret Voltaire in 1917, the Dresden Albert Theater, and in Max Reinhardt's Berlin *Kammerspiele* in 1919. He was no longer attracted to Vienna. Answering a letter from Egon Schiele asking him to participate in a Neukunstgruppe exhibition in 1918, Kokoschka wrote: «In response to your kind invitation I politely inform you that I ... will not participate in an exhibition in Vienna, and have not done so for many years. As there is no indication that the attitude of the Viennese art scene has improved in regard to my work, I have no desire to ever feel at home there by showing even the smallest of my works.»[14] Kokoschka had nothing to gain from participation in the show, he had found financial stability, acclaim, and friends in Dresden. His contract with Cassirer enabled him to travel across Europe and North Africa between 1923 and 1931 to paint cityscapes and landscapes. His period of experimentation was, for now, over.



After Erika Giovanna Klien's 1924 graduation from the Kunstgewerbeschule, she struggled to stay financially afloat with commercial commissions, including designs for surcharge stamps and book covers, and began working as a teacher at the Duncan School in Klessheim near Salzburg, in 1925. It is notable that it was largely women who studied with Čižek and who went onto develop his method. Few managed to establish careers as working artists. The fact that Čižek regarded his pedagogic work as artistic creation influenced several of his students to become educators.

The ambitions of the Duncan School corresponded with those of Čižek's Kinetism in many regards; both schools were concerned with providing a holistic education that was based on expressive force and the rhythm of movement, and consistent with the development of physical and mental powers. Because of its emancipation from narrative contexts, modern dance had become interesting for the visual arts towards the end of the nineteenth century. Dancers were popular subjects in Kinetism. Organist, musicologist, and composer Max Merz, who had led the Duncan School alongside Elizabeth Duncan since 1910, recognized this connection, and asked Čižek to recommend a competent teacher. Čižek recommended his star student, Erika Giovanna Klien.[15]

Isadora and Elizabeth Duncan had established the first Duncan School in Berlin in 1904. Four years earlier the sisters had left the United States with their mother and two other siblings. With her new style of dance—uncorseted and barefoot, in loose clothing, and with free rather than choreographed movements—Isadora Duncan soon achieved success in London, Paris, and Berlin. The Duncan School was a boarding school that fostered girls' bodies and spirits, and offered dance classes and drawing lessons. «Kinetist» Klien began leading the drawing class in 1925. After having moved from several other locations, the Duncan School moved to Schloss Klessheim that same year. Klien was hired as a full-time teacher in 1926, but wasn't happy in Klessheim. She would have rather been a working artist, and missed her Vienna friends, and the more open artistic climate of the capital. Klien mailed *Klessheimer Sendboten* (Klessheim Emissaries) to her teacher Čižek from Salzburg. These combinations of texts and drawings were sent as letters. Twenty-one *Sendboten* remain intact. They are characterized by the simultaneous depiction of several scenes that combine textual and visual elements in a collage-like manner. The *Sendboten*, which are rather private in nature and have diary-like features, count among Klien's most interesting works from this period. The drawings possess a dynamic line structure, and jagged black lines often separate the various scenes in which Klien plays the leading part. The scenes themselves, which depict sequences of motion through overlapping and scaling, have an evident relation to Kinetism.

Klien's *Sendboten* voiced her homesickness for Vienna as well as her lovesickness and desire for recognition. Her *Politische Nachrichten* (Political News) (ca. 1926/27) supplied a recipe for Kinetism, with the instructions: «Please stir well!» and: «There is no guarantee that it's edible or digestible.» Another 1927 drawing entitled *Skandal-Nachrichten* (Scandalous News), wherein she depicts herself as the «Klessheim Virgin» (referring to Joan of Arc), holding a palette as a shield while a furious Salzburg mob attempts to stab her with an oversized pencil, voices the lack of acceptance with which she felt her work had been received. In the drawing, an artist with a palette reading: «long live honest skill» leads an angry mob. In the top part of the drawing Klien portrayed herself creating a life drawing in a kinetic style, while the same artist who is leading the mob at the bottom is faithfully composing a naturalistic study. The drawing demonstrates the discrepancy between their styles. It also describes the development of international modernism and the artistic landscape of Salzburg, which continued to hold on to aspects of realistic naturalistic

traditions even after the 1925 and 1928 *Sonderbund* exhibitions had brought international art to that city.

In 1928 Elisabeth Karlinsky substituted as a drawing teacher at the Klessheim school for Klien while the latter gave birth to a son, who had been fathered by married Jewish chemist Walter Simmel (also father of Johannes Mario Simmel, a student at the Duncan School and later a well-known author). Walter Klien was raised by foster parents and would go on to become a pianist. In 1929 Klien moved to the United States to forget about her unrequited love for Simmel and in the hopes of finding more recognition for her art.

During the 1920s Modernist efforts in Salzburg began to wane.[16] This was to some extent the case for the Duncan School as well. Max Merz, who had written about the necessity of racial hygiene as early as 1912, had begun implementing his ideas within the school program.[17] Merz and the Duncan sisters shared an interest in Nordic myths and rites, and Merz regarded folk culture as true art. Reinhard Harrich writes that: «This moment of anti-Modernism identified him [Merz] with Nazi ideology, for whose purpose he let himself be used.»[18] In 1936 the school moved to Munich, where it remains today.

## Emigration

During the 1920s, Erika Giovanna Klien experienced more success outside of Austria than at home. In 1923 and 1924 her works were represented in Čižek class group exhibitions in the United States and Paris, and in 1926 Katherine S. Dreier selected one of her works for Société Anonyme's *International Exhibition of Modern Art* at the Brooklyn Museum. The exhibition later travelled to Buffalo, New York and Toronto, Canada. At the suggestion of Marcel Duchamp, the Société Anonyme purchased several of Klien's works.[19] It is possible that this success was a deciding factor in her 1929 decision to emigrate to the United States.

On December 12, 1929 Erika Giovanna Klien wrote her mother in Purkersdorf, near Vienna, these enthusiastic words from New York: «Every Wednesday night New York society's best get together—I am amazed—at how many people I know in N.Y.—and I am having the peculiar experience—that I am much better known in New York than in Austria—as a result of the many exhibitions and reviews—I've had here—I'm getting offers to exhibit on every corner—I will paint a lot and exhibit in the spring ... I am doing wonderfully—I am successful and think—I can build a career here—I haven't been this hopeful in a long time—as since I started working here—especially after the discouraging time I've had in Austria—this is like a salvation for me.»[20] These hopes would not be realized. Klien had to rely on teaching at various New York art schools to earn a living in the United States as well. She had her first—and during her lifetime, only—solo exhibition at the New School for Social Research in 1930.[21] Klien struggled to keep afloat in New York with teaching jobs and commercial art commissions, and her art developed towards abstract diagrams. New York inspired her to create kinetic depictions of city streets and subway tunnels. In 1934, after a long trip across the United States with her mother and sister, Klien began introducing Native American influences into her work, creating pieces like *Driller in Motion* (1951), which in terms of color and form is reminiscent of pre-Columbian art.

Klien established a network in the United States that helped her survive and feel comfortable. She contacted Duncan alumnae, and in 1932 received a commission to create a mural in composer Leopold Stokowski's stairwell. His second wife, Evangeline Stokowski, heir to Johnson & Johnson and an influential patron of the arts, introduced Klien to musician and light artist Thomas Wilfred in 1935. Klien was very interested in the Clavilux, which he had invented. The machine created light projections, and was especially intriguing within the context of her theater work at the New York Dalton School, where she had been teaching for three years. «I designed a stage—that is nothing but an empty cube—the fly system however is a complex structure with a lot of rolls—rolled screens—that when dropped divide the space into countless possibilities—slides or simply light can be projected onto the screens—or nothing at all—that makes up the architectural structure—the division of space—the rolls I imagine as being operated electronically—the pressing of numbered buttons changes how the space is divided—so fast and nearly inaudibly—like light projections—it all reminds me of my kinetic puppet theater—in which the background was supposed to move on two rolls—I will use this idea too—but differently—using light.»[22] This idea was presumably never realized. In 1940 Klien lost her teaching position and was, for a while, financially dependent on her sister. After the war, she briefly resumed teaching before stopping again in 1951 for health reasons. Klien died in 1957 in New York. Her chance for a fresh start in the United States—based on the 1920s success of the Čižek school group exhibition—was not as successful as she had anticipated, and her work was forgotten in both the United States and in Austria. It would not be until 1975 that—as a result of several exhibitions and publications—Kinetism and Erika Giovanna Klien were slowly rediscovered.[23]

Oskar Kokoschka, who returned to Vienna in 1931 after travelling across Europe and North Africa, left again for Prague in 1934 after his mother's death. He fell in love and remained there until 1938. Kokoschka, like Klien, had not been forced to flee. He left the country because he was unsettled by the events that had taken place in Austria and, similar to Klien, hoped to achieve artistic success in Prague. Kokoschka had been commissioned to portray the President of Czechoslovakia, Thomáš Garrigue Masaryk. The fact that he had no false hopes regarding the political developments of that time became apparent in his 1934 lecture at the Austrian *Werkbund*, where he warned that: «Today's seeming prosperity is entirely thanks to the modern war industry. The next war will not allow for another game of hide-and-seek, it won't be able to be dodged, not even in neutral countries. First it will affect the lower classes, and then the upper classes of all sedentary peoples. A war that threatens to turn everyone against each other.»[24] In Prague Kokoschka became the unintentional focus of émigré circles, which in 1937 went as far as naming the Oskar Kokoschka Bund after him. Kokoschka himself never quite saw himself as an émigré in his father's hometown of Prague. In protest of the *Degenerate Art* exhibition, he created *Self-portrait of a Degenerate Artist* in 1937. Therein he portrayed himself looking pensive and with defiantly crossed arms. In the background, Kokoschka painted a person wandering through a landscape, perhaps a symbol for the many refugees that fled Germany and Austria. One year later, he himself became a refugee, and escaped to Great Britain with his girlfriend Olda Palkovská, whom he married in 1941.

After his escape to England, Kokoschka began to process the political events of the past years in his art. He also became involved in the Free German League of Culture, of which he became president in November 1938, and the Free Austria Movement. He aided Germans and Austrians who had been classified as «hostile foreigners» and interned in camps. His self-perception as an émigré or expatriate was changing. According to art historian Keith Holz: «The fit of such terms loosens when one asks whether his years in Prague and England comprise experiences so different from his move in 1910 from an intolerant Vienna to Berlin or from his travels between 1927 and 1931 as an itinerant painter producing landscapes to be marketed through his dealer. To adequately describe his early twentieth century relocations, one would have to draw upon the vocabulary that has recently been brought into currency to describe the contingency of home and the multiple

severances from place more common to the refugees, travelers, tourists, migrants, nomads, transients and displaced persons of the latter part of this century. Moreover, Kokoschka's adoption of guises such as ‹knight errant,› ‹happy tramp› and ‹emigrant› during earlier phases of his life betrays his own chameleon-like reinventions of his identity amid successive migratory displacements.»[25]

Kokoschka created a total of nine political allegories while in England; most of these expressed criticism of Great Britain's pre-war appeasement policy that ultimately led to the division of Czechoslovakia between the German Reich, Poland, and Hungary. Kokoschka had received Czech citizenship from President Masaryk in gratitude for the portrait he had painted. A new Czech citizen, Kokoschka felt a connection to his adopted country that arose from his wife's and his own paternal heritage. It also, conveniently, saved him from internment in England. Kokoschka's political paintings touch on the British tradition of political satire as exercised by artists including William Hogarth, James Gillray, and George Cruikshank. The allegory *Anschluss–Alice in Wonderland* (1942) refers to Hitler's 1938 march into Austria: three gentlemen—the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, a German Wehrmacht soldier, and a portly bishop—mime the Chinese monkeys that refuse to hear, see, and speak. They face an allegory of the naked truth locked away behind barbed wire. The depiction of street battles and the burning city of Vienna in the background are reminiscent of the civil war of 1934, in which Austria lost its political independence. Kokoschka never showed interest in party politics: «Back then I painted a series of ‹political› paintings, not because I was politically active, but with the intention of opening other people's eyes to how I saw the war.»[26]

Kokoschka later took on British citizenship and did not return to Austria after the war.[27] Going back to a divided, shattered country proved too difficult an undertaking for a great number of émigrés. Instead, many remained in their host countries, permanent residents in their places of exile. They continued to stand out, however, because they saw everything from the point of view of an outsider, and instinctively sought to compare their new «homelands» with their native countries. Vilém Flusser, an émigré himself, attempted to put a positive spin on the negative connotations of loss and the unfamiliar by defining these sensations as «the migrant's freedom:» «When the cotton blanket of habit is pulled away you begin to realize things. Everything becomes unusual, monstrous, literally ‹unspeakable.› ... Exile ... turns you into a revolutionary, if for the mere purpose of being able to live in it.»[28]

After many years in their respective host countries, Kokoschka and Klien lost their fresh take on life abroad. For Klien, lack of recognition for her work and financial difficulties limited her experience of the «migrant's freedom.» For Kokoschka, Great Britain ultimately remained a station—an important one where he created major works and found friends, but not a permanent one. He finally found his place of permanent residence in 1953 in Villeneuve on Lake Geneva.



1 Thomas Mann, *Leiden an Deutschland. Tagebüchblätter aus den Jahren 1933 und 1934* (Los Angeles: Privatdruck der Pazifischen Presse, 1946), 58.

2 Adalbert Franz Seligmann, «Die Kunstschau 1908,» in *Neue Freie Presse*, no. 15727, Vienna (June 2, 1908): 14.

3 Translated for this essay from Unknown, «Kunstschau 1908,» in *Wiener Abendpost*, supplement to *Wiener Zeitung*, no. 132, Vienna (June 9, 1908).

4 Translated for this essay from Richard Muther, «Die Kunstschau,» in *Deutsches Volksblatt*, morning edition, no. 2049, Vienna, (June 6, 1908): 1.

5 Kokoschka, letter to Emma Bacher, April 27, 1909, in: Olda Kokoschka und Heinz Spielmann, eds., *Oskar Kokoschka. Briefe I, 1905–1919* (Düsseldorf: Claassen, 1984), 10.

6 Translated for this essay from Dieter Bogner, «Erika Giovanna Klien: Form, Struktur, Dynamik,» in Bernhard Leitner, ed., *Erika Giovanna Klien. Wien New York 1900–1957*, exh. cat., (Vienna: Museum für angewandte Kunst, 2001), 8.

7 Monika Platzer, «Kinetismus = Pädagogik – Weltanschauung – Avantgarde,» in Monika Platzer und Ursula Storch, eds., *Kinetismus. Wien entdeckt die Avantgarde*, exh. cat., (Vienna: Wien Museum/ Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2006), 25.

8 Ibid., 14.

9 H. G., «Eine staatliche Schule für Expressionismus in Wien,» in *Der Cicerone. Monatszeitschrift für Künstler, Kunstfreunde und Sammler* (1921): 452.

10 Cf. Barbara Lesák, «Der Wiener Theaterkinetismus,» in Platzer und Storch, 2006, 138–146, esp. 140–143.

11 Ibid.

12 Cf., among others, Hans Bisanz, «Österreichische Kunst der Zwischenkriegszeit – Hoffnung und Enttäuschung,» in *Die uns verließen. Österreichische Maler und Bildhauer der Emigration und Verfolgung*, exh. cat., (Vienna: Belvedere, 1980), 16.

13 Cf., among others, Agnes Husslein-Arco and Alfred Weidinger, eds., *Oskar Kokoschka. Träumender Knabe—Enfant terrible*, exh. cat., (Vienna: Belvedere, 2008), 256.

14 Oskar Kokoschka, letter to Egon Schiele, January 6, 1918, in: Kokoschka und Spielmann, 1984, 281.

15 Oskar Kokoschka, *Mein Leben* (Vienna: Metroverlag, 2008), 185.

15 Harald Krejci, «Kinetismus und der Tanz – Zur Choreographie einiger Zusammenhänge,» in Gerald Bast et al., eds., *Wiener Kinetismus*, exh. cat., (Vienna: Belvedere/Vienna: Springer, 2011), 72–73; Reinhard Harrich, «Die kinetische Schule und der Klesheimer Sendbote,» in *Schule der bewegten Körper. Isadora & Elizabeth Duncan und Erika Giovanna Klien in Salzburg*, exh. cat., (Salzburg: Romanischer Keller (Hypo)/Salzburg: Schatzkammer Land Salzburg, 2001), 12; on the Duncan-Schule cf. Claudia Jeschke's essay in this publication.

16 Cf., among others, Nikolaus Schaffer, «Kurzer Höhenflug und langsames Stranden. Oppositionen innerhalb des Kunstvereins: ‹Wassermann› and ‹Sonderbund›,» in *150 Jahre Kunstverein. Kunst und Öffentlichkeit*, exh. cat., (Salzburg: Kunstverein, 1994), 115–143.

17 Lilian Karina, «Art and Culture under National Socialism,», chap. 2 in Lilian Karina and Marion Kant, eds., *Hitler's Dancers: German Modern Dance and the Third Reich* (New York, Berghahn Books, 2004), 33–34.

18 «Die Elizabeth Duncan-Schule in Salzburg,» in Reinhard Harrich, 2001, 9.

19 «Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte», in Leitner 2001, 17.

20 Erika Giovanna Klien, letter to her mother, December 12, 1929, in Leitner 2001, 85.

21 Erika Giovanna Klien, letter to her mother, December 12, 1929, in Leitner 2001, 85.

22 Erika Giovanna Klien, letter to her mother, 1935, in Leitner 2001, 100.

23 In 1975 artist Bernhard Leitner published his first essay on Kinetism and in the same year art dealer Michael Pabst showed Kinetism in his Vienna gallery. Thereafter the following publications, among others, were published: Marietta Mautner Markhof, *Erika Giovanna Klien, 1900–1957*, exh. cat., (Vienna: Museum moderner Kunst; Vienna: Nebehay, 1987); Leitner 2001; Platzer and Storch, 2006; Gerald Bast et al., eds., *Wiener Kinetismus*, 2011.

24 Translated for this essay from Oskar Kokoschka, «Vortrag im Österreichischen Werkbund,» in Heinz Spielmann, ed., *Oskar Kokoschka. Das schriftliche Werk*, vol. 4: *Politische Äußerungen* (Hamburg: Hans Christians, 1976), 107.

25 Keith Holz, «Kokoschka in London, 1938–45,» in *Exiles + Emigrés. The Flight of European Artists from Hitler*, exh. cat., (Los Angeles: County Museum of Art, et al./New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), 88.

26 Kokoschka, 2008, 250.

27 Ibid, 257.

28 Translated for this essay from Vilém Flusser, «Exil und Kreativität,» in Vilém Flusser, *Von der Freiheit des Migranten. Einsprüche gegen Nationalismus* (Bensheim: Bollmann), 105.





# A Year-Round Art Academy for Salzburg?

This text provides an opportunity to elaborate on the long-term project «Global Academy?» and anchor it within a historical context. This research and networking project from the Salzburg International Summer Academy of Fine Arts is dedicated to global developments in the fields of innovative art education. It addresses the idea for a year-round Salzburg-based academy from different contemporary and historical points of view. Within this article I distinguish between different academy models: the public art academy, responsible for formal art education in the framework of a tertiary education sector; the academy as an institution for adult education, as in the case of the Salzburg International Summer Academy of Fine Arts; and finally postgraduate studies such as the Rijksakademie in Amsterdam and the Wiels Contemporary Art Center artist-in-residence program in Brussels. As these considerations have grown out of my role as the director of the Salzburg International Summer Academy, I offer no «objective or distanced» scientific view.

I first investigate Salzburg's historical points of reference, then touch on the history of the Mozarteum, Salzburg's art university, and finally elaborate on the history of the founding of the Salzburg International Summer Academy of Fine Arts and its principles. I raise questions such as: when, why, and for what target audience were the three public art universities for fine arts in Austria founded? I then present the essential features of the ongoing «Global Academy?» project, to suggest a contour of what the International Summer Academy could look like in ten years time. The text addresses several options for a year-round academy, including a year-round International Summer Academy and a department for visual arts at the Mozarteum University.

## The 1840s: The Founding of Salzburg as a Cultural City

The 1840s were an especially significant moment in the cultural and social life of the city of Salzburg. Many of the ideas and institutions that have gone on to shape this city had their origins in this era. The Mozarteum was founded on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Mozart with the aim of galvanizing the Salzburg music scene. In 1842 there was a simultaneous public initiative to erect a Mozart monument by Ludwig Schwanthaler on present-day Mozartplatz.[1] The Salzburger Kunstverein was founded in 1844. It envisioned itself as an institution for public education dedicated to giving exposure

to both local and international fine artists. Tourism also became fashionable in the nineteenth century. This continues to shape the city to this day. Mozart, the beauty of the baroque city, and the surrounding environs, were and still are, the most attractive marketing instruments of «Mozart's city.» Institutionally speaking, this is still palpable in the city's concentration on musical and theatre within the cultural life and the prominent international position of the Salzburg Festival.

## The Mozarteum University

The Mozarteum University goes back to the founding of the Cathedral Music Association and the Mozarteum in the year 1841. In 1914 it was turned into the Public Conservatory Mozarteum, a public school.[2] In 1998 the former conservatory finally became the Salzburg Mozarteum University as we know it today.[3] The contemporary focus of the university is on music, opera, and theater. The department for fine arts was founded in 1976. This offers only training in art instruction and is of little relevance beyond the Salzburg region. There are currently four art classes, but no chair for art history or theory. Prospective art educators are also required to study an additional subject not only art, and therefore have little time to spend in the studio. It is not surprising that few internationally renowned artists—such as Erwin Wurm, who only attended the Mozarteum at the beginning of his studies—were educated there.

## The Founding of the Salzburg International Summer Academy of Fine Arts

The idea for a «real» year-round art academy for fine arts in Salzburg has been around since 1919/20, when artist Anton Faistauer, who foresaw the *Salzburg Kunstverein's Künstlerhaus* as a trial run thereof, began propagating the idea. In 1919 there was a brief offering of artist workshops for art and fashion founded by the architect Georg Schmidhammer on Haydnstrasse 6. Painter and graphic artist Emma Schlangenhausen, sculptor Hilde Exner, and bookbinder Irma Lux taught there.[4] Faistauer also requested a state gallery—as a pendant to the art academy—to strengthen the city of Salzburg as a location of the fine arts.[5] Art dealer Friedrich Welz revived the idea for an academy in the 1950s. Despite his participation in the National Socialist art thefts, he was probably one of the most important and influential actors in the field of fine arts in Salzburg from the late 1940s until the late 1970s. Welz conceived of fostering an appreciation for fine art in the city also for for commercial reasons. He had been pursuing the idea for a permanent art academy, which would be led by Oskar Kokoschka, since 1950, when he brought Kokoschka to Salzburg to paint one of his famous city portraits. After many years of exile in Prague, London, and Switzerland, Kokoschka had not ruled out returning to Austria. He did not, however, consider a year-round academy attractive; at maximum he wanted to dedicate a series of summer weeks to teaching, and have the rest of the year free for his own artistic endeavors.

The Salzburg International Summer Academy of Fine Arts was finally inaugurated in 1953 in the Hohensalzburg Fortress. Oskar Kokoschka called it the «school of vision,» and differentiated his concept from that of a public academy with by way of two arguments. First, the school was open to all enthusiasts, amateurs as well as artists and art students. He was fully aware of the fact that being an artist could not be taught within a few weeks. He also rigorously rejected academicism, which in the 1950s he saw as laying primarily in abstraction, a movement he vehemently opposed. Kokoschka wrote the following about his concept:



«Not at all a school in the usual sense of the word, supervised by the state and with a program consisting of sterile routine, as is generally found in academies, but a school—in Austria, where I had earlier been so deeply misunderstood—in which I could educate young people in how to see. Art cannot be taught—particularly not in an annual summer course. It would actually need generations, as in the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, to convey the traditions of seeing. Modern state bureaucracy, which is now everywhere responsible for art education, has no idea that seeing is an experience to be absorbed by the individual consciousness if one immediately makes the effort to capture it as an event.»[6]

He deepened his position in another passage: «The selection of teachers—or rather, the competence to persuade those whom I really wanted to come—that was quite a headache, because I wasn't opening an academy in Salzburg for those abstractionist wasters. They have the upper hand the world over, anyway, so I was concerned to stand up to this deranged nonsense, even if I had to do it alone, against the fashion and against the trend. This was always my character, and that's why I have a better reputation than all the international clique together.»[7]

Kokoschka, a skilled advertising expert in his own right, made several crucial decisions that have allowed the Summer Academy to continue updating and expanding its concept up until today, rendering it internationally attractive:

1 The Hohensalzburg Fortress as the academy location.
2 A limited timeframe of a few summer weeks running parallel to the Salzburg Festival.
3 Internationality as the highest principle for teachers and students, an idea that was nearly revolutionary in Austria at that time. Konrad Wachsmann's architecture class, which ran from 1956 until 1960, has arguably influenced an entire generation of Austrian architects (Friedrich Achleitner, Erich Boltenstern, Gerhard Garstenauer, Hans Hollein, Friedrich Kurrent, Johannes Spalt, and Gunther Wawrik were all among his students). After a fight with Arno Breker in 1933, Wachsmann left the Villa Massimo, stayed for a while in Rome, and in 1938 fled to the United States via Paris, where he lived in Los Angeles until his death in 1980.
4 An open admission policy. For many years this decision led to its perception as a «school for housewives,» but at the same time this has become the guarantee of openness and ongoing regeneration.

## The Three Austrian Art Universities of Fine Arts

Consideration of a permanent art academy in Salzburg takes us first to the questions of when, for whom, and upon which principals the three extant Austrian art academies were founded. These are the Academy of Fine Arts and the University for Applied Arts, both in Vienna, and the University of Art and Design in Linz. As early as 1688 there was a precursor to the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. Emperor Karl VI reformed this in 1726, and the prestigious building on Schillerplatz that we now know was opened in 1877. The Viennese academy was one the most important in Europe, and chiefly functioned to serve the representational needs of the imperial family, the aristocracy, and the church. The University for Applied Arts had a different role: the *k. k. Kunstgewerbeschule* (imperial school of arts and crafts), which was founded in 1876, preceded that university as we know it today. The former was affiliated with the Austrian Museum for Art and Industry: the first museum for applied arts on the European continent (today's Austrian Museum

for Applied Arts / Contemporary Art — MAK). In the tradition of historicism, the great styles of the past were also to be made available for study in Vienna with the help of arts and crafts museum objects, and the School of Arts and Crafts as an education and training site for draughtsman and craftsmen. The Vienna School of Arts and Crafts was to train artists and educators alike, thereby satisfying the demands of the «art industry.»[8] The main building opened on Vienna's Ringstrasse in 1877, the same year that the academy opened on Schillerplatz.

The University of Art and Design Linz, a cooperation between the city of Linz and the state of Upper Austria, was not founded until 1973. It was initially called the School for Art and Industrial Design (the predecessor to the Art School Linz). This name carries with it reference to a previous historic focus, namely the concrete connection between liberal art and applied design, an obvious connection in an industrial city like Linz.[9] The University of Art and Design Linz is one of several similarly ambitious projects of the city of Linz and the region of Upper Austria in the art and culture sectors (the Ars Electronica Center, the Lentos Art Museum, and the Musiktheater for example) which have been helping reposition this former industrial city since the 1970s. To this day it remains the sole Austrian art university outside of Vienna.

In summary we can say that the three Austrian art universities were each founded according to the very specific requirements of potential clients for the future artists: the academy on Schillerplatz to represent the imperial family, the aristocracy, and the church; today's University for Applied Arts as a result of demands from industry and craft; and the University of Art and Design Linz as an integral part of a new post industrial policy regarding culture and education for an industrial city. What are the reasons for establishing a comprehensive department for visual arts at the Mozarteum University in our own time?

Today a formal art education lasts at least four years and provides students with not only years worth of studio practice but so too a broad theoretical and historical education. But few artists will actually be successful in the art market, so what careers are they actually being trained for? We can generally assume that an art education prepares students for working in a «project-based polis» more so than many other studies, and furthermore represents a good foundation for numerous careers in the cultural sector.

## What is the Ideal Environment for an Art Academy?

If a «new» academy is to be established, questions loom regarding the ideal environment for an art academy. What «climate» do educators and students need? In regard to Salzburg, the concrete question is: could a small city like Salzburg—a city dominated by tourism—even serve an art university? The presence of an art academy also would mean that educators and students would (should) live there year-round, and would need affordable housing, studios, bars, and restaurants—or at least the conditions to establish these. There would also need to be an infrastructure of interesting movie theaters, music events, and various exhibition spheres ranging from off-spaces to commercial galleries, art associations, and museums. A significant university with interesting and highly qualified cultural and social science professors is, moreover also a point of attraction. On this basis a scene wherein various groups advance discourse and art production can flourish, and nourish itself. Salzburg appears to have this fertile ground in terms of music and the performing arts. Could the city be an appropriate location for an academy of visual arts serving up to three hundred students and corresponding faculty? How could additional affordable



housing, sufficient space for studios, and inspiring temporary projects—in general, a stimulating environment for art students—be created?

Salzburg is attractive for the International Summer Academy as an eminent, beautiful, and manageable city. The Summer Academy brings together many people from various regions of the world for a concentrated amount of time, and they form a scene that harmonizes with Salzburg's cultural institutions and artists.

## «Global Academy?»

The International Summer Academy of Fine Arts is, unlike the previously mentioned examples, not a public academy; it is not year-round, but takes place for only six weeks. It offers roughly twenty courses, given by an international selection of lecturers and for various durations, to around three hundred international students of all ages and nationalities. How could the International Summer Academy be redesigned to function as an art academy by the year 2026?

The «Global Academy?» project deals with questions regarding of how art can be learned and taught in a globalized world. It thus provides for analysis of perspectival deliberations and virulent questions about the Summer Academy, as well as of the potential for an art academy in Salzburg. During the course of the summer 2016 conference in which the project will first be made public, numerous models and initiatives ranging from formal to largely informal, possibilities for art education and training will be presented. Examples will include the Spring Sessions in Amman, ruangrupa in Jakarta, RAW in Dakar, the Roaming Academy in Arnhem, and the Open School East in London. Several of these institutions organize exhibitions, lectures, exchange programs, short and long-term workshops, classes, and other training modules; others see themselves primarily as «schools.» This is an exemplary selection that attempts to compare various models, methods, and organizational forms. They all share a global perspective and local anchoring, as well as a desire to continue adapting and developing, testing new possibilities.

Ruangrupa in Jakarta, for example, is a collective comprised of more that forty artists, curators, architects, authors, and historians. The group space, available for meetings, discussions, workshops, et cetera, is central to their work. Ruangrupa aligns itself with the «right to the city» movement that struggles for civil rights and the use of public space as space for art, city development, and participation. The initiative offers many cultural workers the opportunity to professionalize and learn various important «cultural skills.» Founded in 2000, ruangrupa developed something akin to institutional structures with specific responsibilities very slowly.[10]

The spring sessions in Amman, on the other hand, take place only once a year. There they see themselves as an experiment in art education. The focus is on bringing together international lecturers, artists in residence, and local artists that want to broaden their professional practice while exploring the city of Amman.[11]

RAW Material Company in Dakar, in turn, is a center for art, knowledge transfer, and community. The initiative organizes exhibitions and symposiums, issues publications, and runs a library. RAW's program is generally focused on the growth of artistic and intellectual creativity in Africa. RAW considers artistic practice an opportunity to promote social and societal change.[12]

The European academies that appear of interest in this context are, for example, the Dutch Art Institute's Roaming Academy in Arnhem, and the Open School East in London. Although the comparably small Roaming Academy is a classic public academy with a

master's program, it is committed to creating a lively community rather than traditional studio training. Professors meet their students for an intensive week once a month, including once a year in another part of the world—in Jakarta, for example, in 2016.[13] London's Open School East was founded in 2013 as an answer to rising tuition fees and the fact that students are increasingly accruing debt. It offers a diverse and freely accessible program. Of central importance is the students' cultural and intellectual exchange with the broader public. The program refers to local conditions and constitutes an informal space for the exchange of knowledge on various forms of art, crafts, and society.[14]

Representatives from these and other intuitions and initiatives will discuss various models for art education in a conference entitled Global Academy?, which will be held in Salzburg in the summer of 2016 to illustrate new possibilities for cooperation and knowledge transfer. What will happen in regard to the future of the Summer Academy? These relatively recent global institutions and initiatives that stand in direct contact with local and international developments dealing in artistic production have developed many methods and formats that could serve as inspiration for the future. There is hope that new forms of cooperation will emerge and give way to new research networks. The International Summer Academy sees itself as a global academy that brings together lecturers and students from the world over. In order to do justice to these claims they need a strong and viable global network.

## The International Summer Academy in the Year 2026

In the last twenty years there have been numerous publications, conferences, and workshops on, among other themes, art education, the art academy as an institution, the Bologna Process, the scientification of the study of art, and PhDs for artists. Public art academies have undergone enormous changes and hundreds of new summer academies are founded each year. These are not only academies that see themselves as schools, but also biennials as in Kiev (the title for the 2015/16 biennial is *School of Kyiv*), or museums (The Museum der Moderne Salzburg has emphasized its educational efforts and operates with the term «academy,» as was recently the case with the «academy» on the occasion of the *Andrea Fraser* exhibition), and art associations (Salzburger Kunstverein Open Academy). A statement by Anton Vidokle, artist and founder of the e-flux platform, offers a point of view that appears sensible.[15] Vidokle, who has undergone no formal art training and is generally skeptical of the afore mentioned developments, associates himself—as do many others—with Kokoschka's belief that art cannot be taught. He takes this one step further in stating that, «art is not a profession. What does being professional even mean under the current conditions when skill in art is becoming less and less important?» He also questions where the expertise of contemporary artists should lie, and suggests the following: «Perhaps as a kind of passionate hobby, a committed amateurism.» With the notion that contemporary art is anchored within the realm of hobby and amateurism, and that today's artists are often—in their own self-perception—dilettantes, the case for the joint study of «professional» artists and others, as at the International Summer Academy, appears in a new light.

Summer Academy courses differentiate themselves from academy master classes in that lecturers at the former spend morning to night with their students for one to four weeks, working on the production, reflection, and presentation of their art. This creates an intensive atmosphere that fundamentally differs from classic art academies. Almost none of the artists, curators, or authors that lecture at the Summer Academy hold a position at a public art academy. Many of them do not want to teach year-round, they like to have enough time for their own artistic (or curatorial, or other) work. Should one wish to encourage a similarly creative and intensive atmosphere at a year-round academy, we would need to develop a completely new concept.

Postgraduate programs, such as that at the previously mentioned Rijksakademie, and the residency in Wiels, could serve as models. At Amsterdam's Rijksakademie young artists from all over the world come together after their studies. Admission is subject to application, and students receive a two-year postgraduate education that is completely subsidized. Participants work in studios and benefit from various opportunities including studio visits, project activities, and et cetera. The art center Wiels in Brussels operates differently. There they are more oriented toward the artist-in-residence model. Artists there are not left to their own means, but rather are involved in a wide range of activities. Wiels has, moreover, a very ambitious exhibition program. These models need financiers. Artist-in-residence and postgraduate programs only work if they are completely financed; only then can artists fully immerse themselves in the program, allowing creativity, teamwork, and networking to flourish. It is appealing to combine these models with the extant program of the International Summer Academy. This could help establish a first-class year-round international scene in Salzburg populated by, among others, program participants and lecturers. It goes without saying, of course, that these programs would be developed in close cooperation with local cultural institutions.

The author would like to thank Hildegard Fraueneder for her critical engagement with the text.

1 Cf. Robert Hoffmann, *Mythos Salzburg* (Salzburg: Pustet, 2002), 51.

2 In Austria private schools can be issued public status, and therefore issue diplomas comparable to those of the public school system.

3 https://www.uni-mozarteum.at/de/university/index.php (last accessed March 13, 2016).

4 http://www.onb.ac.at/ariadne/vfb/bt_fk_malschulen.htm (last accessed March 29, 2016).

5 Cf. Anton Faistauer, «Eine moderne Malerakademie in Salzburg» in *Salzburger Volksblatt*, (November 4, 1920), as referenced in *Salzburger Museum Carolino Augusteum*, Salzburg, 1962 (yearly bulletin #7, 1961): 111–112. The state gallery was inaugurated in the Residenz in 1923.

6 Translated for this essay from Oskar Kokoschka, *Mein Leben* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1972), 273–274.

7 Olda Kokoschka and Heinz Spielmann, eds., *Oskar Kokoschka, Briefe III: 1934–1953* (Düsseldorf: Claassen 1986), 268.

8 http://dieangewandte.at/jart/prj3/angewandte/main.jart?rel=de&content-id=12295082556516reserve-mode=active (last accessed March 13, 2016).

9 http://www.ufg.ac.at/Geschichte.1237.0.html (last accessed March 13, 2016).

10 http://ruangrupa.org/15 (last accessed March 13, 2016).

11 http://thespringsessions.com/about/ (last accessed March 13, 2016).

12 http://www.rawmaterialcompany.org/about_raw.php?categorie_id=1 (last accessed March 13, 2016).

13 http://dutchartinstitute.eu/page/4944/not-to-be-compared-to-any-studio-based-program-and-certainly-not-to-the-notori (last accessed March 13, 2016).

14 http://www.openschooleast.org (last accessed March 13, 2016)

15 Anton Vidokle, «Art and the Cultural Turn: Farewell to Committed, Autonomous Art?», in *e-flux*, 2013, http://www.e-flux.com/journal/art-without-market-art-without-education-political-economy-of-art/ (last accessed March 29, 2016).