Brogmen and Wagner, Vienna

1

Introduction: Retrospectives On An Empire And Its Capital

F. Peter Wagner

What is in a name? In the case of Austria, everything. The difficulty of finding a general historical term for the geographical, cultural, political, and economic entity in question is the starting point for many historians, and for good reason, because the problem of finding a proper term is already part of the history itself. Robert Kann has called Austria a "multinational Empire," and Hans Mommsen has employed the term "multipeoples state" to capture and remind the reader of the complexities and contradictions that, in this case, go with the historical territory.

The term Habsburg Empire designates the "permanent affiliation" of what had at one time been three separate ruling houses and their territories: the German Alpine hereditary lands, the house of Behemia, and the Hungarian-Croatian crown.[1] Its history, like that of all other empires, is a prolonged and violent one. What made the Habsburg Empire special and complex, however, was its intrinsic instability. Indeed historically the Empire was always "evolving" and never a stable entity.

The territorial heterogenity of the Empire is one of the reasons for its tumultuous history. On the one hand, the decisive ruling house was for the most part German and on the other hand, most of its territories were not. Starting from the original *Erblande*, the territory comprising upper and lower Austria and Styria, the House of Habsburg—from its seat in Vienna—pushed in all directions during its five-century reign. During that period with the most expansionist thrust occurring between the Confessional Wars and the Thirty Years' War (1521–1648), the Habsburgs acquired Bohemia and Moravia in the north; Hungary with Transylvania, Slavonia, and Croatia in the east and southeast; and Carniola, Carinthia, and Tyrol in the southwest and west.

The actual relationship between the German ruling house and its territories, however, was never satisfactorily resolved. In particular the relationship between the house of Habsburg and the Hungarian crown was a continuous source

of tension.[2] Besides this political tension, which continually contested the hegemonic position of the German ruling house within the imperial structure, disunity was further exacerbated by the multiethnic character of the Empire. At one point or another, Czechs, Poles, Ruthenians, Slovenes, Italians, Magyars, Slovaks, Rumanians, Croats, Serbs, and Szekels were all living within Habsburg territory. Any attempt at an imperial unity had to reckon with the centrifugal forces of ethnicity and nationalism.

The obvious question to ask at this point is how *any* "unity" was possible. How *did* the Empire manage to survive at all? The answer can be found in the Eastern character of this absolutist regime. As Perry Anderson has pointed out, in contrast to the West, "[t]he Absolutist State in the East was the repressive machine of a feudal class that had just erased the traditional communal freedoms of the poor. It was a *device for the consolidation of serfdom*, in a landscape scoured of autonomous urban life or resistance."[3]

Political-territorial instability is part of this Eastern historical experience. That, for all of the differences between the territories, "[s]erf agriculture predominated,"[4] points to the sad truth of the matter: insofar as *any* stability could be achieved at all, it was a stability built on feudal politics and economics. "Modernization," in this context, thus simply meant domination: political supremacy of the House of Habsburg over its territories. Indeed if the socioeconomic glue that kept the Empire in uneasy cohesion was serf agriculture, the conservative and often reactionary role played by the Empire in Continental European politics provides the flip side to the same coin.

It is not by coincidence that the Empire's founding period proper should have started with the Reformation and the Confessional Wars. Ever since its beginnings as the eastern outpost or mark, *Marca Orientalis*, of Charlemagne's realm, Austria had served as the bulwark of the West against the East.[5] After the death of the last Babenberg ruler, Friedrich II, in 1246, the eastern mark was left without a ruling family. In 1282, Count Rudolf of Habsburg (1218–91) defeated the Bohemian King Ottokar II and secured the Austrian lands as hereditary possessions for the House of Habsburg. After this victory, the initial years of Habsburg rule—especially under Maximilian I (1493–1519)—were marked by sucessful marriage policies thorugh which the interests of the Habsburg were continually advanced. The words of Matthias Corvinus are worth quoting at this point: "Let other powers make war! Thou, happy Austria, marry; For Venus will give you those realms which usually Mars bestows."[6]

But it was only in 1526, after Charles V had decided to rule Spain and the Austrian lands were handed over to his brother, Archduke Ferdinand, that the Habsburg Empire took its characteristic form as an Empire straddling west and east.[7] During the upheaval of the long sixteenth century, the devoutly Catholic House of Habsburg used the counter-Reformation to crush anti-Habsburg sentiments among the Protestant Bohemian nobility and to secure its position in

Hungary, where the interests of the Habsburgs and certain feudal lords clashed—at times to the point where the Habsburgs had to champion the Hungarian peasantry.[8] Thus the struggle of "west" versus "east" during the Turkish Wars can more fruitfully be interpreted as a battle for imperial territories between the two great powers in the eastern portion of Central Europe at that time.[9]

The rise of the House of Habsburg must also be understood within the context of the decline of the German Empire to the north. After the death of Friedrich II in 1250, the papacy saw to it that the "nest of vipers"—the Hohenstaufen dynasty—was stomped out. The success of the popes in their endeavor created internal chaos and external weakness for the German territory, which was only cemented by The Confessioanl Wars. From 1521 to 1648, which marked the end of Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia, Germany was actually little more than a battle zone in Central Europe.

The Habsburgs filled the power vacuum in Central Europe as the only standing German Ruling House that commanded an empire. The period from the Peace of Westphalia to the death of Maria Theresa in 1780 thus marks arguably the period of the Habsburgs' most powerful presence in European politics. Only in the slow but steady rise of the House of Hohenzollern in Brandenburg (Prussia) did a serious German competitor appear on the horizon.[10]

The outcome of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48), which secured the rule of the house of Habsburg-Lorraine, provided the Empire with a certain sense of security, stability, and importance within the Central European theater.[11] The reign of Maria Theresa (1740–80) witnessed the first attempt, following the reign of Maximilian I, at a long overdue reform: centralization and the introduction of bureaucracy. Both aimed at consolidating the Empire's internal but it was only during the reign of Joseph II (1780–90) that an enlightened absolutism was introduced. In C. A. Macartney's characterization, "Joseph II is perhaps the completest enlightened despot in European history, and the noun in the phrase is quite as fully operative as the adjective."[12] It is the tension between the adjective and the noun that encapsulates failure and success of *Josephinism*, as the rule of Joseph II is generally called.

Joseph II's wish to "modernize" and secure Habsburg rule by a long-overdue push for administrative centralization revealed itself as incompatible with the actual base of Habsburg rule: feudal socioeconomic structures and military might. In the end he had to embrace absolutism in all its traditional religious glory to rescue the legitimacy of the Habsburg Empire.[13] The period of "revolutionary absolutism" (Jaszi) thus illustrates the important historical contradiction in the make-up of the Empire: modernization in any form would gnaw at its socioeconomic foundations even though some form of modernization was politically necessary to maintain it.

The contradictory structure of Austrian absolutism became painfully apparent to the emperor at the point where political centralization and the

socioeconomic relations of feudalism intersected: in short his Germanization policy. In the interest of bureaucratic interaction and efficiency, the Empire needed a common language. Clearly Joseph II had the interests of rationality and efficiency in mind when he decreed German the official language of the entire Empire. Equally clearly, however, he met the limits of attempting to modernize from above. The Hungarian nobility perceived the decree for what it would have been: the final blow to the nobility's chance of independence from the German yoke.

Joseph II gave the Hungarian nobility an easy target. What could be more unjust, what could have exposed more clearly the German yoke, than this attempt to eradicate Hungary from the map of the Empire? The rise of anti-German sentiment prompted the emperor to withdraw most of his most progressive proposals and decrees with a few exeptions: *The Patent of Tolerance of 1781*, which freed the protestants from centuries of blighted existence in the catholic Empire, and *The Patent of Tolerance of 1782*, which established freedom for Jews as individuals: "to make the totality of Jewry harmless, but the individual useful."[14] There were also some decrees concerning the liberation of the serfs. But true to the Empire's variety of territories and the socioeconomic differences between them, liberated peasants fared better in some than in others. Especially in (central) Hungary, which had the largest feudal posessions, liberated peasants found that they had only two liberties—to starve to death or to work freely on the lands of their former lords.[15]

The outcry was unanimous. Joseph II, of failing health and confronted with a resistance he—the supreme bureaucrat—had not foreseen, gave in. His real legacy thus amounted to little more than the creation of an imperial bureaucracy, for which Maria Theresa had laid the foundations, imperial courts, and an imperial police. All of which happened not a moment too soon.

* * *

The French Revolution caused a shock wave all over Europe. For a brief period, it was possible to speak of an international alliance of burghers and laboring classes—including workers and peasants—against the proponents of the old feudal order. The ensuing terror might have cooled the sympathies of some progressives. But, more important, it provided existing regimes with a "legitimate" excuse to stomp out the various fledgling liberation movements that had sprung up. Nowhere is one able to observe the dialectic of revolution and counterrevolution more clearly than in Germany and Austria.

With the administrative apparatus of Joseph II at his disposal, Francis II reverted back to the absolutist conceptions of the Empire's founding period. The discovery of a Jacobin conspiracy in Vienna and Budapest in 1794/95 gave him the needed reason for ruthlessly stomping out the political enlighten-

ment throughout his realm.[16] Absolutist rule was reestablished through a pre-Josephinist alliance of aristocrats, bureaucrats, and the Catholic church. The Empire's role as the "bulwark against the French Revolution" (Jaszi) was a model for Europe. Indeed in the interests of "international" counterrevolutionary solidarity, the Empire—with Baron von Thugut at the diplomatic helm—sacrificed its rivalry with Prussia for a common absolutist front.[17]

The triumph of this policy was the Congress of Vienna in 1815. There, under its devoted chancellor Metternich, the Empire spearheaded the general resurgence of absolutism after the twin shocks of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars.[18] The age of reaction was characterized by Stendhal as a swamp. Austrian prestige was never higher. The dialectic of restoration and modernization, however, reasserted itself soon enough.

When news of the February Revolution in Paris swept through Vienna in 1848, it catalyzed public discontent with the police and military regime. Two interrelated events make the events of the Austrian Revolution special. At its zenith during the March uprising in Vienna, it was a revolution of students and the industrial working class, but it was also mediated by various ethnic-nationalist liberation movements in the non-Germanic territories. Thus the famous *Reichstag* meeting would both adopt a Constitution proclaiming the independence of all citizens from the repressive authority of the monarchy and simultaenously offer all non-German nationalities the right to independence from German rule.

The Reichstag of Kremsier illuminates—rather tragically in the final analysis—the problem of radical politics in the Habsburg Empire. The complex relationship between radical political claims of a universalist nature (rights, participation, legal-constitutional development) and the concrete, ethnic-nationalist meaning they gained in the Empire would prove volatile. Ultimately, however, the Kremsier constitution never had a chance to prove itself. The Vienna uprising was bloodily quelched by imperial troops; the army of Prince Windischgrätz crushed the Hungarian revolt; and the prime minister, Prince Schwarzenberg, dissolved the Reichstag and had most of its radical members imprisoned. Alexander Bach, who had moved from a radical-liberal position to endorsing the most ultraconservatist measures in the span of a year, became the new minister of the interior. To top it all off Emperor Ferdinand I was forced to resign on 2 December 1848 in favor of his eighteen-year-old nephew Franz. As Franz Joseph I he would rule for sixty eight years, almost to the very end of the Empire itself.[19]

* * *

The year 1848 not only marked when the nationalities problem took modern form and the proletariat appeared as a major political actor, but it was also

the moment in which Vienna became the seat of the Austrian class struggle. Much of its spatial and architectural development no less than its "society" and culture, in fact, can be explained in terms of class and class struggle.[20] Its rise as a modern city was bound up with the inability of absolutism to reconstruct itself in terms of the *ancien regime*. Quite on the contrary. In the 1850s the Habsburg star begins to fade in Europe. Domestically Bach continued the Josephinist program of bureaucratic rule and sought to further the liberation of the serfs. But the Habsburgs were faced with a major defeat at the hands of Prussia on the battlefield of Königgrätz in 1866, and the subsequent Treaty of Prague between the House of Habsburg and Prussia reduced the Empire to second power status in Continental Europe. It also reduced the Habsburgs hold over her territories—which the Hungarians used very skillfully. Indeed with the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, the moderate Hungarian nationalists celebrated their own decisive victory over the previously all-German ruled Empire.

A "compromise" (*Ausgleich*) established the Empire as a dual structure, and the new name Austria-Hungary bears witness to this arrangement. Franz Joseph I became emperor of the Austrian lands (*Cisleithania*) and king of Hungary—hence the designation *k.und k.* monarchy for *kaiserlich und königlich* (imperial and royal). Both administrative units had their own domestic governments. The ministeries of foreign affairs, defense, and finance, all imperial appointments, were the only departments with general jurisdiction over both units.

Common matters were debated by delegations from each unit in meetings held alternately in Budapest and Vienna. Each delegation had to sit separately, however, and both had to communicate with each other in writing.[21] The real problem for the Empire, however, was one of precedent. For in granting a special status to the Hungarian nationality within the Empire, it gave the other nationalities a goal to strive for. The *Ausgleich* galvanized the national-ethnic rumblings into a powerful political voice that dominated Habsburg politics from then on.[22]

The price that the Empire had ultimately to pay for its loss of hegemony in Central Europe was its permanent status as an underdeveloped country. For centuries the house of Habsburg had made European politics, and in so doing it had defined frontiers and identities. As the only continuous and, within its own limits, stable German empire, it had been the promulgator and beacon of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nations. With it *German* history in Europe rose and fell. But with the ascendancy of Prussia in the eighteenth century, the Habsburgs for the first time faced a serious German competitor. In the second half of the nineteenth century that competitor finally beat them.

Prussia took its German identity from the battlefield of Königgrätz, and Austria experienced a trauma, which only further enabled the abled German chancellor Bismarck to move ahead with his plan for a German Reich and a so-called

kleindeutsche solution to the problem of German unification, leaving Austrian-German Nationalists out in the cold. Both countries would feel the repercussions until the annexation (*Anschluss*) of 1938.[23] The political stagnation of Austria, following the defeat by Prussia, which turned into a prolonged crisis, defines what would ultimately be the Empire's last fifty years.

This, in turn, had a profound effect on Vienna. The city had always been the outpost of the Austrian part of the Empire. Thus it carried the burden of the Empire's contradictions throughout its history, even magnifying those contradictions in the process. The defeat and subsequent stagnation of the Empire and the forces created by this experience cast a terrifying shadow on Vienna as the short-lived center of the modernist experiment. Indeed 1867 marked the real creation of Robert Musil's "*Kakania.*"

* * *

Vienna, that is the old core of the city, is located on a channel of the river Danube.[24] Its general location also points to a very important historical fact: Vienna is an Eastern city. Take an Atlas with a map of south-central Europe. Switzerland is to the west and West Germany to the northwest. Buth there is also what is today the Czech Republic and Bratislava to the north and east, Hungary to the southeast, and what was once Yugoslavia due south. Budapest and Prague are not that far. Geography is, at least in this case, decisive for the destiny of the nation. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Vienna defended the West against the Ottoman Empire. The two sieges of 1529 and 1683, in fact, have become part of the city's "historical consciousness."[25]

Three periods distinguished the history of the city. The first is the period of feudalism and absolution extending from 1528, when the lands of the Habsburgs were unified, to 1780 when Maria Theresa died and Joseph II became emperor. The second period is the bourgeois period, which extends from 1780 to 1879 and the electoral defeat of the liberals. The third period, the "crisis of modernity," spans the remaining years from the 1880s to the beginning of World War I in 1914.

The first period marks its assumption of imperial status. It is the period of the *inner city* protected by a huge wall with inner and outer fortifications, which formed a double ring around it. St. Stephen's Cathedral, a Gothic structure with a tall spire, marked the center. Only slowly did the city expand outward and for good reason. During most of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, its inhabitants lived in a constant state of fear awaiting the next Ottoman challenge.

With the defeat of the High Portal in 1683, however, the Empire showed its newfound security by spreading into the outer territory. The imperial summer residence, the castle of Schönbrunn, was begun by Leopold I in 1694.

Between 1700 and 1723, Prince Eugene, the "Noble Knight" who had conquered Belgrade for the Habsburgs in 1717, had his own summer residence—the magnificent Belvedere Castle—built outside the city's walls. These two grand monuments of Habsburg rule point to the artistic style that went with the triumph of the Empire: baroque. Indeed this style and a new building spree in the eighteenth century reflected the ascension of the Habsburgs to absolute power and the transformation of Vienna into one of the premier cities of Europe.[26]

The high point of the second period in the history of Vienna is 1848. This is the period of both the political (democratic) and the industrial (capitalist) revolution.[27] Interestingly enough, of course, the bourgeoisie never really triumphed in Austria.[28] By 1848, however, Vienna had established itself as a crucial industrial, commercial, and financial center for the Empire. By all accounts, furthermore, Lower Austria had become one of the three dynamic areas of industrialization in the Empire during the 1840s thanks to its growing textile industry.[29] In addition Vienna was clearly the administrative center of the Empire—at least until 1867. This implies the existence of a considerable civil service and a "middle class." Indeed it was precisely this classic intellectual-administrative part of the bourgeoisie that served as the recruiting ground for Vienna's Jacobins and became the locus of resistance to the reactionary turn in the centralization policies of Joseph II and his successor.[30]

By the same token, the problematic nature of this development can already be discerned. Insofar as Vienna became the center of a "western" path of development, it presented a vanguard with almost no following. But the bourgeois period of the city was not, as an orthodox marxist interpretation might maintain, defined by the victory and subsequent hegemony of the bourgeoisie. The Compromise of 1867 solidified its contradictory position. As the imperial city of Austria-Hungary, it was caught in the middle of the fight between modernizing Western and reactionary Eastern interests. Vienna's emerging Western identity was part of a struggle, which was fortified by the new "bourgeois" elements, with and against its identity as the imperial city of an Eastern Absolutist Empire.

* * *

Vienna was a perfect example of "combined and uneven development" in which, what David Blackbourn and Geoff Ely have termed, "indirect" rule was exercised. A new set of cultural tastes, virtues, and vices, coupled with the hegemonic presence of parliamentary institutions, legal norms, and procedures, made this possible. The fact is also that Vienna had developed a set of suburbs between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which encircled the city like the old fortification itself.[31] These suburbs, as distinct from the suburbs prior to the late eighteenth century, were the locations of the burgeoning industry and the homes of the working class. This precise spatial arrangement was reinforced by the events of the 1848 Revolution. The transformation of the suburbs from summer resorts into industrial sites was quite consciously done in the wake of revolutionary fears.

Still it had become impossible any longer to ignore the demands of the Viennese bourgeoisie. With the municipal statute, which granted independent municipal government to the city on 6 March 1850, the issue of the razing of the fortifications and the development of the land (the glacis) acquired a new institutional setting conducive to the Viennese bourgeoisie's newly found vision of self-importance.

> As the fifties progressed, economic needs proved stronger than counter-revolutionary fears in the highest councils of government. On December 20, 1857, Emperor Francis Joseph proclaimed his intention to open the military space to civilian uses, and established a City Expansion Commission to plan and execute its development.[32]

The decison to raze the old fortification by the emperor did not initially imply a victory for the bourgeoisie. Quite the contrary. The development of the *Ringstrasse*, a grand boulevard forming a horseshoe around the inner city in place of glacis and wall, the symbol and arguably greatest achievement of the Viennese bourgeoisie, was mired in the struggle for hegemony that defines the period. At the outset the military and aristocracy envisioned it as providing a setting for maintaining the security needs of the regime. Concerned with thwarting what might become another 1848 or any city uprising for that matter, after the fortifications with their barracks had fallen, the military treated the projected development like their counterparts in Paris: a boulevard-type street to ensure the easy deployment of troops and material to any potential trouble spot in the city. This convergence of "military considerations . . . with civilian desires," following an intial period defined by the neoabsolutist "priorities for monumental building," as evidenced by the *Votivkirche* with its emphasis on "the unbreakable unity of throne and altar," secured the new development and provided its final form.[33]

The defeat of the Habsburg military in 1866 changed the balance of power to the bourgeoisie's advantage.[34] The ensuing period of liberal-constitutional government in Austria led to the bourgeois development of the *Ringstrasse.*

> The contrast between the old inner city and the Ring area inevitably widened as a result of the political change. . . . The art of building, used in the old city to express aristocratic grandeur and ecclesiastical pomp, now became the communal property of the citizenry, expressing the various aspects of the bourgeois cultural ideal in a series of so-called *Prachtbauten* (buildings of splendor).[35]

And, indeed, the buildings that defined the Ring were decidedly bourgeois, first and foremost in their function. For Vienna's bourgeoisie began to erect, starting with the *Rathaus* or city hall in 1873, buildings congruent with its political and cultural identity: from constitutional government and municipal independence to the temples of the arts and sciences.[36]

Overstating the case concerning the "hegemony" of the bourgeoisie, however, is dangerous. In the architecture, that is, in the styles used, it is also possible to discern the profound ambiguity and insecurity lying at the heart of the bourgeois experience. As Carl Schorske has remarked correctly: "In Austria as elsewhere, the triumphant middle class was assertive in its independence of the past in law and science. But whenever it strove to express its values in architecture, it retreated into history."[37]

Ironically, of course, that history in Vienna, as elsewhere on the Continent, was decidedly aristocratic. What the bourgeoisie faced in Vienna no less than anywhere else on the Continent was the need to establish counterhegemony and create "a world after its own image."[38] Whatever its successes in the fields of law and science, literature and painting, this class was unsuccessful in the sphere of culture more broadly considered. Indeed this failure is linked to its inability to attain power in the sphere of politics.

Because the presentation of its own achievements could occur only by using a history that was not its own, Vienna's bourgeoisie was quite aware of its ambiguous position. And, for this reason, it sought to construct an alternative history by looking to the middle ages when Vienna was a proud and independent city. The ambiguity and insecurity of the bourgeoisie were thus camouflaged by its retreat into classicism and eclecticism.

City Hall was built, for example, entirely in the Gothic style. The university was built in the style of the Renaissance. A Greek, "classical" stule was chosen for the Parliament. Taken together this all seemed to make good sense. The Gothic style of City Hall was to represent the independent city by harking back to its medieval independent origins. And what better to represent the mission of the University than the style of the Renaissance, that could "proclaim the historical affiliation between modern, rational culture and the revival of secular learning after the long night of medieval superstition"? Also in using the "classical" style for the Parliament, an image was created that linked the aspirations and the self-understanding of Vienna's bourgeoisie with the Greek city-state, that is, with the vision the bourgeoisie had of itself as the fountainhead of democracy and the ideal state.[39]

The aristocracy had *Schönbrunn* and Belvedere Castle to celebrate its achievements; the bourgeoisie had the *Ringstrasse*. In reflecting the self-image of the bourgeoisie at the height of its triumph, however, the *Ringstrasse* actually paid tribute to the persistent influence of the old regime. Rather than going boldly forward, expressing itself in a style all its own, Vienna's middle class resorted

to an architectural historicism capable of expressing only one sad truth; namely, that all the bourgeoisie really wanted was to be a "better" aristocracy, that is, an aristocracy of means.

Artistic and intellectual life may have moved from the court to the salons of the grand bourgeoisie. But society met at the opera and the theater. This "social compromise" and the "cultural synthesis" between aristocracy and the bourgeoisie accompanying it,[40] of course, proved highly lopsided; it was open to cancellation once the economic foundations of existence were undermined, which was precisely what happened with the economic crash of 1873. Mercantilist, guild-approved policies supplanted the liberal, free-market vision of the 1860s. A more bitter fate, however, awaited the bourgeoisie after their defeat in the elections of 1879. Emperor Franz Joseph called on the conservative Count Taaffe to form a government that lasted for fourteen years. Liberalism collapsed as a major force in Austrian politics, and a situation was created in which the "new political trends moved in the direction of political intolerance and prejudice."[41]

* * *

And this is where the third period of Viennese history begins to take shape. If the death of liberal Vienna stands at its beginning, then World War I stands at its end. The period itself is characterized by the steady growth of anti-Semitic, nationalist, and ethnic-nationalist forces. Vienna served as the political battleground for these forces both as the cultural center of the Empire and as the center for migration from the eastern territories. Vienna would now fully express in its society and cultural life the explosive mixture of West and East that the Empire had become.

The change the city underwent is reflected in the victory of the Christian Social Party under the leadership of Karl Lueger, the rise of political anti-Semitism, and the prominence of the Secession movement among the artists of Vienna.[42] The latter, needless to say, has become the cause célèbre whenever Vienna is being mentioned. The explosion of modernism during that period, with names such as Klimt and Kokoschka, has attracted considerable attention. But the point here is not to resolve any of the various disputes concerning artistic modernism. It is rather to note that the Secession seceded *from something*. And that something can be described as *liberal* Vienna.

That writers such as Musil and Kraus satirized *Kakania*, the ossified k. u. k. Monarchy and that painters such as Klimt and Kokoschka shocked the sensibilities of its "establishment" with their eroticism should not obscure a basic fact. The target of satire and shock was as much liberal as it was aristocratic "society." Politically, if not artistically, this is of some importance.

The two instances in which this oppositional relation becomes the most apparent

is in the life/work of Kraus and in the architectural development from the respectively mythic and antihistorical turn of Camillo Sitte and Otto Wagner to the works of Olbricht and Loos. In the case of the early Kraus, for example, his tendency to identify corruption with liberal Vienna and its press, along with his singular moralism, is well known. Too rarely noted, however, is the manner in which he refused to distinguish between "Kakania" and liberal Austria. The sharpness and undifferentiated nature of his attacks originated in his experience as a hopeful journalist at the most respected liberal paper, the *Neue Freie Presse*. There Kraus witnessed what he thought to be the symbiosis of *liberal* Vienna with what he held to be the stagnation and moral impurity of the times. And, as Alfred Pfabigan has shown, Kraus's rather personal disdain for "liberalism" therefore entailed a curious one-sidedness of his attacks. Lueger and the Christian Socials did not figure prominently in his satirical world nor, much later, did the fascists.[43]

The development of architecture during this period also reflects a struggle over the legacy of the *Ringstrasse*. Both Sitte and Wagner ultimately defined themselves and their styles against the liberal vision celebrated in the Ring. Sitte consciously embraced the vision of a preindustrial, preliberal Vienna. Stemming from artisan roots, Sitte reamined true to the ideal of artisan life; his attempt to humanize the cityscape would take the form of an assault upon the street with its oppressive monumental buildings. His embrace of Richard Wagner in the 1870s would only cement what was already his credo: the "glorification of the German medieval artisan community against modern capitalist society."

Otto Wagner, in contrast, had totally embraced the rational-functionalist culture of capitalism. This commitment moved him ever farther away from the historicism of the *Ringstrasse* with its monumentalism and adornments. In Wagner's first projects, Vienna's streetcar system and public bridges and viaducts, technology became style; art and engineering converged to expose gradually rather than hide "the engineered structure . . . in sweeping girders, massive riveted elbows at abutments. "Wagner's Postal Savings building (1904–6) and his apartment house building Neustiftgasse 40 (1909–10), in fact, fulfilled the modernist form he had always sought to create. It achieved "the victory of the office over the home."

In very different ways, then, Sitte and Wagner turned against the style of the Ring and—whether consciously or unconsciously —the liberal values it represented.[44] But the antiliberalism of Vienna's artistic leaders, though significant for the general cultural atmosphere, was still rather unfocused or better: apolitical. In the final analysis, as Carl Schorske has convincingly shown, the politics of Viennese modernism (as everywhere else) *were* aesthetics. The explosive appearance of modernism was ultimately a retreat into the psyche.[45] There were other, far more dangerous, currents. Indeed against the art scene, the

antiliberalism of anti-Semitism and the Christian Social Party of Karl Lueger was decidedly political.

* * *

Anti-Semitism, to be sure, had existed in Vienna for a long time; it was a staple of Christian culture, West and East. Christian identity, religious, cultural, and social, had always been a matter of division: believers (Christians) and nonbelievers (heathens). Although Nietzsche knew about the basic, universalist identity of the Judeo-Christian creed as the fertile ground of the modern intellectual Western tradition, most Christians were not that sophisticated. Religious, social, and cultural anti-Semitism were ultimately justified by one simple belief: the Jews had killed Christ and they were the ultimate heathens. This traditional anti-Semitism historically led to brutal outbursts of mass paranoia (pogroms) but not in a systematic way.

Against this traditonal anti-Semitism, one must distinguished a more directly political form of anti-Semitism, which came into being in the last half of the nineteenth century.[46] Although political anti-Semitism *uses* traditional anti-Semitism, it does so in a *systematic* way and as a tactic.[47] Its actual target was not so much the Jews, as industrial, liberal, capitalist society: the Jews, in fact, become stand-ins for an aggregate set of historical forces. Its chief proponents in Austria, like elsewhere, were generally of petit-bourgeois decent or were people with close emotional ties to that class.[48] To distill the point: the Jews were, strange though the thought might seem, "logical" targets for that kind of demagogery.

The Jews in the cities of the Habsburg Empire, the German territories, and all across Europe had embraced political liberalism and the philosophical values of the Enlightenment. This is quite understandable for both in its philosophical and political parts, liberalism promised a society in which differences of belief and culture were protected by universal rights and the benefits of citizenship in a democratic state. Thus if Joseph II's attempts at modernization burst open the doors of equality in Austria, these reasons generally led the Jews to become champions of the liberal parties in the Habsburg Empire during the nineteenth century.

It is no accident, then, that the Jews could have been so easily singled out by political demagogues. They had often publicly allied themselves with classes and ideologies seemingly inviting them to leave the ghetto and become full members of society. The "ideology of emancipation," which prompted Jews to accept the bourgeois ideal of *Bildung* (educational development) was, furthermore, apparently backed up by material forces: the burgeoning *Rechtsstaat* and an emerging rationalist model of politics predicated on the notion of interest.[49]

Assimilationist politics, of course, drew a wedge between various parts of the Jewish community. And that was undoubtedly true in Vienna. Assimilated Jews looked with disdain upon their unassimilated brethren—mostly the Eastern Jews who seemed incapable of leaving the *shtetl* behind.[50] But the fact remains that, in the eyes of the political anti-Semite, the Jews were not simply guilty of being Jews but also of being the "leaders" of that immense conspiracy that had toppled the seeming security, safety, and transparency of olden times: modern, industrial, capitalist, bourgeois society.

It is no wonder, then, that political anti-Semitism should have developed when it did. Its attractiveness to the Viennese petit bourgeoisie and its importance in providing the Christian Social Party with a common political language must be understood in the context of a mounting resistance against the modernization of Austria-Hungary. And so in his study on the formation of the Christian Social Movement and the early career of Karl Lueger, John W. Boyer has presented Lueger and the Christian Socials as a "third alternative." The coalition was committed to bourgeois values of hard work and economic privilege but was still ideologically antiliberal, though populist and yet opposed to social democracy. Squeezed by the monied bourgeoisie of the *Ringstrasse*, horrified by the disregard of the workers for privilege and *stände*,[51] victory of the anti-Semitic coalition points to a disarticulation of class politics beginning in 1848 and reaching its peak in the Great Crash of 1873.[52]

Again Vienna was hardest hit by this development precisely because of its double position as a Western and Eastern city. There the forces were true to the form of Eastern Absolutism; they were fiercely modern and fiercely antimodern at the same time. The territorial conflict of the nineteenth century would oscillate between the commitment to ethnic particularism and democratic universalism; it would wave between the demands of economic rationalization and classical style; and it would witness the political contest between a fiery industrial proletariat development, a quiescent bourgeoisie, and a set of diverse traditional classes. It would also evidence a new cultural sensibility as well as a nostalgia for tradition. It is in these ways that the seeds of economic, political, social, and cultural crisis were sown. All the "ingredients" for a successful transition to a modern society were there. Events would show that breaking the deadlock of Eastern Absolutism demanded the ultimate explosion: World War I.

Notes

1. Robert A. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526–1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 1–4.
2. Ibid., 20–21 and passim. Originally the affiliation of the House of Habsburg with the crown lands of Bohemia and Hungary was by marriage between the Habsburg family and the Jagiello family in the fifteenth century. As Kann observes the movement toward such a consolidation was facilitated by the emergence of "a defensive alliance system of the eastern nations against the Turks." ibid, p. 20–21 and passim.
3. Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London: NLB, 1974), 195.
4. Ibid., 300.
5. Arthur J. May, *The Hapsburg Monarchy, 1867–1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 2f.; also Friedrich Heer, *Kampf umösterreichische Identität* (Wien: 1981), 23ff.
6. May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 3–7; Corvinus quoted ibid., 6.
7. Kann, *History of the Habsburg Empire*, 18–24; May, *Hapsburg Monarchy*, 6–8.
8. It is within this context of the Habsburgs' struggle to consolidate and centralize their realm against the resistance of the Magyar nobility that we understand the roots of the Habsburgs' early commitment to freeing the serfs. The same political motivation—with an added economic motif—becomes evident again in the reform-regimes of Maria Theresa and Joseph II. For our interpretation it is besides the point that the counterreformation "was not in its origins a native growth" as R. J. W. Evans has asserted in *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550–1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 41ff. Evans point concerns the intellectual origins of "Counter Reformation" in the Empire, which was indeed a Jesuit import; my point, however, concerns the power politics (the *Realpolitik*) that fostered the building of the Empire and the subsequent attempts at consolidating it.
9. The West versus East view of the Turkish Wars has become part of historical folklore. Cf. Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany, vol. 1.: The Reformation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 305ff. Also for the Habsburgs' role during the Reformation period and the sixteenth century in general, cf. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire*, 37f. and 62f. For a critical assessment of the Turkish Wars as a struggle for territorial supremacy and the realism of the Habsburgs' realism in dealing with the Hungarian situation, cf. Oscar Jaszi, *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy* (Chicago; IL: University of Chicago Press, 1929), 43–44.
10. Holborn, *A History of Germany*, vol. I, 24–25 and passim, vol. II, 52ff.
11. The war ensued because Charles VI, the last Habsburg ruler, had no male offspring, only a daughter, Maria Theresa, who later married Francis Stephan, the Duke of Lorraine. Although he had tried to deal with the situation through the Habsburg house law, the so-called Pragmatic Sanction, not everyone was willing to accept it.

    In the words of Paul Hofmann, "Prince Eugene warned before his death that '100,000 men and a full treasury are the best guarantees for the Pragmatic Sanction.' Karl VI left behind neither." *The Viennese: Splendor, Twilight, and Exile* (New York: Anchor Books, 1988), 68.
12. C. A. Macartney, *The Habsburg Empire, 1790–1918* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 119.
13. Jaszi, *The Dissolution*, 72–73.
14. The quote is taken from the formulation of the Patent itself. Cf. Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews 1867–1938: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 125.
15. This ambiguity in developments, due to the actual differences of the territories, was exacerbated during the nineteenth century. It illustrates the actual West-East split within the Empire itself, a split that became apparent—and the key factor—in the political and economic modernization process of the nineteenth century. Cf. Alan S. Milward and S. B. Saul, "The Economic Development of Austria-Hungary,

1850-1914" in idem., *The Development of the Economies of Continental Europe, 1850–1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1977), 271–331.

16. Fearing the "export" of the Revolution, Francis had already proclaimed a court edict against crimes committed against the state. This edict of 2 January 1795, together with his previously declared measure for reinstalling the imperial police system (*Geheimpolizei*), gave Count Pergen the legal tools for moving against the Jacobins swiftly and brutally. Cf. Helmut Reinalter, *Aufgeklörter Absolutismus und Revolution: Zur Geschichte des Jakobinertums und der fröndemokratischen Bestrebungen in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Wien: Böhlau, 1980).
17. Cf. Karl A. Roider in his Thugut biography, *Baron Thugut and Austria's Response to the French Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987). Roider argues that Thugut, contrary to prior assumptions that cast him in the role of a *Machtpolitiker* whose only goal was the accumulation and securing of territories for the Habsburgs, consciously worked for an Absolutist alliance because he realized the importance of the French Revolution as a threat to the Old Order.
18. It is interesting to note that the only two names of the reaction mentioned in that modernist pamphlet, *The Communist Manifesto*, are those of Metternich and Guizot whose verdict on democracy was: "There is no longer legitimate cause." Cf. Eric J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848* (New York: New American Library, n. d.), 148.
19. Vide the idealized vision of Franz Joseph by many of his contemporaries who saw him as standing "above" the nationalities problem and representing the Empire as a "whole," which was how he liked to portray himself. Also note the many political-cultural rituals that the emperor performed to create and reinforce with his own body, so to speak, the unity of the realm. Cf. William M. Johnston, *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History 1848–1938* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 33 and passim; also cf. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire*, 250–260, 299–318.
20. "By stratum I shall understand a category of persons who occupy a similar position on a hierarchical scale of certain situational characteristics such as income, prestige, style of life." Ralf Dahrendorf, *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1959), ix.
21. Barbara Jelavich, *Modern Austria: Empire and Republic, 1815–1986* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 66.
22. Ibid., 67, 70–71, 72, and passim.
23. Given their defeat, the Austrian-German–nationalists had to maintain their vision of one German nation as only possible through an act of grace by Prussia. This led them to reject the possibility of an Austrian national identity. Vide articles 1 and 2 of the Constitution that created a republic in 1918: "German-Austria is a democratic republic," "German-Austria is a part of the German Republic." Later German national ideology relied again on terming Austria the "Ostmark," and Hitler was quite happy to bring the Austrians back into the Reich. Cf. Heer, *Kampf um die österreichische Identitt.*
24. Ilsa Barea has pointed to the frequent misconception, no doubt thanks to Richard Strauss, that the Danube is to Vienna what the Thames is to London or the Seine is to Paris; unfortunately this is not the case. *Vienna* (New York: Knopf, 1966), 21–22.
25. At this point it has become customary for the historian of Vienna to tell the audience that the "coffeehouse" (the *café*), one of the most typically Viennese institutions, is a result of the contact between "East" and "West" in Vienna before, during, and after the Turkish Wars. Cf. Hofmann, *The Viennese*, 60–63.
26. On the inner city and the legacy of Baroque, cf. Barea, *Vienna*, 22, 58–110; and Hofmann, *The Viennese*, 63–67. For a general discussion of the "Age of the Baroque" in both German and Austrian history, cf. Hajo Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany* vol. 2 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 123–178.
27. Cf. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848*, passim.
28. Still impressive after all these years: Barrington Moore, Jr., *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).
29. The others were Bohemia with Moravia in the East most likely being the most important and Vorarlberg in the far west, which was heavily under Swiss influence. On the issue of economic development, cf. David F. Good, *The Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire, 1750–1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
30. Cf. Reinalter, *Aufgeklärter Absolutismus und Revolution.*
31. In what follows I am heavily indebted to Carl E. Schorske's seminal essay "The Ringstrasse, Its Critics, and the Birth of Urban Modernism", in *Fin-De-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1980), 24–115.
32. Ibid., 29.
33. Ibid., 29–31.
34. Even prior to the pivotal defeat at the hands of Prussia absolutist rule was shaken by the push for Italian unification in 1859. On the battlefield, against the troops of Sardinia-Piedmont backed by France under Napoleon III, the Empire lost Lombardy. Cf. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire*, 267–69.
35. Schorske, "The Ringstrasse," 31.
36. The *Hofburgtheater* (1874–88), the University (1873–84), and the Parliament (1874–83) are, beside the *Rathaus*, the most famous examples of the Ring development. On the planning and also for telling photographic reproductions, cf. Schorske, "The Ringstrasse."
37. Ibid., 36.
38. Karl Marx, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert Tucker (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974), 477.
39. Cf. Schorske, "The Ringstrasse," 36–43, quote on p. 40.
40. Ibid., 45.
41. Kann, *A History of the Habsburg Empire*, 361.
42. The *Secession* is the name that a group of young Viennese artists assumed in 1897 when they left the Vienna artists' association to form their own association. The group included Klimt, Schiele, and Kokoschka, also the architects Adolf Loos and Joseph Maria Olbrich who built the *Secession's* famous exhibition building.
43. On Kraus, see Caroline Kohn, *Karl Kraus* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1966); Alfred Pfabigan, *Karl Kraus und der Sozialismus: Eine politische Biographie* (Wien: Europaverlag, 1976); and also, Nike Wagner, *Geist und Geschlecht: Karl Kraus un die Erotik der Wiener Moderne* (Frankfurt a M.: Suhrkamp, 1982).
44. On the juxtaposition of Sitte and Wagner: Carl Schorske, "The Ringstrasse", pp. 62-110; all quotations taken from there.
45. Carl E. Schorske, "The Transformation of the Garden" [on Hofmannsthal and Andrian-Werburg], and "Explosion in the Garden: Kokoschka and Schoenberg" in *Fin-De-Siecle Vienna*, 279–321, and 322–66.
46. The distinction between a traditional anti-Semitism and the newer political anti-Semitism has become a mainstay in the literature. In what follows I am drawing

heavily on the following classical studies of the subject: Paul W. Massing, *Vorgeschichte des Politischen Antisemitismus [Rehearsal for Destruction]* (Frankfurt a. M.: Europische Verlagsanstalt, 1959); Peter G. J. Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (New York: John Wiley, 1964); Jocob Katz: *Emancipation and Assimilation: Studies in Modern Jewish History* (Westmead, England: Gregg International, 1972).

47. See, more recently, John Bunzl, "Zur Geschichte des Antisemitismus inösterreich," in idem and Bernd Marin, *Antisemitismus in sterreich: sozialhistorische und soziologische Studien* (Innsbruck: Inn-Verlag, 1983), 9–88, esp. 27–28.
48. Cf. Massing, *Vorgeschichte.*
49. Reinhard Rrup, "The Tortuous and Thorny Path," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook XXXI* (1986), pp. 3–33; David Sorkin, "The Genesis of the Ideology of Emancipation: 1806–1840," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook XXXII (1987)*, 11–40. It should be noted at this point that the attempts at legal reform concerning the status of Jews in the German territories were direct outcomes of the Napoleonic wars and the French occupation. The southwestern administrative units, under direct French control, were the most progressive precisely because they had to adapt to the standards ultimately derived from the Revolution and were set by the French.
50. "Those who came here ten years ago do not love the newcomers. Yet another one has arrived. Yet another one who wants to make a living. Yet another one who wants to live. The worst thing is: one cannot let him die. He is not a stranger. He is a Jew and a compatriot" [my translation]. Joseph Roth, "Juden auf Wanderschaft," *Werke III*, ed. by Hermann Kesten (Munchen: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1976), 325, also 291–369, and especially 323f. Also cf. Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 45 passim.
51. Cf. John W. Boyer, *Political Redicalism in Late Imperial Vienna: Origins of the Christian Social Movement, 1848–1897* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
52. Note Boyer's interpretation of the "two patterns of political attitudes" that developed in the Revolution of 1848, one inclusionary and defensive, centering on bourgeois privileges and cultural ambition, the other inclusionary and aggressive, centering on the model of the *citoyen. Political Radicalism*, 10–13.

Part I

Viennese Society and Its Life-World

2

Cafés, Feuilletons, and Cabarets in Vienna 1900

Fritz Hackert

The acknowledged center of the coffeehouse on the European continent during the nineteenth century was indisputably Paris where about four thousand cafés existed by 1897. It is thus all the more astonishing that in 1881, a French visitor to Vienna, Victor Tissot, should have noted in his travel journal, which he entitled *Vienne et la vie Viennoise*, the great number of remarkable cafés in that city.[1] These "true Old Vienna coffee houses still posessed those roomy basement pubs with broad columns, deep alcoves, and vaulted ceilings."[2] The vaunted biedermeier *Gemütlichkeit* was by this time, however, already in retreat. A new "metropolitan splendor and fin-de-siècle" were already going hand-in-hand.[3]

The Viennese coffeehouse evidences a historical mixture of architectural styles from the monumental and neorenaissance "Café Central" to the experimental and modern "Café Museum." They often evidenced grand ambitions. The "Café de l'Europe," for example, belonged "to the tourist attractions of the Imperial city and . . . [had been given] the nickname 'eternal coffee house' because it was open around the clock."[4] For the owner the business was doubly profitable: besides the financial gain, Ludwig Riedl enjoyed "a popularity that reached upwards into the Imperial family" and that provided him with numerous prizes and medals from his important international guests—so many, indeed, that he "'could not wear them all at the same time.'"[5] The global fame of the Viennese coffeehouse was probably fostered in those last decades of the k. u. k. Monarchy and, no less than other myths deriving from the glory days of the Habsburgs, became a symbol of Austrian *savoir vivre*.

The typical characteristics of the Viennese coffeehouse were developed in different areas of the restaurant business, specifically in the area of coffee making and serving. No essay and no book on the theme of the Viennese coffeehouse fails to mention the extraordinary number of coffees mixed in Vienna, the traditions of brewing and serving, and the special terminology invented there:

"Great Black, i.e. a cup of strong, black coffee . . . Great Brown, i.e. a cup of black coffee with whipped cream . . . Melange, i.e. milk and coffee in a cup or glass," etc.[6]

Beside the coffee cup was always the obligatory glass of water, which was constantly being refilled free of charge as a special service. It represented a symbolic consumption, which invited even the poorest guest to stay as long as he would like. This was a necessary condition of coffeehouse life for its bohemian habituées at the turn of the century. It enabled the poorest among them, who always seemed to have a firm belief in their own genius, to beg rather shamelessly for some food—like the mandatory *kipferl*, schnitzel, or Viennese sausages—to go with their drink.

A piece of furniture, however, also helped spread the fame of the Viennese coffeehouse during the second half of the nineteenth century. A beautiful chair of bended wood, easily transportable and remarkably comfortable, would define the style for cafés throughout the world. It was produced by the Thonet Company and it was used to furnish the "Café Daum" in 1849. Four hundred pieces were delivered to a hotel in Budapest during that same year and thus the victorious march of the Thonet chair began.[7] Receiving medals for their design qualities at all the world fairs, the chairs were exported from Austria in increasing numbers. In 1896 the company had reached design-type no. 14 and had sold 40 million pieces of that model abroad. Their combination of elegance and usefulness made them attractive to the "Americanized" architect Adolf Loos who employed the Thonet chairs in 1899 for the interior of his Viennese "Café Museum" in which various styles were randomly juxtaposed leading various critics to call the museum the "café nihilism."[8]

As far as the handling of the newspaper selection in pubs and coffeehouses is concerned, the Viennese contribution was already registered by the Berliner Friedrich Nicolai, a travel journalist in 1781: "In the Viennese coffee houses the newspapers are stuck into a special board with a stick which is fastened by a lock. . . . This discovery is not bad, thus, the single pages can not get messed up or stolen."[9] Although theft was thus prevented, however, hoarding newspapers by individual readers became commonplace and the ongoing target of caricaturists of all sorts. Nevertheless the ready supply of reading material helped turn the Viennese coffeehouse into an "expanded 'living space.'"[10]

More concretely, of course, this was brought about through industrialization and the migration at the end of the nineteenth century spurred by anti-semitism in Eastern Europe. There was "a lack of housing, but also . . . a lack in the quality of housing."[11] The coffeehouse thus served several functions through which the vital needs of the city dwellers were met. In the travel descriptions and feuilletons about the Viennese coffeehouse, this fact is expressed in almost identical formulations. The institution served as an ideal home where one could receive comfort, where one did not have to be ashamed, where one could surmount

one's frustration and despair, and where one could find a social way of life and perhaps even a bit of financial support. Thus it is not surprising when one hears from a local that "he has mother-womb feelings whenever he sits for a couple of hours in the coffee house, that strongly does he feel the experience of absolute security."[12]

In his autobiography, the journalist Stefan Grossmann recalls that "there were coffee houses in the suburbs, merchants' coffee houses in the business districts, artists' coffee houses at the *Reichsratsgebäude*, doctors' coffee houses in the surroundings of the general hospital."[13] The Jewish merchants, for example, chose the coffeehouses near the Danube: "In a simple, unassuming coffee house by Stierböck at the Danube, moved from morning until night a couple of hundred people, closing or making business deals all the time, without anything but a notebook. . . . Similarly . . . it was the case with the liquor trade. It took place in the coffee house Fetzer, across from Stierböck."[14] And as everywhere in the world, in Vienna "at least since the middle of the nineteenth century almost all bigger coffee houses became simultaneously also meeting places for associations and clubs. . . . The coffee house Louvre in Vienna is since 1898 the coffee house of the philatelists, in the coffee house Schiller on Sunday mornings the association of the deaf and dumb has its meetings."[15]

In Hans Weigel's review of the Vienna coffeehouses, one finds the social contrast of the Viennese high society coffeehouse. This can be seen in the "'Tschecherl', actually 'Tschocherl', an ugly, comfortable, popular coffee house,"[16] whose status the waiter Eduard refers to in Karl Kraus's tragedy *The Last Days of Mankind* when he reprimands a colleague and a coffee brewer for their disturbing jokes: "Are you in a Tschecherl? You should be ashamed!"[17] Weigel states how quickly the term can lose its *Gemütlichkeit* and become seedy: "a not so comfortable Tschocherl is called 'Tschoch' and that mostly means a coffee house that is frequented by gangsters.—And this facet of the Vienna coffee house scene has to be mentioned, too, namely, the night café where the knife is quickly drawn and where illegal gambling goes on . . . gangsters, gamblers, actors, poets and writers have their own coffee houses in which they hang out, but so do . . . the jewel merchants, the bookmakers, the athletes."[18]

But whether Tschecherl, bourgeois coffeehouse, or night café, there was always the music. Live music in Vienna could mean "anything from the respectable string quartet that played happy tunes by Mozart and Lanner to the extremely scantilly clad female band who at night entertained in the 'Cafe Laferl' (1889) the demi monde."[19] During the nineteenth century, in fact, open-air concerts near the "People's Garden" and the Prater became increasingly popular when music pavillions were erected in front of the coffee houses and people could sit outside. One young, poor, musical genius in particular liked to stand at the fence of the First Prater coffee house "'to listen to music for free'—his name is Arnold Schönberg."[20]

The chess players, however, undoubtedly considered the noise disturbing. They would retreat to the separate chess room of the coffeehouse, which guaranteed silence, and where—as an ad for the "Cafe Central" claimed—they could meet all the "world-champion chess players." The most well-known of all the anecdotes about the chess players, their onlookers (*Kiebitze*), and their strange habits is the remark by a Viennese acquaintance of Trotsky during the Russian Revolution. At the outbreak of the First World War, the revolutionary had moved to Zürich, and now one heard the incredible news of his former chess partner: "Who is trying to make a revolution in Russia? Why, Mr. Trotsky from the Cafe Central?"[21] Most of Trotsky's coffeehouse friends, such as the prominent Austro-Marxists Otto Bauer and Karl Renner, however, "were not revolutionaries."[22] What Trotsky discussed with them and published in the exile-*Pravda* or in the *Wiener Arbeiter-Zeitung* seemed to make little impact on them. Thus in his memoirs, the leader of the Bolshevik Revolution could write: "Between 1900 and 1910, Vienna was one of the intellectual centres of the world, and Vienna didn't know it."[23]

Besides chess there was billards. After it had been picked up from France in the second half of the eighteenth century, the game became so fashionable in Vienna that the Hugelmannsche coffeehouse developed "into the Mecca of the billard artists" and after its remodeling in 1830 even "into the European 'University of the billard game.'"[24] Around the middle of the nineteenth century, the poet Nikolaus Lenau counted among the best billard players of those in the "Silbernes Kaffeehaus" in Vienna, and as a matter of course, even into our century, all literature with Vienna as its setting always has an obligatory billard scene. "Little coffee house in the second district," for example, is the heading of the third scene of Horváth's *Geschichten aus dem Wiener Wald*, and the instruction reads: "The Hierlinger Ferdinand (playing billard against himself)."

As in the case of the billard or the card player, the coffee house also encouraged the passion of the monomaniacal newspaper reader, from the "reading room around 1800 to the reading café of the late 19th century—which finds as one of its apexes the Viennese Café Central, a kind of 'library with coffee enjoyment.'"[25] Thanks to the practical newspaper carriers, the coffeehouse readers were hardly able to tear the papers apart or to steal them. Instead the coffeehouse readers engaged in a different vice, which the twenty-two-year-old Karl Kraus depicted in his controversial satire on the literary round tables in the Café Griensteidl. They spyed upon "tables whose relationship to literature is only sporadic, [at which] people are sitting whose talent is confined to the marginal notes and glosses which they write into every magazine that is carried in the literary caf."[26]

Newspaper graffiti expressing the ever-present Viennese anti-Semitism, in this vein, also had its fanatical readership in the coffeehouse. One young man in particular wandered the city, slept at times "on park benches and in coffee

houses,"[27] intoxicated himself with the monumentality of the Ringstrasse and the pathos of Wagnerian opera, and sat "for hours . . . with the newspapers in small, cheap suburban coffee houses, preferring to read the anti-semitic *Deutsches Volksblatt*":[28] his name was Adolf Hitler. Nevertheless the principal aim of Kraus's satire "Die demolierte Literatur" in the *Wiener Rundschau* was the pretensions of this literary bohemia, the "mood people,"[29] whose circles and opinion leaders met in the "Café Griensteidl."

The journalist Karl Kraus, according to Alma Mahler-Werfel, "listened here and there—had stories told to him and used the gossip unchecked in his newly founded journal *Die Fackel*."[30] His use of the parodistic quotation or dismissive characterization spared neither persons nor institutions and ridiculed every programmatic statement of his contemporaries, including the pathos of their formulations. His hatred was especially nourished by the feuilleton section of the newspaper with its genres of the book and theater review, the serial novel, and the mood piece from the everyday life of Vienna, which usually concerned "the emotional comfort drawn from thinking in 'a quiet street on a Sunday afternoon' and 'the unbelievably sad Prater pub on week-days.'" Kraus believed that the preoccupation with such themes fed the "eternally recurring sentimental insane imaginings" of a mass public and its "touchingly narrow horizon."[31] Instead of informing and enlightening, according to Kraus, journalism of this sort catered to the self-satisfaction and stupidity of the public in the same way that the overinflated symbolism of *Jung-Wien* betrayed the clarity of language.

The showy classicism of Hofmannstal and the Goethe-cult, both of which provoked Kraus's scorn, were examples of a general trend in artistic self-stylization whereby historical retrogression converged with idolatry. Around the turn of the century, Vienna was not only full of memorials for rulers, but also of memorials for artists. Memorials were erected for Schubert (1872), Schiller (1876), Grillparzer (1889), Mozart (1896), Raimund (1898), Makart (1898), Goethe (1900), Strauß and Lanner (1905), and Anzengruber (1905).[32] The childhood dream of the great artistic career stressed in Stefan Zweig's depiction of his Viennese childhood was coupled with the growth of personality cults by which insignificant encounters with Brahms or Mahler triggered ecstatic raptures.[33] To fill a little space at the main table of an establishment or to wait for inspiration in the aura of a locale for one's own important works were both the essence and pastime of many guests at the cafés of artists. It is quite characteristic that "the literat" in Moritz Jung's caricature has an empty page in front of him and the feather in the ink well—phenomena depicted on the periphery, whereas the center is taken by the crumpled elegance of his clothing and his brooding facial expression. Kraus expressed both the image and the causal chain in his image of the "author working for years on the third line of a novel while reflecting upon each word in several dresses."[34]

The hint of literary activity here supports the art of fashionable self-expression and a lifestyle for which, in the course of the nineteenth century, the term "dandy" was employed. This social role became highly attractive for the younger generation of Viennese feuilletonists, which had distanced itself from the working bourgeoisie and mastered an elegant and playful style of life at the turn of the century. Richard Schaukal, who already in 1901 retrospectively assessed the "Interieurs from the Life of a Twenty-year old" and in 1908 translated into German Barbey d'Aurevilly's work "Of Dandyism and George Brummel," became particularly famous in this regard with his short stories about the dandy "Herr von Balthesser." What distinguishes him from all other bohemians is his aestheticism and his lifestyle. He manifests a mystically inborn "proper conduct."[35] "A chosen breed of young people"[36] might achieve it through education. But for him it is "a peculiarity of his 'race,' like sweating for the blacks."[37]

The dandy, according to Rudolf Kassner, is a dilettante who "wants to be everything at once, asketes and tennis players, Machiavelli, Novalis, and George IV."[38] Franz Blei, the author of an essay entitled "The Dandy," believed he could handle any character. He portrayed "Murderers" and "The Holy Teresa," the "Expert in the Art of Living" and the "Nun Mariana," "Casanova" and the "Marquis de Sade," "Three Romantic Lovers" and the dancer "Isadora Duncan," the occultist "Doctor Schrenck-Notzing" and "Karl Kraus,"[39] whom he appropriately called the "Swift of Vienna."[40] All of them, according to Kassner, are artists of life (*Lebenskünstler*) for whom aesthetic affectation provides the basis of all understanding so that ultimately: "One fakes the artist since Nietzsche. Everything that man is . . . one wants to be as an artist: statesman, philosopher, general, critic, gangster, doctor, naturally also journalist and publisher."[41]

These ambitions extend to the cabaret, which played such an extraordinary role in Viennese cultural life. Just as it is a small step from the style of the feuilletonist to the cabaretist so is it a short way from the feuilleton to the cabaret. Indeed it is correct to suggest that:

> The brevity, acuity of observation, topicality, wit, and superficiality of the feuilleton found an easy accommodation in the cabaret. Serving as a kind of bridge between contemporary Viennese journalism and the cabaret, the feuilleton also enhanced the receptivity of the cabaret to the other generically related minor prose forms such as the sketch, the caricature, and the anecdote, and in concert with them eventually brought about the literary transformation of the early Vienna cabaret. Whatever other entertainments won favor, whether musical, choreographical, or dramatic, it was, beyond doubt, the writer and performer of small prose who came to the fore of the Vienna cabaret and left his mark on it.[42]

Before anything was fixed in writing, anecdote, and aphorism, it usually was rehearsed spontaneously in the medium of everyday speech. This, after all, was how it would later appear in the cabaret. One could observe acts in the day-to-day theatrics of the coffeehouse. The most especially brilliant of Vienna's feuilletonists, such as Peter Altenberg or Egon Friedell, provided the cabaret "with the wit and gossip of turn-of-the-century Viennese café society."[43] And within that context, the "literati without any writings"[44] also had a productive function. They offered ideas, formulations, stimulation, and sometimes even usable material for colleagues working on jokes, poems, glosses, short dramas, sketches, dialogues, revues, and operetta libretti.

The literary and artistic cabaret of Vienna was based on models derived from Berlin and Munich. It was preceded by the success of the suburban variety shows with their beloved singers and star comedians, couplets and sketches. Here certain entertainers from Budapest had a significant influence.[45] In "Herzmanns Orpheum" of Budapest, the actor Mendel Rottmann and the tenor Benjamin Blass came together under the stage name of "Brüder Rott."[46] After moving to Vienna in 1889, they participated in founding the Budapest Orpheums Society. Its program was initially linked to the restaurant business, especially in the Leopoldstadt and the Prater:

> One played at first at the "Schwarzer Adler" in the Taborstrasse 11, then at Stalehner and Tokes in Hernals, beginning in 1895 at the Hotel "Stephanie." Later, beginning in 1903, the Hotel "Central" in the Taborstrasse 8 was added, after 1905 several Prater localities and, finally, in 1911 what would become the "Roland Bühne," Praterstrasse 25.[47]

Also from Budapest, where he had learned his trade as a comic and dancer, came Heinrich Eisenbach who, from 1894, served as the inspiration and leading man of this Viennese troupe.[48] The jokes and anecdotes of the solo scenes satirized public events in Vienna. They often dealt with the fate of the little salesmen from the mostly Jewish Leopoldstadt. "The evening began with resounding marching music, followed by acts of several song-humorists, succeeded by the first one-act show, which most of the time stemmed from one of the in-house authors. After the intermission came on as highlight of the evening a solo scene by Eisenbach or Max Rott, as well as another one-act show."[49]

One cabaret writer never mentioned in any history of literature saw the premiere of his one-act scene on 19 November 1890, at the Budapester. The one-act scene was played in a milieu dominated by card games in a "little, spare coffee house in the Leopoldstadt."[50] The author was Adolf Bergmann, and the farce was called "Die Klabriaspartie." It was so successful that—at times with the stars Heinrich Eisenbach and Max Rott—it received "a thousand encore presentations"[51] and became for the owners of its copyright, the management of the Budapest Orpheum, a particularly profitable venture. The

preoccupation with money is revealed by a character, Moritz the waiter, who sighs: "If I say to someone, I want my money, he says, of course you can have your money, but not mine."[52] Felix Salten found Eisenbach's acting praiseworthy insofar as it evidenced "the indestructable, untamable power of life . . . that wants to flee the sadness of the ghetto."[53] Salten's nemesis, Karl Kraus, became so enthralled with the cabaret, however, that he suggested that the vapid and "mostly empty *Burgtheater* should be rented to the *Budapester*."[54]

Entertainment for the grand public was dominated in Vienna by the operetta, whose godfather, Jacques Offenbach, even Karl Kraus revered. The turn of the century, however, marks the divide between its "golden" and the "silver epoch." In 1899, the year of the premiere of "Wiener Blut," Johann Strauss (son) died. His operetta, *Die Fledermaus* (1874), made him the undisputed master of the genre. The Vienna premiere of the operetta *Die Lustige Witwe* (1905) by Franz Lehar marked the beginning of the new epoch. In the "Café Museum," composers of the "silver epoch" such as the Hungarians Lehár and Emmerich Kálmán, as well as the Czech Leo Fall, met regularly.[55] And for another member of the circle, Oskar Strauß, the former "decadent" poet of the "Café Griensteidl," Felix Dörmann, wrote the libretto of the successful operetta *Ein Walzertraum* (1907).

What academics later divided between poetics and trivial entertainment art is, from a historical perspective, a network of interdependent influences. The "belletristic and music journal" of 1890 in which the first poems of Hugo von Hofmannsthal were published, for example, was called "On the Beautiful, Blue Danube," a Viennese "journal of entertainment for the family."[56] The Viennese cabaret, which found its niche in competing with the opera and theater, the ballet and variety show, and the circus and revue,[57] was actually a mixture of all of them and showed marked differences in the quality of its products. Its attractiveness derived from the avant-garde and experimental character of the shows, which undoubtedly explains the short-lived character of its institutions and programs.

In September of 1901, Ernst von Wolzogen and his Berlin cabaret troupe, *Überbrettl*, played at the Carl-Theater in Vienna.[58] The poets of Jung-Wien from the "Café Griensteidl" were impressed and decided to replicate the *Überbrettl* in the form of a literary variety show and provide it "through the special concern with the specifically Viennese contents in music, poetry, and painting, a totally independent, native character."[59] Local color was expressed in the name "Lieber Augustin," which was taken from the Viennese folk song and its hero, as well as in the announcement that a "newly discovered Johann-Straus-waltz" would be played at the premiere.[60]

When Felix Salten, culture editor at the *Wiener Zeitung*, took over the artistic direction of the cabaret program and used the Theater an der Wien, the set design became legendary and made theater history under the name of *Stilbühne*.

Kolo Moser, later the star-designer of the *Wiener Werkstätte*, created (among other things) decoration curtains, using a pattern of black-and-white squares.[61] The program mostly consisted of well-liked chansons. Frank Wedekind, who had been engaged from Munich as the main attraction, presented some of his own cryptic ballads like "Brigitte B." and "Ilse." This overtaxed audience and critics alike. The few positive reviews, as Karl Kraus put it, all came from the clique who were financial or artistic partners in the "Jung-Wiener Theater zum lieben Augustin." After seven performances, the cabaret was cancelled and, in its stead, the theater once again began playing operettas like the old standby *Die Fledermaus*.

Vienna continued to witness cabaretistic contributions to its entertainment and nightlife. In the inner city and the Prater, cafés and night-bars offered short operettas, one-act plays, variety shows, acrobatics, and dog tricks—all of them in conjunction with the restaurant business, whose clientele and profits dictated the kind and quality of the entertainment programs.[62] It was in fact at the regular table of a pub-restaurant, the "Löwenbräu, Teinfaltstrasse 12,"[63] that Viennese bohemia, with the help of some Munich cabaret experts formerly of the "Elf Scharfrichter," created a new intellectual cabaret. The "Nachtlicht" opened at the Ballgasse 6 on 5 January 1906 and sought to create a Parisian atmosphere: on the walls hung French posters and, in a corner, stood the statue of the singer Marya Delvard posing as a femme fatale.

Peter Altenberg was especially active, and he awakened the interests of Adolf Loos, Egon Friedell, and Karl Kraus in the new cabaret. Together they served as a pseudopublic and claqueurs. Altenberg, in fact, wrote the heart-wrenching, apologetical review of the premiere for the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*.[64] Chansons and songs dominated the program of the *Nachtlicht*: the painter Carl Hollitzer sang lansquenet songs dressed in old uniforms; Fred Dolbin, later to become famous as a portrait artist, sang Richard Dehmel's *Erntelied* and Felix Dörmann attempted to practice poetry—namely his own—with the presentation of selected erotic songs. For the grotesque horror scene of the parodist Hanns von Gumpenberg, the entire artistic cast assembled on stage and one after the other committed suicide. The dance act was presented by Gertrude Barrison using the Kathinkapolka by Johann Strauss; she was "the youngest of the popular 'Barrison-Sisters'"[65] who, with the Wiesenthal sisters, would make a career as dancers in that decade. There were also guest appearances by Roda Roda who told anecdotes and military jokes, as well as the future anarchist Erich Mühsam, whose debut as a Viennese cabaret player received only a luke-warm response.

Only three months after the opening of the *Nachtlicht*, a conflict developed among the cast and financial contributors sparked by the all-too-intensive interest that Karl Kraus showed for the singer Marya Delvard. When she criticized the "good advice" of artist friends who made unwelcome advances in the Vienna *Fremden Blatt*, Kraus felt personally wounded and took this as a new

opportunity for personal polemics in *Die Fackel*. The polemics continued after the demise of the *Nachtlicht*. They were accompanied by a civil lawsuit because Marc Henry, Delvard's jealous and offended partner, beat up Kraus in a public establishment.

The higher aspirations and demands of art received expression in cabarets like *Schmiere* or *Simplicissimus*, which often offered more champagne than aesthetic appreciation. Mary Irber danced in bare feet to a gangster chanson translated into German from the repertoire of Yvette Guilbert.[66] She was much admired by Erich Mühsam and belongs to the history of expressive dance which, whatever the protestations of the nudist movement, took place in cabarets and variety shows as well as in nature.[67] The club Hölle with its *Jugendstil* interior, located in the basement of the Theater an der Wien, offered various "short sketches, vaudevilles, operettas, and, last but not least, a 'modern restaurant'" in 1906.[68] There the star singer was Mella Mars, and among her admirers was the feuilletonist, theater critic, and cabaret texter Alfred Polgar, who was transfixed by the "strange, restless beauty" of the singer.[69]

Polgar was the notorious regular patron who wrote the "Theory of the 'Café' Central.'"[70] But he was also a productive contributor to the program of this uniquely Viennese artistic cabaret in whose service Marc Henry and his group decided to stay after the closing of the *Nachtlicht*. The extravagant interior and performances led to its being nicknamed *Die Fledermaus*. There was a "'Bar-Room' in front of the theater room,"[71] and one could seat "around 300 guests . . . at tables from three to ten Kronen in black-and-white colored seats."[72]

Fitting the highly styled interior decoration was "the fashionable design of the dinner set."[73] Painters and designers of the Vienna Secession, such as Gustav Klimt, Oskar Kokoschka, and Emil Orlik, created the corporatist identity of the *Fledermaus* in the service of the Wiener Werkstätte and under the direction of its cofounder Josef Hoffmann. They created a "total work of art . . . full of mundane totality; the ante-chamber, bar, theater room, stage, costume design, curtains, posters, programm leaflets, table settings, and interiors."[74] The appearance of this new *Jugendstil*-cabaret meshed with its program in which "all senses . . . simultaneously [should] at least be stimulated if not satisfied, and none of the arts (poetics, music, dance, painting, architecture) [should be] left out," because in their specific ways all of them obeyed "the intended totalizing effect."[75]

Marc Henry, who had been involved in founding the *Nachtlicht* and, toward the end of 1905, in the Viennese *Modernes Cabaret* at the Philipphof,[76] now found himself in a truly path-breaking scene. Here Vienna's best feuilletonists—Altenberg, Friedell, Polgar—had dedicated themselves to the art of entertainment and propagated poetically and with a lot of humor the separation from the nineteenth century and its way of life. On 19 October 1907 in front of invited guests in the basement of the house Kärntnerstraße 35, the dress rehearsal

took place,[77] and Lina Vetter, the first wife of the architect Loos, recited the opening monologue, written by Altenberg, with its utopian program for a new art and a new life:

> The habitual only makes me sick and tired. Concert, theater, much too heavy fare in a steamy auditorium! I'm dreaming of a smaller room in which freedom reigns. Comfort, art, and culture all at the same time, and fresh air for our poor lungs. Our light mood, after all, comes only from oxygen.[78]

Principles of the life-reform movement, which Altenberg would occasionally expound upon to the regulars at the café, co-determined the total work of art, although for the creation and enjoyment of a light mood, certain drugs seemed desirable. Thus the monologue continues in somewhat contradictory fashion: "I'd like to . . . do what I feel like at the moment, eat, drink, smoke. . . . I'd like to surrender myself perhaps more, for a moment, to the smoke of a fine cigarette than to some ever so lovely song."[79]

The cooperation among the writers of the *Fledermaus* led to legendary teaming of authors: "the team of Altenberg and Friedell, Altenberg supplying anecdotes or serving as the butt of them, and Friedell reciting them, became a Fledermaus institution."[80] The greatest popularity was reached by the team of Friedell and Polgar in "their 'Grotesque in Two Scenes,' Goethe, a satire lambasting the artificiality and aridity of contemporary pedagogy, on the one hand, and, on the other, in the familiar style of cabaret irreverence, mocking a literary great, this time, in the German context, the greatest of all—Goethe!"[81]

The sketch can be found in the January program of 1908, and Friedell himself played the part of Goethe, with a "peculiar swabian-bavarian jargon, which in Viennese company he called frankfurtian" as his coauthor Polgar ironically remarked.[82] The little piece was as much of an encore success as the "Klabrias Partie" at the "Budapester." Its satire was directed not merely against the school system and the cultural monuments but also against the reign of positivism in the contemporary interpretation of literature. Goethe, summoned from the beyond, can neither recall the details of his biography nor find appropriate explanations of his works in secondary sources; the experiences responsible for his poetry never appear in the chronological and statistical data. This critical perspective is obvious in Friedell's history of culture.[83] Indeed he continued to play "Goethe" in native and foreign ensembles for thirty years until his death in 1938.[84]

The young Kokoschka demonstrated his talents not only through his contributions to the interior design and advertisements for the *Fledermaus* but also by appearing in his own one-act shows. In *Das getupfte Ei*, for example, he experimented with an "indian fairytale in the form of a shadow play in moving pictures" and, in 1907, he recited his poem *Der träumende Knabe*. He also produced his first dramatic works, *Sphinx und Strohmann* and *Mörder Hoffnung der Frauen*, which would become expressionistic precursors for Ionesco's theater

of the absurd.[85] Those afternoon shows—"consisting mainly of dance numbers"[86]—with their program of puppet plays and pantomimes demonstrate the increasing interest in the language of the body. In Altenberg's *Maskenspiel*, for example, the text of the female figures is reduced to an aphorism: "the little play features a dramatic personae of nine masked women in costume each of whom represents what Altenberg . . . perceived to be a distinct female type."[87] In different costumes, or "masks," female allegories of behavior and lifestyle appear—"The Philosophical One" or "The Complicated One"—and recite as living monuments the cryptic insights of their creator. "*Die weissen Schwestern*," which was based on sayings by Peter Altenberg,[88] was similarly a nude plastic art act, consisting of "two naked actresses painted snow-white, with golden tassels hanging from their hips" and assuming "a series of visually stunning poses behind yellow-gold veils."[89]

In the black-and-white interior of the *Fledermaus*, the eroticism of such veil dances, popular in cabarets and variety shows, became an aesthetic element of a Jugendstil work of art. Artists struggled for an heightened form of expression, which was especially needed by the silent art of dancing through employing the grotesque. If the painter Carl Kollitzer still designed the Rokoko and Biedermeier costumes for the dances of Gertrude Barrison in a quasi-naturalistic way, Kolo Moser created for the February program of 1908 "the design of Barrison's costume (in green) for a number billed, in the words of Peter Altenberg, as a "noble-grotesque dance."[90] The step from the historical or folk dance to expressionist dance had been made.

Brilliant exaggerations of operetta clichés and folkloristic Vienna-stereotypes in works like *Der Petroleumkönig oder Donauzauber* actually increased the pleasure of the public in the genre. Ever-present business worries, however, threatened to transform the artistic cabaret "into an ordinary operetta and farce theater."[91] In March 1909 a matinee took place honoring the fiftieth birthday of Peter Altenberg. It marked the period in which the *Fledermaus* underwent a "metamorphosis from a total work of art to light entertainment."[92] Friedell gave up his position in 1910 and, with that, the avant-garde stimulus vanished.

For about two years, "from its inception in 1907 to its effectual demise, in the creative sense, by the end of 1909,"[93] the *Fledermaus* company stood at the apex of the international cabaret world and actually enriched the activities of its precursors in Berlin, Munich, and Paris. With the opening of a folksy place named *Das Biercabaret Simplicissimus*, however, a less adventurous cabaret scene was restored. Its guiding spirit was "the actor/director Egon Dorn from Lübeck"[94] who had briefly served as the director of the *Fledermaus* following Friedell's resignation. The new cabaret offered a "colorful mixed program with different guest appearance by cabaret greats every month."[95] It also presented Viennese locals like Friedell or the promising young talent Fritz Grünbaum. "At the beginning of each show, a house orchestra put the Viennese in a good mood

with walzes and popular opera melodies. . . . Dorn, however, showed little interest in dramatic scenes since he feared that those would keep his audience from ordering and eating meals."[96] The nonmusical part of the program was traditional enough. Nationalistic themes were highlighted. The Viennese cabaret, in this way, kept up with the times. It, too, participated in the march down the road to World War I.[97]

Notes

1. See Friedrich Hansen-Löwe, "Kaffeehausgesellschaft", in Kurt-Jürgen Heering, ed., *Das Wiener Kaffeehaus* (Frankfurt/M. und Leipzig: Insel Verlag, 1993), 263. Also, cf. Hans Weigel, Christian Brandstätter, and Werner J. Schweiger, *Das Wiener Kaffeehaus*, Goldmann Tachenbuch Nr. 26904 (Reihe "Austriaca": Originalausgabe: Wien-München-Zürich: Fritz Molden, 1978), henceforth cited as Weigel; *Das Wiener Kaffeehaus: Von den Anfängen bis zur Zwischenkriegszeit.* Wien 1980 (Katalog zur 66. Sonderausstellung des Historischen Museums der Stadt Wien vom 12.6. bis 26.10.1980), henceforth cited as *Katalog*; Ulla Heise, *Kaffee und Kaffeehaus: Eine Kulturgeschichte* (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms Presse/Edition Leipzig, 1987), henceforth cited as Heise.
2. Cf. Hirschfeld, "Kaffeehauskultur," in *Katalog*, p. 7.
3. Ibid., 81.
4. Hans Veigl, "Der wichtigste Mann von Wien: Aus dem 'Lehmann' 1913," in idem, ed., *Lokale Legenden: Wiener Kaffeehausliteratur* (Wien: Kremayr und Scheriau, 1991), 209; other citations from this volume will appear as: Veigl I.
5. Ibid.
6. Heering, *Dos Wiener Kaffeehaus*, 311.
7. On the history of the Thonet chair, see Heise, 100–101, and *Katalog*, 81.
8. Cited in *Katalog*, 109, no. 236.
9. Cited in Weigel, 103.
10. Johannes Spalt, "Das Wiener Kaffeehaus–Seine Entwicklung und Gestaltung" in *Katalog*, 46/Sp. 1.
11. Ibid.
12. Milan Dubrovic, *Veruntreute Geschichte: Die Wiener Salons und Literatencafés* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1987), 106.
13. Cited in Veigl I (n. 44), 80.
14. Sigmund Mayer, *Die Wiener Juden, 1700–1900* (Wien, 1917), cited in Veigl I (n. 4), 109.
15. Heise, 140. The "talk between the deaf" was a motif of the caricatures of the coffeehouse that Moritz Jung created for the Wiener Werkstätte around 1910 as drafts for postcards: cf. Weigel, 30.
16. Hans Weigel, "Das Kaffeehaus als Wille und Vorstellung", in Heering, 302.
17. Karl Kraus, *Die Letzten Tage der Menschheit* (Zürich: Pegasus, 1945), 35.
18. Weigel, "Das Kaffeehaus als Wille und Vorstellung," in Heering, 302.
19. Heise, 165.
20. Ibid., 155.
21. Cf. Dubrovic, *Veruntreute Geschichte*, 156.
22. Cited in Veigl I (n. 4), 163.

23. Otto Friedlander, *Letzter Glanz der Märchenstadt: Das war Wien um 1900* (Wien-München: Molden Tachenbuch nr. 12, 1976), 219.
24. Heise, 150.
25. Ibid., 137.
26. Karl Kraus, "Die demolirte Literatur", in Heering, 85–86.
27. Joachim C. Fest, *Hitler: Eine Biographie* (Frankfurt/Main: Ullstein/Propylaen, 1973), 70.
28. Ibid., 73.
29. Karl Kraus, "Die demolirte Literatur," 62.
30. Cited in Veigl I (n. 4), 110–11.
31. Karl Kraus, "Die demolirte Literatur", in Heering (n. 1), 78.
32. See the image series "Wiener Denkmäler I/II" in *Meyers Großes Konversations-Lexikon* (Leipzig und Wien: Bibliographisches Institut, 1908), vol. 20, 602ff.
33. Cited in Heering, 41.
34. Kraus, "Die demolirte Literatur," in Heering, 72.
35. Richard Schaukal, *Leben und Meinungen des Herrn Andreas von Balthesser* (München: Georg Müller Verlag, 1907), 46.
36. Ibid., 34.
37. Ibid., 46.
38. Rudolf Kassner, "Dilettantismus (1910)" in *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 3 (Pfullingen: Neske, 1976), 28.
39. Franz Blei, "Der Beau" in *Porträts* (Wien/Köln/Graz: Böhlau, 1987), 630–32.
40. Ibid., 501.
41. Rudolf Kassner, "Dilettantismus," 29–30.
42. Harold B. Segel, *Turn-of-the-Century Cabaret: Paris, Barcelona, Berlin, Munich, Vienna, Cracow, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Zurich* (New York: Columbia Univeristy Press, 1987), 198; also, cf. Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), 9.
43. Segel, *Turn-of-the-Century Cabaret*, 202.
44. See Hartmut Binder, "Ernst Polak–Literat ohne Werk: Zu den Kaffeehauszirkeln in Prag und Wien,"*Jahrbuch der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 23 (1979), 366–415. With Polak, Binder describes a type within the literary bohème whose life encompassed thoroughly the double spheres of bourgeois work (bank clerk) and artistic society. One is unable to classify him using Kreuzer's categories of the dandy, the daydreamer, the debate fanatic, the Weltschmerz martyr. Cf. Helmut Kreuzer, *Die Bohème: Analyse und Dokumentation der intellektuellen Subkultur vom 19. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971), 201–11.
45. How lasting and deep the influence of the Budapest models were for the international entertainment business can be seen in the premiere of the "proto-typical schwabian characters" "Häberle and Pfleiderer." The original text, based on coffeehouse talk (!), was created by the Budapest feuilletonist Laslo Vadnay and arrived via an agency at the Stuttgart-based "Bunte Bühne Pavillon Excelsior." There a duo with the Hungarian names of "Hacsek and Sajo" was rechristened for Schwabian consumption into "Häberle and Pfleiderer." Cf. Ulrich Keuler, "Häberle und Pfleiderer: Zur Geschichte, Machart und Funktion einer populären Unterhaltungsreihe [Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde e. V., 1991, 11–23]).
46. Hans Veigl, *Lachen im Keller. Von den Budapestern zum Wiener Werkel. Kabarett und Kleinkunst in Wien.* (Wien: Locker Verlag, 1986), 13; otherwise cited as Veigl II.
47. Ibid., 10.
48. Ibid., 11.

49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., 12.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., 12.
53. Cited in Veigl II, 11.
54. Ibid., 13.
55. See the picture in Veigl I, 11.
56. See the catalog "Jugend in Wien: Literatur um 1900," Ausstellung des Deutschen Literaturarchivs im Schiller Nationalmuseum Marbach a.N., 1974, 96, no. 84.
57. See on the revue, Franz-Peter Kothes, *Die theatralische Revue in Berlin und Wien, 1900–1938: Typen, Inhalte, Funktionen* (Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen's Verlag, 1977).
58. See Walter Rösler, ed., *Gehn ma halt a bisserl unter: Kabarett in Wien von den Anfängen bis heute* (Berlin: Henschel Verlag, 1991), 480.
59. Cited in Veigl II, 16.
60. Cited in Veigl II, 15.
61. Ibid., 16.
62. Ibid., 20.
63. Ibid., 24.
64. Peter Altenberg, "Cabaret Nachtlicht" in the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, 9 January 1906, reprinted in Veigl II, 25.
65. Ibid., 30.
66. Veigl II, 36.
67. See Hedwig Müller/Patricia Stockemann, "... jeder Mensch ist ein Tänzer: Ausdruckstanz in Deutschland zwischen 1900 und 1945" (Giessen: Anabas-Verlag, 1993)–the sphere of the entertainment business is only mentioned in passing there.
68. Veigl II, 38.
69. Ibid., 38–39.
70. Alfred Polgar, "Theorie des 'Café Central,'" in Heering, 149–54.
71. Veigl II, 28.
72. Ibid., 29.
73. Ibid., 31.
74. Ibid., 29.
75. Ibid., 28.
76. See Veigl II, 23.
77. Ibid., 28.
78. Cited in Segel, *Turn of the Century Cabaret*, 203.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid., 199.
81. Ibid., 205.
82. Cited in Veigl II, 32.
83. See Egon Friedell, *Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit*, vol. 1/1927, vol. 2/1928, vol. 3/1931.
84. Segel, *Turn-of-the-Century Cabaret*, 206.
85. Veigl II, 31; also Segel, 208–11.
86. Segel, *Turn-of-the-Century Cabaret*, 212.
87. Ibid., 205.
88. Ibid., 214.
89. The role of nude dancing and plastic art in the nude is illustrated in the catalog by Müller/Stockemann by using the example of Olga Desmond "who appeared at 'evenings of beauty'" and "together with the athlete Adolf Salge" demonstrated monument-like, allegorical poses in the nude. Ibid., 26.
90. Cited in Segel, 215.
91. Veigl II, 34.
92. Ibid., 34–35.
93. Segel, *Turn-of-the-Century Cabaret*, 219.
94. Veigl II, 42.
95. Ibid.
96. Ibid., 45.
97. Ibid., 48ff.