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ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates Heiner Müller's search for post-World War II and post-reunification German identity as depicted in his Geschichtsdramen, Germania Tod in Berlin (1956/1971) and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann (1996), respectively. In my analyses, I demonstrate how Müller exposes the various myths surrounding German identity by combining historical elements with the literary techniques of collage, intertextuality, metaphors, allegorical figures, political songs, ballads, and fairy tales. Germania Tod covers the time spectrum from the first to the mid-twentieth century as the author looks for clues to help explain the evolution of German identity which led to Hitler's reign of terror and Germany’s ultimate defeat by the Allied Forces in 1945, the division of Germany, and the formation of the GDR in 1949. Germania 3 offers a retrospective look at the GDR following reunification with an emphasis on the enduring German-Russian aggression as a remnant of German identity based on the legacies of Hitler and Stalin.

Chapter One consists of a presentation of scholarly research on Müller and his works, including a classification of his dramatic oeuvre. In Chapter Two I offer an overview of this literary genre: its development over the centuries, beginning with Goethe and concluding with Brecht; followed by critics’ views about the Geschichtsdrama, starting with Friedrich Sengle in the fifties and ending with Jürgen Schröder in the nineties: Schröder's criteria about defining a Geschichtsdrama serve as the basis for my analyses. In Chapter Three I present relevant historical information relating to post-World War II Germany: the social, economic, political, religious, and literary differences; followed by an overview of the political, economic, and literary situation in post-reunification Germany, with an emphasis on the new challenges facing German literature and German identity in post-reunification Germany. In my analysis of Germania Tod in Chapter Four, I offer a classification of the various historical characters Müller chose to represent German identity. In my analysis of Germania 3 in Chapter Five, I present the legacies of various historical characters whom Müller believed continued to influence German identity even after reunification. In Chapter Six, the Conclusion, I present the reception of each play; I compare and contrast how each deals with German identity and; finally, I discuss the challenges facing German identity of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century.
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I. Introduction: Heiner Müller and German Identity

I.1 Exposition

Motto:
"Solange wir an unsere Zukunft glauben, brauchen wir uns vor unserer Vergangenheit nicht zu fürchten."1

The above statement by Heiner Müller crystallizes his ideology concerning the past, present, and future of Germany and is thus central to an understanding of his Geschichtsdramen. The present generation of Germans can and must believe in a bright future; if it possesses this positive attitude, there is no need to fear the past, and one does not fear something if it is known. Rather than hide the skeletons of the past in a closet, one should open the door and let in the light and the truth. Therefore, one must learn about and study the past in order to master the future. Müller's aphorism also encapsulates the formula for a successful Geschichtsdrama according to Horace's docere et delectare: It teaches the audience in an aesthetically pleasing manner about past events in order that it will apply the lessons learned and look optimistically to the future. There are two significant deviations from Horace's concept in Müller's texts. Firstly, he did not use an "aesthetically pleasing manner", but rather preferred to shock his audience with violent images and, secondly, he was generally not optimistic about the future.

Heiner Müller (1929-1995) was a famous -- perhaps "infamous" would be a more appropriate adjective -- playwright from the German Democratic Republic2 (GDR) who used history, specifically German historical figures, events, legends, and myths in his plays to create powerful and unforgettable Geschichtsdramen3: among them Germania Tod in Berlin

---

1 This quote is the title of an interview with Gregor Edelmann found in: Heiner Müller, Gesammelte Irrtümer 1 (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001) 186. ("As long as we believe in our future, there is no need to fear our past.") Unless otherwise stated, the translations are my own.
2 Throughout the dissertation, I shall refer to the German Democratic Republic as GDR and to the Federal Republic of Germany as FRG.
3 A Geschichtsdrama is generally considered a "historical play"; i.e., a play that uses historical events and persons of the author's choice in order to relate a story or message that the author wishes to convey. However,
(Germania Death in Berlin) (1956/71) and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann
(Germania 3 Ghosts at Dead Man) (1996)\textsuperscript{4}, which explore the varied and controversial facets
of German identity in the post-World War II and post-reunification eras, respectively.

Because he lived most of his adult life in the GDR, his texts tend to reflect a Marxist world
view partly as a result of necessity, partly due to his own conviction. Censorship made it
necessary at times for Müller the author to at least seemingly comply with the party line, yet
his faith in Marxism and revolution can be seen in the majority of his plays. Müller's hopeful
attitude about the future of Marxism is a major component of his drama, Germania Tod; by
the time he wrote Germania 3, however, he had realized that this hope was only an illusion:
the fall of the GDR confirmed that the "socialist experiment" had failed.\textsuperscript{5}

Müller used the Geschichtsdrama as a literary tool to showcase his ideas and his
perspective on what it meant to be German by using historical facts, literary traditions, and
mythical legacy. His search took him through the span of German history back to the first
century when the Romans fought the Germanen, forward into the twentieth century to World
Wars I and II, Germany's defeat in World War II, and the division of Germany into the FRG
and the GDR. His search finally led him to the era of the GDR's demise and its subsequent
official reunification with the FRG in October 1990, and the post-reunification years. Müller
never directly poses the question as to which is the real or the true Germany, yet his
Geschichtsdramen investigate the difficult questions: "Who were the Germans in ages past?";
"Who are they in the present?" and; "Who will they be in the future?" A nation's past, a
people's history contributes to its current identity, whether "Gothic man" or "Faustian


\textsuperscript{5}Throughout the dissertation I will abbreviate these two plays as Germania Tod and Germania 3, respectively.
peoples", to borrow Oswald Spengler's (1880-1936) terms. Spengler writes in The Decline of the West that: "For Gothic man - so far as he reflected about himself at all - the question was not whether he should look for linkages of his being and history, but in what direction to look for them. He required a past in order to find meaning and depth in the present" (2: 79). The important role attributed to history itself is only superseded by the meaning found in the given historical events. In other words, the significance relating to a nation's existence is decided by future generations whose distanced perspective allows them to judge the past. Further, Spengler writes: "It is the hall-mark of Faustian peoples that they are conscious of the direction of their history" (2: 180). The term "direction" in both of the above quotes refers to an awareness by later generations of the course their nation has taken through the actions of earlier generations. Like Spengler, Müller was aware of the impact on a nation's identity based on its history, and the influence its past has on a nation's present and future generations and further course of action. Müller was concerned for Germany's future, in particular that of the GDR, and not without reason, as hindsight proves. Since a nation's future existence is based on current circumstances which in turn are based on past events as part of the time continuum, Müller's search for German identity thus logically led him on a journey through Germany's past. To this end he focuses his attention in his Geschichtsdramen on depicting different facets of German identity based on historical as well as current persons and events from the German past up to 1995, the year of his death.

I.2 Biographical Aspects

During his lifetime, Müller concentrated his literary efforts on exploring German history and its development throughout the ages, emphasizing how events affected contemporary Germany and in particular the GDR. His own personal experiences were tied strongly to events in the periods during and after World War II. For German authors who had lived in exile during the years of the Nazi regime, such as Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956), the
establishment of an alternative German nation at first offered renewed hope for a bright future free of fascists, dictators, and capitalists. The Communist dream of proletarian peace and prosperity, the GDR, shone like a silver star on the bleak horizon of a country literally in ruins. Eventually this star lost its luster and the promise that was the GDR revealed itself as an illusion. Müller, unlike Brecht, lived long enough to experience not only the rise but also the fall of this Communist state. For this reason his oeuvre presents a complete overview of these four decades in German history. His own sense of personal identity as well as his convictions as a writer were determined to a great extent by the era into which fate had placed him. Considered the most productive and most controversial of GDR playwrights (McGowan 125), he has even been called the most famous GDR playwright since Brecht (Teraoka 9). In order to better appreciate Müller's insights about German history and German identity in his Geschichtsdramen, it is necessary to take a brief look at the events which shaped his personal sense of self.

He was born in 1929 in the Eastern region of Germany known as Saxony where events in his own life would develop as dramatically as the historical events unfolding around him. Reinhard Tschapke writes in *Heiner Müller*: "Leben und Werk lassen sich bei Heiner Müller kaum trennen" (5). Müller's conscious decision to remain in the GDR even before construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961 is due partly to his belief in the Marxist ideology and his hopes for the future of the Marxist state. Unfortunately, German Communism was dependent on the Soviet Communist Party and Stalin, a fact which Müller bitterly regretted, and so Hitler's was not the only dictatorship that he would experience in his lifetime. He was a product of two different dictatorships, as he said in 1990 in an interview with Jeanne Ophus entitled, "Jetzt sind wir nicht mehr glaubwürdig":

---

6 ("Life and work of Heiner Müller are not easily separated.")
Müller could identify more with the German version of the Soviet Communist dictatorship, the rule of the proletariat than with Hitler's National Socialist dictatorship, the rule of the leader or "Führer". The historical and political circumstances of the Nazi years had a great impact on his personal life as well as on his sense of being, and thus played a major role in shaping Heiner Müller the playwright. He could never totally reconcile himself with what he perceived as the FRG's legacy of Hitler's dictatorship and the Nazis. But even in the GDR he remained critical as well as sceptical of the Communist leaders. Two years later in an interview with Uwe Wittstock entitled, "Zehn Deutsche sind dümmer als fünf", Müller again talked about his impressions of living under the communist dictatorship and how it affected his writing:


---

7 ("I grew up in one dictatorship and became an adult in the next one. That one was at first a counter-dictatorship, a counter-violence for me, even in the form of Stalinism. I could half-identify with it [. . . ] But despite that I could identify more with it than with the previous one.")

8 ("When one writes, one is dependent on a basic experience by which one is marked. My basic experience was: state as violence. On the one hand the fascist violence, on the other the communist - in parentheses: stalinistic - counter-violence. I could identify myself with that. Also due to totally subjective, autobiographical reasons. That was of course a productive situation for a playwright.")
Müller considered his identification with the Gegengewalt ("counter-violence") of Stalin's regime an important element of his motivation to write. He attributed his productivity as an author to his personal experiences under first the Nazi dictatorship, and then under the Soviet-controlled GDR. Apparently these events ignited a historical-philosophical spark in him which he acted upon and expressed in his Geschichtsdramen. In this later interview he no longer uses the term "half-identified" with the Communist dictatorship, he rather uses the term "identifies" which suggests that he had reconciled himself with his life in the former GDR. As a playwright during the forty year period of GDR existence, he strained to the limits what was considered acceptable or allowable under GDR censorship. In one instance he went too far in fact: after the premiere of his play Die Umsiedlerin ("The Resettled Woman") in 1961, he was subsequently banned from the GDR Schriftstellerverband ("East German Writers Association") and was not reinstated until 1988. In spite of such difficulties, life under a dictatorship was an energizing force for Müller as a playwright, to which he attributes his productivity during those years. As a GDR author living under a repressive regime, his voice was not totally stifled: it was possible to criticize the ruling party and survive. This stood in marked contrast to the conditions for writers under Nazi rule where virtually all resistance was crushed or extinguished and any hint of political criticism or opposition to the ruling party, especially by known German leftists, Socialists and Communists, was met with harsh repercussions: imprisonment or death.

Müller's first introduction to Nazi violence on a personal level occurred at the start of the twelve year period of Nazi dominance in Germany. It demonstrates the violent measures of which the Nazis were capable towards Germany's own citizens when confronted with opposition to their ideology and rule. This event traumatized him and remained engraved in his memory. He described what happened in 1982 in an interview with Sylvère Lotringer entitled, "Ich glaube an Konflikt. Sonst glaube ich an nichts":
Das erste Bild, das ich von meiner Kindheit habe, stammt aus dem Jahre 1933. Ich schlief. Dann hörte ich Lärm aus dem nächsten Zimmer und sah durch das Schlüsselloch, daß Männer meinen Vater schlugen. Sie verhafteten ihn. Die SA, die Nazis haben ihn verhaftet. Ich ging wieder ins Bett und stellte mich schlafend. Dann ging die Tür auf. Mein Vater stand in der Tür. Die beiden Männer neben ihm waren viel größer als er. Er war ein sehr kleiner Mann. Dann schaute er herein und sagte: "Er schläft." Dann nahmen sie ihn mit. Das ist meine Schuld. Ich habe mich schlafend gestellt. Das ist eigentlich die erste Szene meines Theaters (GI1 90). Müller, as a four year old child, was witness to an act of Nazi violence against his own father, a member of the German Communist Party. As a grown man, this memory would strongly affect his views about politics, ideologies, German identity, and his own father. Normally, a father figure represents a position of power and respect to a small child and perhaps even fear when the child is to be punished for some misdeed. This dilemma, brought on by the Nazis abusive physical treatment of the child's father, led to confusion in the child: he could not understand what was happening to his father's strength and why his father did not fight back. Such confusion resulted in the child's fear of becoming an object of physical abuse himself and he felt the need to protect himself from these men. Though he must have worried about his father's safety, the basic human instinct for survival took over and he feigned sleep in order to avoid attracting their attention. Eventually, the child grew up with the memory of this night whereby his inaction in order to protect himself bred subjective feelings of guilt for what he perceived as an act of treason against his own father. Because he was only a small

("The first image I have of my childhood is from the year 1933. I was asleep. Then I heard noise coming from the next room, and saw through the keyhole that men were beating my father. They arrested him. The SA [Sturmabteilung, Storm Troopers], the Nazis arrested him. I went back to bed and pretended to be asleep. Then the door opened. My father was standing in the doorway. Both of the men standing next to him were much bigger than he. He was a very small man. Then he looked in and said, "He's sleeping." Then they took him with them. That is my guilt. I pretended to be asleep. That is actually the first scene of my theater.") Müller also published a text entitled, "Der Vater", in 1977 which is based on this event. An English translation of this text,
child at the time of this incident, it is illogical for him to think he could have somehow saved his father or even expressed solidarity with his father had he not feigned sleep. Tschapke explains the child's dilemma, "-- Eine Art von Verrat? Aber was hätte das kleine, ängstliche Kind tun sollen?" (Heiner Müller 8). There is not much a four year old could have done in that predicament to get rid of the dangerous men or to save his father from imminent harm, but the fact that his father was concerned for him makes Müller's regret at having feigned sleep more incriminating in his own mind. The father's desire to take care of his child was nullified by Müller's feigned sleep. Though the father had no idea that the boy was only pretending, Müller knew, and this fact disturbed him. The significance of this memory is that Müller's own response haunted him as much as the violent behavior of the Nazis. Rather than stand up and show solidarity with his father, he chose not to do so when his father looked into the room that fateful night and for this he felt guilty. It showed him as a flawed human being in whom the seeds of treason and betrayal, recurring themes in his texts, are also present. This episode was one of the reasons Müller was so intent on analyzing historical events and the violence that accompanies them. One way Müller later found to work through his feelings of guilt was to write about them in the "language of literature", as Frank Hörmigk refers to it in his essay,"Kein Verlaß auf die Literatur? - Kein Verlaß auf die Literatur! Fünf Sätze zum Werk Heiner Müllers":


10("-- A kind of betrayal? But what would a small, scared child have been able to do?"

11("The theater of Heiner Müller begins with an early picture of memory, a first experience of guilt. He retold the story again and again; it was one of the obsessions of his life, as a catastrophe of his own, earliest failure; indescribable except in the language of literature."
This experience in Müller's life was extremely important to his future development as a writer because it so deeply affected his psyche and his sense of self. Müller's memory serves to remind him that he chose not to become a victim at what he believes was his father's expense. He seemed to equate history and in particular German history with violence. It is, therefore, not surprising that he was unable to identify with the violent Nazi regime since it had terrorized his father, his family, himself, and all of Europe. This episode also served as the author's first lesson in the animosity that existed between Germans professing of differing ideologies: the National Socialists and the German Communists, which is another important element in his works. This experience would leave a lasting mark on his character, but was not the only reason for his decision to remain in the GDR, rather than emigrate with his father to the FRG.

A year after his father was imprisoned, when Müller was five years old, he and his mother went to visit him. Though not as dramatic as the night in 1933, it served to leave a scar not only on his psyche but on his relationship with his father as well. Again the child witnessed his father as a weak and powerless individual with little or no control over his own life. Since a young boy is too naive to understand the intricacies of politics, seeing his father in this weakened position lessened his respect for the man. This prison visit also demonstrated the continuing conflict between the Nazis and the Communists, and how differing political ideologies were able to drive a wedge between the Germans; a wedge that would later be cemented in the shape of a wall. The themes of brother (Nazi) versus brother (Communist) and betrayal are understandably very prominent in his texts dealing primarily with World War II and German history. Müller's disillusionment with his father and with humanity was also steadily growing with each new, unpleasant experience.

In the above-mentioned interview with Lotringer, Müller describes his reaction as a child to this visit: "Wir gingen nach Hause und später erzählte mir meine Mutter, daß ich tage- oder wochenlang im Schlaf redete. Ich konnte nicht verstehen, warum er nicht über den Zaun gesprungen war" (GI 90). ("We went home and my
There is a third story from these early childhood memories, which occurred in 1936, two years after his father had been released from the Nazi prison, and which had a finalizing negative effect on Müller's relationship with him. Although Müller was only seven years old when this occurred, he could never reconcile himself with what he astutely perceived as his father's betrayal of his own principles: his father sold out to the Nazis for the price of a job! After having survived incarceration by the Nazi Party for his beliefs in the Communist Party, he betrayed himself for material gain and he used his son to do it: a double betrayal. In fairness to his father, it must be mentioned that his intention was most likely to earn money in order to support and feed his family who had endured a difficult time while he was in prison. After all he had gone through during imprisonment, perhaps his father was now interested in survival and was prepared to ignore his political ideology to that purpose. Whatever his reasons, Müller could not accept any justification for what he perceived as moral weakness and ideological perfidiousness, and, therefore, felt no inclination to move to West Berlin with his father in 1951. Müller admits that his feelings about his father played a major role in his desire to remain in the GDR (GI 90-91), but as a follower of Marxism, certainly he remained there for his own politically ideological reasons as well. Since living in a socialist state which he claimed inspired him to write his dramas, this aspect may also have affected his decision. The fact that he was witness to significant historical events both on a personal

---

10

mother told me later that I spoke in my sleep for days or weeks afterward. I couldn't understand why he hadn't jumped over the fence.

13Müller describes this incident in his interview with Lotringer: "Ich erzählte meinem Vater von dem Aufsatz. Er sagte: «Kein Problem. Du brauchst das Abzeichen nicht zu kriegen. Mach dir keine Sorgen.» Zwei Stunden später sagte er: «Essen wir», und er machte was zu essen. Dann sagte er: «Ich helfe dir bei dem Aufsatz.» Und er half mir. Dann sagte er: «Du mußt schreiben, es ist eine gute Sache, daß der Führer die Autobahn baut, weil mein arbeitsloser Vater da Arbeit bekommen kann.» Und ich schrieb das. Das war die Erfahrung von Verrat und Schwäche, aber einer anderen Art von Schwäche als vorher. Von da an war ein Bruch zwischen uns" (GI 91). ("I told my father about the essay. He said: «No problem. You don't need to win the award. Don't worry.» Two hours later he said: «Let's eat», and he made us something to eat. Then he said: «I'll help you with your essay.» And he helped me. Then he said: «You have to write, it's a good thing that the Führer is building the Autobahn because my unemployed father can get a job there.» And I wrote it. That was the experience of betrayal and weakness, but a different kind of weakness than before. From then on there was a breach between us.")
level and on a greater scale helps explain his lifelong interest in writing about German history, which can at least partly be attributed to these early traumatizing experiences.

I.3 Müller's Views on History, and the Underlying Theories of Hegel, Marx, and Benjamin

Because historical events played such a decisive role in his life and subsequently in his texts, and with the awareness that he was a Marxist and Communist, it is important for the analysis of his Geschichtsdramen to understand Müller's views concerning history and the theories on which his interpretation of history is based. He commented about the concept of history in his 1992 interview with Wittstock: "Wenn der Begriff Geschichte irgendeinen Sinn hat, dann beschreibt er doch wohl die Struktur und die Zerstörung menschlicher Beziehungen" (GI3 152). This statement reflects his belief in the destructive force exerted upon personal relationships by historical events. Because he was a witness to this destructive power in his own life, his plays are an expression of his understanding of history based on personal experiences. For Müller, history was all about human relationships: the interaction among individual persons, various societies, countries, cultures, and races. He viewed history as a phenomenon whose structure consists of human relationships which at the same time contain the seeds of their destruction due to the violent nature of these relationships. A close look at the history of mankind reveals a brutal and conflict-ridden past full of wars and violence from which the human race was ultimately able to emerge again and again, albeit not unscathed. Müller's plays thus demonstrate to some extent a realistic view of the historical world and especially of German historical events based on a dialectical model. Although Müller claimed that he only used philosophy as subject matter for his plays: "Auch Philosophie ist für mich immer nur Material gewesen. Ich habe mich für philosophische

14("If the concept of history has any meaning, then most probably it describes the structure and destruction of human relationships.")
Fragen nie interessiert" (GI3 153), his views on history seem to be based on the philosophies of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), Karl Marx (1818-1883), and Walter Benjamin (1892-1940). The influence of their ideas can be found in crucial components of his Geschichtsphilosophie ("philosophy of history") and as such they comprise an important element of his literary works. His Geschichtsdramen mirror the ideas of these three philosophers: Hegel's dialectical view of history, Marx's historic materialism and utopian dreams, and Benjamin's unique brand of dialectical materialism.

Hegel influenced Müller indirectly by way of Marxism in the sense that Marx did not totally reject Hegel's premise, but rather built upon it and, as he and Engels believed, improved upon it. The importance of Hegel's influence on Marx's philosophy is that Marx applied Hegel's dialectic to the process of history as he, Marx, perceived it and thus believed he had reached a "dialectical method of understanding the real processes of human history" (Selden 83). Müller shared the basic tenet of Marxism concerning history; namely that the process of history is not merely concerned with the past, but that it is part of a developmental process of which the present is an integral part as Andreas Dorpalen writes in German History in Marxist Perspective: The East German Approach (23). As an author, Müller used this idea of the developmental process of historical events to concentrate primarily on exploring the many facets of German identity based on German history in his Geschichtsdramen.

Walter Benjamin was concerned with the effect of past events on present and future generations and his historical-philosophical writings had a strong influence on Müller. Though Müller did not agree with every aspect of Benjamin's philosophy: "Benjamin's significance for Müller is indisputable", as Matthew Griffin writes in "Image and Ideology in the Work of Heiner Müller" (439). An excellent opportunity to compare and contrast their

15 ("Philosophy was also just subject matter for me. I was never interested in philosophical questions.")
viewpoints is provided by the "Angelus Novus" text. Benjamin expressed his views about the philosophy of history in his Thesen über den Begriff der Geschichte (1940) ("Theses concerning the term of history"). Of major interest to this study is his Ninth Thesis and the text, "Angelus Novus" (697-698), the "Engel der Geschichte" ("angel of history") because it reflects his views about history, but more importantly, because Müller wrote his own subsequent angel texts based on Benjamin's original description (Theater-Arbeit 7). Benjamin's text reflects the philosopher's meditations of a Paul Klee (1879-1940) painting from 1920 which transforms this simple angel image into an allegory of history, as Benjamin interprets Klee's angel through a historical-philosophical interpretation. Though the angel is facing or looking at the past, he is being propelled into the future by a storm which, as the last line clearly states, refers to progress. Dialectical materialism is only one part of societal development and is subject to a universal dialectic and, as such, is propelled by laws that operate autonomously (Dorpalen 35). These "laws" are the autonomous forces of nature

17 See also Rainer Schmitt, Geschichte und Mythisierung, p. 48, footnote 64: Müller's original purpose in writing this first angel text was at the request of Paul Dessau to write a "Libretto" as part of the rewriting of Brecht's fragment, Reisen des Glücksgotts which Müller talks about. I agree with Schmitt that the text, Der glücklose Engel, can be read independently of the "Libretto" because the subject matter speaks for itself. See also Jutta Schlich's essay: "Heiner Müllers Engel: Bezüge, Befindlichkeiten, Botschaften," Heiner Müller: Probleme und Perspektive Bath Symposium 1998. Eds. Ian Wallace, Dennis Tate and Gerd Labroise (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000) 323-346. Pages 324-325 refer specifically to Müller's rewriting of Brecht's fragment.
18 Benjamin's text: "Es gibt ein Bild von Klee, das Angelus Novus heißt. Ein Engel ist darauf dargestellt, der aussieht, als wäre er im Begriff, sich von etwas zu entfernen, worauf er starrt. Seine Augen sind aufgerissen, sein Mund steht offen und seine Flügel sind ausgespannt. Der Engel der Geschichte muß so aussehen. Er hat das Antlitz der Vergangenheit zugewendet. Wo eine Kette von Begebenheiten vor uns erscheint, da sieht er eine einzige Katastrophe, die unablässig Trümmer auf Trümmer häuft und sie ihm vor die Füße schleudert. Er möchte wohl verweilen, die Toten wecken und das Zerschlagene zusammenfügen. Aber ein Sturm weht vom Paradiese her, der sich in seinen Flügeln verfängen hat und so stark ist, daß der Engel sie nicht mehr schließen kann. Dieser Sturm treibt ihn unaufhaltsam in die Zukunft, der er den Rücken kehrt, während der Trümmerhaufen vor ihm zum Himmel wächst. Das, was wir den Fortschritt nennen, ist dieser Sturm" (Gesammelte Schriften I-2 697-698). ("There is a picture by Klee that is called "Angelus Novus". An angel is depicted on it who looks as if he were about to distance himself from something at which he is staring. His eyes are torn wide open, his mouth is open and his wings are spread out. The angel of history must look like this. He has his countenance facing the past. Whereas a chain of events appears before us, he sees only a complete catastrophe, which is incessantly heaping ruins upon ruins and hurling them at his feet. He would probably like to stay, to wake the dead and put the smashed pieces together. But a storm is blowing over from paradise which has gotten caught in his wings and is so strong that the angel cannot get them to close anymore. This storm is propelling him irresistibly into the future, to which he has turned his back, while the piles of rubble in front of him are accumulating to the sky. That, which we call progress, is this storm.")
which in Benjamin's text propel history forward. A Biblical aspect is present in the term "paradise" because man was banned from paradise for breaking the rules set by God or, one could say, the laws of nature for the sake of Fortschritt ("progress"): thus the concept of progress is presented negatively by Benjamin. The angel would like to return to paradise, the allegorical "goldenes Zeitalter" ("golden era") where mankind had its origins long ago. Or, in the Marxist sense, the concept of paradise here could also represent the communist vision of a utopia, a perfect society. The angel may be on his way there, but instead of coming closer to his goal he is hindered by historical events and progress which are symbolized by the storm. He is trapped in the stream of history and carried further and further away from the promised land while the mountain of rubble prevents him from even seeing the original paradise any longer. Benjamin offers a further distinction; that is, between what the angel sees and what mankind sees: two differing perspectives. The claim by the German historian, Walther Hofer, in his essay, "Toward a Revision of the German Concept of History", that as one sees a landscape from a single place, all historical vision is similarly determined by that place from which one views it: the perspective (188) has lost none of its relevance half a century later. Seen from the angel's perspective, a multitude of earthly or human disasters, which have been brought about by progress or technology, such as guns and tanks, poison gas, and the atomic bomb, appear as a single, large and steadily growing catastrophe. Mankind sees a series of catastrophic events, but only one at a time, because man stands at one point in time on the time continuum; whereas the angel has an overview of the entire time continuum. The angel's perspective reflects a negative view of progress throughout the course of human history, which is contrary to the views held by Hegel and Marx concerning progress: for both men progress meant the development of man and thus improvement. The fact that Benjamin uses the adjective "new" to describe the angel implies that there was an "old" angel who belongs to an older, "bygone" era; whereas the new angel belongs to modern times. Angels in the
Biblical sense were used as messengers, such as the angel who announced the birth of the Savior, the Messiah who would save the world. Benjamin's angel, however, is the new angel seemingly frozen in time. Thus he can offer neither hope nor help for the world: he can only stare in horror at mankind's self-destruction.

Benjamin believed that the historical process consisted of a single continuum which mankind must break or interrupt: only then could the destructive nature of history be halted. Hegel saw progress as a positive force based on the time continuum, but Benjamin's idea was to destroy the time continuum so that the pattern of destruction would come to an end (Teraoka 120). This does not mean that history would end, rather that the violence would end. Müller's view of the destructive forces of history reflect a Marxist attitude in that he wanted to fight violence with violence in order to create a utopian society; he envisaged a bloody revolution in the Marxist tradition in order to change society. Müller wrote his own texts as a response and in some ways as a counter text to Benjamin's and titled it: "Der glücklose Engel" (1958), which was followed twenty-one years later by: "Ich bin der Engel der Verzweiflung" (1979), and thirty-three years later by the poem: "Glückloser Engel 2" (1991).

The angel, as an allegory of history, is defined by both Benjamin and Müller by either attributive adjectives or a genetive noun, such as "new", "luckless" or "unlucky" or "despairing": this calls for further interpretation.

I.3.1 Müller's Three Angel Texts and Their Reflection of His Views on German History

Müller wrote his Angelologie (342) ("angelology") or "Engel-Zyklus" (335) ("angel cycle") as Jutta Schlich refers to it in her essay, "Heiner Müllers Engel: Bezüge, Befindlichkeiten, Botschaften", over a timespan of thirty-three years: the three texts are listed in order below for the sake of convenience. The first one, written in 1958 is entitled, "Der glücklose Engel":

---

I.3.1 Müller's Three Angel Texts and Their Reflection of His Views on German History

Müller wrote his Angelologie (342) ("angelology") or "Engel-Zyklus" (335) ("angel cycle") as Jutta Schlich refers to it in her essay, "Heiner Müllers Engel: Bezüge, Befindlichkeiten, Botschaften", over a timespan of thirty-three years: the three texts are listed in order below for the sake of convenience. The first one, written in 1958 is entitled, "Der glücklose Engel":
Hinter ihm schwemmt Vergangenheit an, schüttet Geröll auf Flügel und Schultern, mit Lärm wie von begrabnen Trommeln, während vor ihm die Zukunft staut, seine Augen eindrückt, die Augäpfel sprengt wie ein Stern, das Wort umdreht zum tönenden Knebel, ihn würgt mit seinem Atem. Eine Zeit lang sieht man noch sein Flügelschlagen, hört in das Rauschen die Steinschläge vor über hinter ihm niedergehn, lauter je heftiger die vergebliche Bewegung, vereinzelt, wenn sie langsamer wird. Dann schließt sich über ihm der Augenblick: auf dem schnell verschütteten Stehplatz kommt der glückose Engel zur Ruhe, wartend auf Geschichte in der Versteinerung von Flug Blick Atem. Bis das erneute Rauschen mächtiger Flügelschläge sich in Wellen durch den Stein fortpflanzt und seinen Flug anzeigt (Ende der Handschrift 21).  

The second text he wrote in 1979 as part of Der Auftrag. Erinnerung an eine Revolution ("The Mission. Memory of a Revolution") and called it, "Ich bin der Engel der Verzweiflung":


19 The German text first appeared in: Theater-Arbeit, Texte 4. (Berlin: Rotbuch, 1975), 18. The English translation is taken from: Heiner Müller: Germania. Ed. Sylvère Lotringer. Trans. Bernard & Caroline Schütze. (New York Semiotext(e), 1990) 99. ("The Luckless Angel: The past surges behind him, pouring rubble on wings and shoulders thundering like buried drums, while in front of him the future collects, crushes his eyes, explodes his eyeballs like a star, wrenching the word into a resounding gag, strangling him with its breath. For a time one still sees the beating of his wings, hears the crash of stones, falling before, above, behind him, growing louder with each furious futile struggle, weakening, lessening, as the struggle subsides. Then the moment closes over him. The luckless angel is silent, resting in the rapidly flooded space, waiting for history in the petrification of flight, glance, breath. Until the renewed rush of powerful wings swelling in waves through the stone signals his flight.")

20 Carl Weber has translated this play as, "The Task", which can be found in: Carl Weber, ed. and trans., Hamletmachine and other texts for the stage (New York: PAJ Publications, 1984) 82-101.
sein wird. Mein Flug ist der Aufstand, mein Himmel der Abgrund von morgen
(Ende der Handschrift 42).21

The third text he wrote in 1991 and is called, "Glückloser Engel 2":

Zwischen Stadt und Stadt
Nach der Mauer der Abgrund
Wind an den Schultern die fremde
Hand am einsamen Fleisch
Der Engel ich höre ihn noch
Aber er hat kein Gesicht mehr als
Deines das ich nicht kenne (Ende der Handschrift 53).22

These three angel texts can be read as frames of reference regarding Müller's view on
german history, in particular how it pertains to German Communism and the GDR for the
respective time period in which each was written. The first angel text is written from the third
person perspective: a narrative text; the second one is also a prose text written from the
perspective of the angel him/herself23; and the third angel text is a lyrical poem consisting of
seven lines, using the "lyrical Ich" form with the lyrical "Ich" or persona of the poem
lamenting the fate of the angel.

The first angel text consists of descriptions that correspond to many found in Müller's
dramatic texts: the images are violent, graphic, apocalyptic. The most significant difference
to Benjamin's angel is that whereas his angel was a victim or Objekt of history, Müller has
taken his angel out of the role of the victim and turned him into the Subjekt of history, as

21("I am the angel of despair. With my hands I distribute intoxication, unconsciousness, forgetfulness, passion
and pain of bodies. My speech is silence, my song a scream. In the shadow of my wings resides terror. My hope
is the last breath. My hope is the first battle. I am the knife with which the dead man breaks open his coffin. I am
he who will become. My flight is revolt, my heaven the abyss of tomorrow.")
22This text first appeared in Sinn und Form in 1991, p. 852. ("Hapless Angel 2: Between city and city / After the
wall the abyss / Wind at the shoulders the alien / Hand at the lonely flesh / The angel I still hear him / Yet he has
no face anymore but / Yours that I don't know") Carl Weber, ed. and trans., A Heiner Müller Reader: Plays,
Francine-Maier-Schaeffer writes in her essay, "Utopie und Fragment: Heiner Müller und Walter Benjamin" (21). "If, indeed, Müller's angel is hapless, Benjamin's is helpless", as Helen Fehervary writes in her essay, "Enlightenment or Entanglement: History and Aesthetics in Bertolt Brecht and Heiner Müller" (93). The term glücklos(e) ("hapless" or "luckless") implies a sense of coincidence, of serendipity: the angel has been placed into that position by past events, revolutions or wars; decisive is what the angel decides to do or is capable of doing. Time stands still for this angel as if he were waiting for something to occur: waiting for further historical developments, a war, a revolution, as Rainer E. Schmitt describes it in Geschichte und Mythisierung: Zu Heiner Müllers Deutschland-Dramatik (48). Müller's angel of history is waiting to move again, and even though Müller's attitude about the angel differs from Benjamin's in that the latter's angel does not or cannot take any action to change the current course of events, Müller's angel, though seemingly frozen in that moment of time, will take flight in the end (Maier-Schaeffer 21): revolutions will again occur. Müller was most likely referring here to the "stagnation" in the GDR which he called a Restaurationsphase ("phase of restauration") in an interview in 1978 with Wend Kässens and Michael Töteberg entitled, "Es gilt, eine neue Dramaturgie zu entwickeln" (Gl1 54), because it had halted progress of the socialist utopian dream. Capitalism has been rejected, but the dictatorship in the GDR kept the socialist movement at a standstill due primarily to the legacy of Stalinism. The most probable implication is that a revolution will break out and set history in motion again, liberating the allegorical angel from its imprisonment, as will be seen in the second angel text.

23 In the first and third angel texts, the masculine pronoun is used, but in the second angel text, the angel is referred to in the feminine due to its role in Müller's play, Der Auftrag.
24 Actually Müller's view of history - waiting for left wing revolutions expressed in the flight of the allegorical angel, is similar to the "Sage" of Kaiser Barbarossa waiting in the Kyffhäuser mountain for a right wing revolution to restore the old empire of Charlemagne. Kaiser Barbarossa is also quasi "verschüttet" ("buried"). The "Verschüttung"-metaphor was so prevalent in Expressionism that a book was written about it.
Another difference is that Müller's angel is looking toward the future; whereas Benjamin's angel looks toward the past. Müller's concentration is thus centered on the future which reflects the element of hope. Maier-Schaeffer explains Müller's concept of movement and how it should function to fracture the time continuum:


According to the above quote, movement is the key to Müller's angel because movement signifies that a change is occurring in history; at this point presumably a change that will advance the socialist utopia and bring it closer to becoming a reality. The angel's standstill can be attributed to Stalin's legacy which has resulted in the petrification of the angel allegory. The eventual renewed movement of the angel will result in the break of the continuum which Müller viewed as essential for achieving the next step in the socialist order: a new socialist revolution. This revolution will halt the continued pattern of the "conquerors" and allow the "conquered" to move along their path of history: thus Müller's angel text reflects the need for a socialist revolution. The implication at the end of this text is that the angel will start to move again, spurred on by the utopian dream of Communism, which would be the final, desirable result of the ultimate socialist revolution.

The second angel text is a continuation and in fact progression of the hapless angel who was destined to commence movement again at the end of the first text and has now started to move: "Der 'Glücklose Engel' ist nun in Bewegung gekommen" (Schlich 333).  

---

25("What he calls movement is in fact the disruption of the continuum. To propel history into moving again means interrupting the history of the conqueror and restarting the discontinuous history of the conquered. The standstill, the lack of movement due to Stalinism, is nothing more than the petrification of the angel of history.")  

26("The "hapless angel" has now begun to move.")
The angel of despair uses direct terminology to describe who he is and what his actions are; there is nothing timid about him as demonstrated by his speech which contains apocalyptic images. Here, the angel speaks for himself using the first person, and indeed refers to himself as the "angel of despair". The use of the indicative, active tense gives the text an additional sense of dynamism, as opposed to the first text which had a stronger mood of passivity about it due to the use of the third person descriptions. This angel, an allegory of despair at the human condition, is also the protector of men in despair. To make them forget their hopeless predicament he gives them drugs, sexual passion, and pain. The angel is silent, but when he opens his mouth a scream of pain and terror is heard: This scream announces the coming of the revolution. The line: "In the shadow of my wings resides terror" is a very poetic description which at the same time serves to underscore how dangerous this angel has become when even his shadow evokes fear. Out of despair grows the revolution which will spread terror among its enemies and opponents. The angel is avenging the dead victims of history who have been killed throughout the ages, yet he will cause more death with his battle and revolt. He can even be considered an "advocate for the dead" whom he considers to have been in despair (Schlich 333). There is little positive imagery in this description: even the concept of hope, which is mentioned twice, refers to death and war. However, the hope is for a revolution: a dying man has nothing to fear and will rise against the oppression without regard to the outcome. The first battle will inspire hope for a possible victory and men will join the cause. Schlich equates the concepts of "the last breath" to "death" and "the first battle" to the "revolution" (333). Müller's vivid verbal imagery here leaves the reader with a picture of a large dark figure flying over a battlefield striking down the aggressors with a large sword: quite a contrast to the hapless angel of the previous text.

If Müller's hapless angel became a Subjekt, then the angel of despair is even more so due to his radical terminology and vengeful spirit. Müller combines the idea of past, present
and future in this text. His reference about "der Tote" ("the dead one") refers to the past; his usage of the present tense "ich bin" ("I am") stands for the present; and his mention of "Ich bin der sein wird" ("I am who will become") clearly indicates his planned future existence, but in the form of a revolt as the next line indicates. The Biblical implication is also present, as in Exodus 3, 14 when the bush spoke to Moses: "I am who is" (Schlich 334; Maier-Schaeffer 26). The angel will free the past by being the means with which the dead open their coffins. The fact that this angel text is included in his play, Der Auftrag, with the subtitle, Erinnerung an eine Revolution ("Remembrance of a Revolution"), corresponds well with the revolutionary attitude of this angel. The words are spoken by a female voice which is heard but not seen and answers Antoine's question, "Wer bist du" ("Who are you") (Der Auftrag 52). The angel's response reflects Müller's final hope for a revolution which would result in the realization of the Communist utopia. According to Frank Hörnigk's interpretation in his "Nachbemerkung" ("epilogue") found in Die Gedichte, the angel of despair will be able to take flight again as part of his "mission" which is to free the dead from their past (338). A central theme running through Müller's works is the important role the dead play in the lives of current and future generations. Hörnigk writes further: "Es ist eine "explosion of a memory" - die nun das Kontinuum der Geschichte aufsprengen soll, ein Aufstand der Toten gegen das Vergessen der Lebenden. Es ist Müllers letzte Hoffnung (338)." This angel represents the last chance for the dead to be saved from eternal forgetfulness which corresponds to Benjamin's idea of disrupting the time continuum in order to alter the

---

27 Though Müller used the singular, "der Tote", the implication is that of the dead, plural. Schlich also makes the same assumption: "Er bricht die Särge der Toten auf " (333). ("He breaks open the coffins of the dead.") In the play itself mention is also made of singular versus plural as Galloudec comments bitterly: "Immer stirbt nur einer. Gezählt werden die Toten" (54). ("Each time only one dies. The dead (plural) are being counted.") Galloudec implies that many are dying or in reality being killed and not merely one, because Debuisson had just made the comment that they should look away since they cannot help only the one they see in the cage. The implication is that although the three men are there with the mission to free the slaves, it would not help to free only one slave: either all or none. And this should be accomplished by a revolution, as Debuisson says: "Der Tod ist die Maske der Revolution." (54). ("Death is the mask of the revolution.")

28 ("It is an 'explosion of a memory' which should now disrupt the continuum of history, a revolt by the dead against the forgetfulness of the living. It is Müller's last hope.")
destructive path of history: Müller's angel of despair stands for the last hope to make this happen. Müller demonstrates in Der Auftrag that up until that point in time, 1979, no revolution had succeeded in breaking the time continuum (Maier-Schaeffer 24). More than a decade later, in a 1990 interview with René Ammann entitled, "Eine Tragödie der Dummheit", Müller reiterated the fact that there had still been no successful revolution in Germany (GI3 113).29

In the third angel text, Glückloser Engel 2: ("hapless angel"), Müller's final hope has been disappointed because the revolution never occurred and in fact, the GDR is no longer extant. The term "Stadt" ("city") refers to the city of Berlin; specifically, the separated parts called East and West Berlin, and the term "Mauer" ("wall") refers to the Berlin Wall. From 13 August 1961 to 9 November 1989, this wall stood between the two parts of the city and separated the residents not only geographically but psychologically and emotionally as well. After the wall was knocked down, and their two parts and their respective countries were reunified, anyone could move freely all over the reunited city: while the wall was intact, this was a freedom that only a privileged few enjoyed, including Müller. The fall of the wall is represented in the poem by the line, "Nach der Mauer der Abgrund" ("After the wall the abyss") and seems to express that while the citizens of the FRG and the GDR were kept apart by the wall in the past, now they are divided by an abyss of mistrust and differing mindsets. An abyss could be interpreted as demonstrating fear of the unknown: in this case pertaining to German identity. Since the conception of the FRG and the GDR and throughout their forty years' existence, and especially during the years of the Cold War, national identity was determined not on the basis of what one was, it was rather based on what one was not: on differentiation from the other, as Jürgen Schröder writes in Geschichtsdramen. Die "deutsche Misere" - von Goethes "Götz" bis Heiner Müllers "Germania": Eine Vorlesung (1). The

29In this interview Müller suggested that the events of 1933 may be seen as the first successful German revolution, but before and after that date, no revolution has thus far proved successful in Germany.
demarcations shifted over the years: after 1945 and during the 1950s there was the
differentiation between Nazi (ex-Nazi) versus Communist; then during the Cold War period it
was Capitalist versus Communist or West German versus East German until finally, Wessi
versus Ossi.  
Seemingly suddenly and in fact overnight, citizens from both countries were
faced with a new set of criteria for determining identity; the old sense of identity was no
longer applicable in this altered environment and so a new one had to be established. Because
the GDR was practically assimilated into the FRG and the East Germans thus lost their
familiar way of life, it is understandable that they felt uncertain about the future and their
place in it. Müller chose to express these feelings of uncertainty and separation from their
newly acquired fellow countrymen by using the concept of an abyss, which symbolizes fear
of the unknown while at the same time implying a negative connotation about the future. The
term "abyss" has been carried over from the second angel text, "mein Himmel der Abgrund
von morgen" ("my heaven the abyss of tomorrow"), but the question to be answered is:
whether this is the type of abyss that the "angel of despair" feared. Is capitalism the abyss that
divides the people, the cold wind that blows across his shoulders? Are they being raped by
the capitalists, "die fremde Hand am einsamen Fleisch"? Will this rape result in a new
offspring? The lyrical "Ich" still hears the call for revolution in the allegory of the angel, but
he can no longer be recognized by the lyrical "Ich". Revolution is still an option: if the angel
can be heard he must still be flying, but the revolution has no face, is undefined. The newly
oppressed will rise in revolt at some time but nobody knows what their aims and goal will be.

At the time he wrote the first angel text, Müller still believed in the future of
Communism and the possibility for a Communist revolution which is indicated by the
implication that the angel takes flight at the end of the text. The Communist revolutionary
forces had been stopped or even reversed by Stalinism but after his death, there is again hope

30 After reunification, Wessi became the term used to denote someone from the FRG or West Germany, and Ossi
the term used to denote someone from the GDR or East Germany; both originally in a pejorative sense. The
for a utopian future. The second angel text is reminiscent of "fire and brimstone" images as in the last judgement, but the implication is still positive: the time to act is now and the Communist revolution and the resultant utopia can still be achieved. At the end, however, there is doubt if this utopia will live up to its expectations. By the time Müller wrote the third text, this hope has been replaced by a vague sense of resignation. The angel can still be heard but he has no face, just like an unnamed second person. The familiar address, "Deines", suggests that this person is very close to him, possibly that of his dead wife. In a poem, "Gestern an einem sonnigen Nachmittag", Müller refers to her lost face and tries to remember it: "Meine Frau auszugraben aus ihrem Friedhof / Zwei Schaufeln voll habe ich selbst auf sie geworfen / Und nachzusehen was von ihr noch da liegt / Knochen die ich nie gesehen habe / Ihren Schädel in der Hand zu halten / Und mir vorzustellen was ihr Gesicht war / Hinter den Masken die sie getragen hat (Ende der Handschrift 38). The angel has no face, just like his wife whose real face he never knew. Just as the lyrical "Ich" admits in the lines above that he did not know his own wife's true face due to the masks she wore during her lifetime, so too the lyrical Ich in the angel poem does not recognize the face of the other it sees.

The concept of "the other" here corresponds to German identity after reunification, and speaks to the theme of brothers, another common element in Müller's plays. Again, the use of the word "Deines" ("yours"), probably referring to his wife, as already discussed, reflects an intimate relationship. It is on a personal level, referring to a loved one, who could also be a relative, a sister or brother, but the fact that the narrator does not recognize or is not familiar with that face could be indicative of the complicated relationship between

---

31"Yesterday on a Sunny Afternoon": "To exhume my wife from her graveyard / Two shovels full I threw on her myself / And to look for what is left of her / Bones which I have never seen / To hold her skull in my hand / And to imagine what her face was like / Behind the masks she had worn." Heiner Müller, A Heiner Müller Reader, ed. and trans. Carl Weber (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001) 21.

32Compare to Schlich, who also mentions the tendency to intimacy in the poem: "Hier, wo alles auf Beziehung eingestellt ist, tendiert die Aussage zur Intimität" (336) ("Here, where everything centers on relationship, the assertion points to intimacy.") Schlich, however, prefers to interpret the intimacy as relating to the angel; whereas I interpret it as superimposing the angel's identity onto German identity.
German citizens from the FRG and the GDR. After reunification, East Germans had to redefine their own identity as well as come to terms with a new type of relationship with their rediscovered "brothers". The word "fremd" ("alien") could be describing the feelings felt by the German "brothers" in the sense that they do not know each other and are thus still foreign or alien to each other, as Wessi and Ossi. The use of the informal or familiar second person personal pronoun also opens the possibility for getting to know each other better, as an "adventure of becoming acquainted" (Schlich 336-337). At the same time, when some type of intimacy could be developing or will develop, there is a distancing occurring as the phrase, "die fremde Hand" ("the alien hand") signifies. The word "fremd" ("alien") is also found in Müller's poem from 1993, "Schwarzfilm", "Alles Menschliche / Wird fremd (Die Gedichte 275) which could be interpreted as implying a distancing or separation from humanity. In other words, the angel has become separated from mankind by the events of history, and that is why he no longer has a face and is only slightly heard. In comparison to the first two texts in which the angel was seen, heard, and with a very vivid image, the angel has now become barely a whisper in the wind. After his valiant efforts and dynamic activities on behalf of the dead as the angel of despair in the second text, he has become still. In the first text, he was unable to take flight due to historical events, but now nobody knows what kind of a revolution should occur: a new revolutionary ideology must, therefore, be developed before an uprising can start. The opportunities for flight i.e., change or revolution have been squandered and history has taken a different course. History, however, has not come to an end: there will be revolutions in the future, but the lyrical "Ich" no longer knows what revolution to expect. Müller's angel texts thus reflect the author's attitudes concerning

---

33 Schlich views the supposed intimacy as applying to the angel and the lyrical Ich; whereas I sense a definite distancing between the lyrical Ich and the angel.
German history at different periods of his life and career, and would remain an essential component of his writing and of his personality throughout his lifetime.

I.4 Müller's Impressions and Expressions of German Identity

The constellation and perception of German identity have been continually changing over the centuries, as is the normal circumstance for virtually every nation state with a growing, dynamic society. Germany, however, more than any other European country throughout history, seems to have had a long and difficult struggle in defining its national identity. This struggle seems to be a German phenomena that began centuries ago and unfortunately has lasted until the twenty-first century. Following reunification, contemporary German magazines, news programs, and talk shows continually wrestled with finding an answer to the question: "Was heißt es, Deutsch zu sein?" ("What does it mean to be German?"). In addition, numerous historians -- German as well as non-German -- have struggled with this concept and continue to contemplate the possible answers to this important question concerning German identity.35 In Shattered Past: Reconstructing German Histories, for example, the historians Konrad H. Jarausch and Michael Geyer point to the various and contradictory representatives of German identity during the past two centuries which: "[. . .] have ranged from unpolitical poets and thinkers to arrogant Junkers, from brilliant scientists to fanatical SS killers, from arrogant GDR border guards to high-minded dissidents, from enterprising FRG businessmen to protesting Greens" and which have

35 It would surpass both the scope and the length of this study to embark on an all-inclusive discussion of this topic given the vast amount of literature available by German as well as non-German authors both prior to and following reunification including, for example: Caspar von Schrenck-Notzing and Armin Mohler (eds), Deutsche Identität (Krefeld: SINUS, 1982); Paul Gerhard Klussmann and Heinrich Mohr, eds., Probleme deutscher Identität (Bonn: Bouvier, 1983); Werner Weidenfeld, ed., Nachdenken über Deutschland (Bielefeld: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1985); Harold James, The German Identity: 1770-1990 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989); Werner Weidenfeld and Karl-Rudolf Korte, Die Deutschen: Profil einer Nation (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1991); Heimo Schwilk and Ulrich Schacht, eds., Die selbstbewusste Nation (Berlin: Ullstein, 1995); Konrad H. Jarausch, ed., After Unity: Reconfiguring German Identities (Providence, Rhode Island: Berghahn, 1997); Mary Fulbrook, German National Identity after the Holocaust (London: Polity P, 1999) and; Konrad H. Jarausch and Michael Geyer, Shattered Past: Reconstructing German Histories (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003). However, since my focus is on Müller's literary search for German identity, I will include selective references from these sources whenever appropriate.
resulted in: "a fragmented nation" (241). Indeed, such a broad spectrum makes pinpointing national identity extremely difficult if not impossible. Müller believed that the clues to help answer the question relating to German identity could be found in Germany's past: to this end, his Geschichtsdramen represent an odyssey through time which took him back as far as the first century and the Germanen in Germania Tod, and up to 1990 and reunification with a view to the twenty-first century in Germania 3. This section is designed to offer helpful insights into Müller's perception of certain historical events which will further an understanding as to why he was engaged in his search for German identity.

Prior to World War II, German identity was suffering from the effects of Germany's defeat in World War I and the aftermath of the harsh repercussions of the Treaty of Versailles: the war guilt clause, loss of the colonies and German territories, disarmament, excessive reparation payments, a faltering economy and high unemployment leading to social unrest and political instability. There is a particularly brutal event from the post-World War I period which helped to shape the course of German history and thus German identity: the murders of the radical leaders of the Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands (KPD) ("German Communist Party"), Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht in 1919. Müller considered himself a Marxist, but abhorred Stalin and the GDR's subsequent dependence on and submissiveness to him and to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (KPdSU). He believed that under the leadership of Luxemburg and Liebknecht the KPD would have foresworn or eliminated its future dependence on the KPdSU. Furthermore, in his opinion, World War II is a direct consequence of these murders. In answer to a question about this war by Gregor Edelmann in his interview, "Solange wir an unsere Zukunft glauben, brauchen wir uns vor unserer Vergangenheit nicht zu fürchten", Müller responded:

Natürlich interessiert mich dann auch die Frage, wie es von deutscher Seite überhaupt dazu gekommen ist. Dazu gehört die deutsche Geschichte, und ein
Hauptdatum ist die Ermordung von Rosa Luxemburg und Karl Liebknecht. Damit fängt der zweite Weltkrieg für mich an. Das war die Enthauptung des deutschen Proletariats (GI 183).³⁶

In Müller's opinion, not only did their murders result in World War II, but this action weakened the party and the German proletariat, as he phrased it in the above quote, thus leaving the door open for other leadership to slip in. Eventually Hitler and the National Socialists stepped in to fill the gap, and their actions caused further harm and destruction, especially to German identity. Müller, however, hugely overrated the importance of the KPD: the party of the German proletariat was the SPD, not the KPD. Because the SPD would not work together with the KPD, nor the KPD with the SPD, this lack of solidarity between the socialist parties helped Hitler to power which ultimately led to the downfall of the struggling Weimar government, as the English historian Mary Fulbrook confirms in A Concise History of Germany (176). As can be ascertained based on his quote above as well as from various scenes in Germania Tod and Germania 3, which will be discussed in Chapters Four and Five, respectively, Müller was also obsessed with Luxemburg’s murder and incorrectly cited it as the starting point for World War II. Certainly her and Liebknecht's abrupt absence from the political scene was detrimental to the further development of the KPD, but to imply that World War II would not have occurred had she and Liebknecht remained alive is an unwarranted assumption. The causes for the rise of the Nazi party to power are many and are hotly debated, and the primary reasons for the start of World War II rest on Hitler's actions and the non-action of other European and world leaders.

Before the defeat of Hitler and the National Socialists at the end of World War II, a large cross-section of Germans had supported him and the Nazi party. After the defeat of Germany in 1945, however, this positive context turned negative, and the average German

³⁶("Of course I am also interested in the question of how, after all, it came to happen from the German side. German history is part of this, and a major date is the murders of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. For me
wanted to dissociate himself from the Nazis. A strong denial of every aspect of Nazism was common among the German citizens. The American attempts at "reeducation" and "denazification" served to further strengthen the German desire to refute and even conceal any connection to Nazism, whether real or assumed. The fact that two Germanies officially developed after the Second World War led to an identity crisis, as the question on each side of the newly drawn border became: who are we. The answer was, however, easily found by looking across the political divide: "We are not they." The division of Germany into two nations, the GDR and the FRG, under the guidance of the victorious allies, now enemies, thus made the concept of "identity" easier to define. Schröder describes the sense of identity after the formation of the two Germanies:

Es gab nämlich in dieser einfachen westöstlichen Welt keine fundamentalen Orientierungsprobleme. Jeder konnte wissen, wo oben und unten, rechts und links, gut und böse, Freund und Feind zu suchen waren. Vor allem aber: jeder wußte, wer er war und wo er stand. Der überall vorhandene Gegner sorgte dafür, daß es keine komplizierten Identitäts- und Definitionsprobleme gab. Identität stellte sich durch Abgrenzung her. Man selber war, was der andere nicht war. Das genügte schon.

Sich positiv zu definieren, war nicht nötig (1).37

Thus after 1949 German identity became dependent on the existence of "the other" and was partly defined by differing political ideologies which were primarily determined by location: East or West i.e., Soviet Union or the USA. In *German National Identity after the Holocaust* Mary Fulbrook discusses the problems associated with defining German identity in this new era of two Germanies. She writes that: [...] there were now two mutually hostile states on

---

37("There were of course in this simple west-eastern world no fundamental orientation problems. Everyone could know where one could find up and down, right and left, good and bad, friend and foe. But above all: everyone knew who he was and where he stood. The omnipresent opponent ensured that there were no complicated identity or definition issues. Identity defined itself by differentiation. One was what the other was not. That was enough. It was not necessary to define one's self in a positive sense.")
German soil, pawns in the Cold War battle of the superpowers. Their official political definitions of each other were in black-and-white terms of friend and foe, good and evil [. . .]" (2). Throughout the period of the Cold War, these political differences and antagonisms between the GDR and the FRG escalated primarily due to the antagonisms between the USA and the USSR. These unfortunate circumstances continued to position German brother against German brother and thus made the question of German identity even more complicated. Fulbrook refers to this peculiar German situation: "[. . .] the artificial creation of antagonistic states glaring at each other in mirror-image symmetry across the Iron Curtain which divided Cold War Europe", accompanied by the dark stain of the recent Nazi past, as being responsible for: "[. . .] the curiously fractured character of German identity since 1945" (18-19). Not only was post-1945 German identity tainted by the crimes perpetrated by the Nazis in the name of the German nation, this nation, which was still literally lying in ruins, was then divided in two and forced to endure this final violation of the German body. Certainly Müller was aware of this sense of them (FRG) versus us (GDR), since this aspect was more or less present in everyday life. However, Müller was also able to see the larger picture: the historical aspects of a single Germany.

During Germany's division into two separate states, it may have been easier to define one's identity based on the conception of one's enemy, on what one was not. But after reunification in 1990, the question of German identity again became blurred because now these two supposed opposites had been reunited as one. Christian Graf von Krockow, who experienced this war and its aftermath, posed the puzzling question about German identity in 1983, well before reunification in his essay,"Das Dilemma der deutschen Identität -- Historische und aktuelle Perspektiven":

Jedermann, so scheint es, befindet sich hierzulande auf der Suche nach seiner verlorenen Identität. Denn kaum ein Begriff taucht in deutschen Debatten der
letzten Jahre so häufig und hartnäckig auf wie dieser. Nicht zuletzt geht es dabei um die nationale Identität: Was bedeutet sie noch, was soll sie sein (89)?

His use of the specific term, "national identity" is here synonymous with that of "German identity". The average German citizen is searching for his "lost identity" in the sense of belonging to a nation. For forty years, Germans on both sides of the wall grappled with the task of learning to live with the division of Germany and the altered status of national identity. After having reconciled themselves to this new status in post-World War II Germany, whether in a positive or a negative sense, following reunification the question again became: how does one find one's lost identity or reconcile oneself with the new national status? The national identity of the German people had undergone dramatic changes after the bitter defeat of 1945 and subsequent division into two politically distinct yet culturally and historically similar Germanies. Over a timespan of four decades each nation's citizens had to learn to readjust to this new status and the new identity forced upon them.

After these two separate entities were again reunited as one nation in 1990, Ossis and Wessis were facing similar circumstances concerning their national identity: "What does it mean to be German?" In his introduction to The Individual, Identity and Innovation: Signals from Contemporary Literature and the New Germany Arthur Williams states the dilemma facing the new generations of Germans, which has its roots in the past:

At a deeper level, the removal of the symbols of division, which were also the symbols of a lost war and, fundamentally, the products of horrendous national aberration, has placed Germans everywhere in a situation which demands of them redefinition of their role and of themselves: of the way they see themselves, first and foremost, and, then, of the way they want others to see them (1-2).

38("Everyone, so it seems, in this country finds himself searching for his lost identity. Because hardly any other concept appears in German debates of the last few years as often and as stubbornly as this one. It is, after all, a question of national identity: what does it still mean, what should it be?")
He astutely zeroes in on the essence of the state of German identity after the Wende, namely: that Germany's current national identity is based on the recent past, the division into two states, the outcome of Nazi aggression and their defeat. This Nazi past is an obstacle to overcome but one which must first be accepted in order for the search to move on. Williams uses the term "redefinition" of personal and national identity as the task facing current and future generations of German citizens. Müller was also aware of this need for a new identity both after World War II, as is reflected in Germania Tod, and again after reunification in his final play, Germania 3. These dramas were his attempt to accept Germany's past with all its horrors so that he and his German audiences and readers could move forward positively.

1.5 Müller's Dramatic Texts

In order to provide an overview of his work, Müller's dramatic texts are listed below in chronological order based on their year of publication; the Uraufführung ("premiere") is listed after each title in square brackets: 39 Zehn Tage, die die Welt erschütterten (1957) [Volksbühne Berlin/GDR 1957], Der Lohndrücker (1957) [Städtisches Theater Leipzig 1958], Die Korrektur (1958) [Maxim Gorki Theater Berlin 1958], Die Umsiedlerin oder das Leben auf dem Lande (1961) [Studentenbühne Berlin/GDR 1961], revised as Die Bauern (1964) [Volksbühne Berlin/GDR 1976], Der Bau (1964) [Volksbühne Berlin/GDR 1980], Philoktet (1958/64) [Residenztheater Munich 1968], Herakles 5 (1964) [Schiller-Theater Berlin 1974], Ödipus, Tyrann (1966) [Deutsches Theater Berlin 1967], Prometheus (1967/68) [Schauspielhaus Zurich 1969], Der Horatier (1968) [Schiller-Theater Berlin 1973], Mauser (1970) [Austin Theatre Group, University of Texas 1975], Zement (1972), [Berliner Ensemble Berlin/GDR 1973], Die Schlacht (1951/74) [Volksbühne Berlin/GDR 1975], Germania Tod in Berlin (1956/71) [Münchner Kammerspiele 1978], Macbeth (1971)

39 For some plays there are two years included in parentheses: The first date refers to the year when Müller originally began writing that particular play and the second to the date when the play was actually published.
40 This play is not included in chronological tables about Müller's life and work; he wrote it together with Hagen Stahl (and Inge Müller though her name is usually omitted).

Müller himself did not believe in the practice of categorizing an author's oeuvre, as he specifically stated in 1991 in an interview with Frank M. Raddatz found in Jenseits der Nation:

Wenn ein Autor tot ist, kann man sein Werk übersehen und in Bezug zu den historischen Daten seiner Zeit setzen. Schon da klappt nichts. Auch die Ordnung einer Werkbiographie nach dem Schema: da gibt es diese Phase, dann die und die,
According to Müller, a classification system does not carry much meaning as far as the interpretation is concerned. The date of origin and the events occurring at the time should not limit one's understanding of the play, or detract from it as a work of art; instead the realization of the given historical context should add to the audience's perception of the author's intent, its awareness of the historical-philosophical context and its appreciation of the play as a Geschichtsdrama, as a witness to certain events in a given period of time. Müller's presentation of Germany as a "subject" rather than an "object" of history stems from his own childhood experiences living under the brutal Nazi dictatorship when he and his father were in the role of "object", with no control over their predicament or fate. Later, as an adult living under the GDR-Soviet leadership, he experienced life under yet another harsh dictatorship.

Müller explains his premise in his interview with Lotringer:

Ich bin immer ein Objekt von Geschichte gewesen und versuche deshalb, ein Subjekt zu werden. Das ist mein Hauptinteresse als Schriftsteller. In Europa ist das Drama immer mit Geschichte verbunden gewesen, besonders seiner geographischen Lage wegen. Deutschland ist ein Objekt der Geschichte gewesen - mehr als Frankreich oder Italien (GI1 88).

This notion that the individual is either the victim of a violent act, the "object," or the perpetrator of a violent act, the "subject," is at the heart of Müller's views about history, and is, therefore, prevalent in his Geschichtsdramen. In his opinion and as he believed history showed, the possibility of a middle position does not exist in the world. There are no heroes

---

41("When an author is dead, one can survey his work and put it into relationship to the historical dates of his time. Already this does not work at all. Also the classification of a biography of his works according to the model: there is this phase, then this one and this one, does not mean anything. Because there is no development in art, only unwrapping. The one is present in the other.

)
in Müller's plays in the traditional sense because any noble acts are turned around by historical events into representing either victim or aggressor: the universe possesses its own violent cycle which cannot be altered by any one noble act. Müller believed that Germany was more often acted upon throughout the history of the European continent than other countries: in this regard, Germany was functioning as an object rather than a subject. Müller's interest in writing Geschichtsdramen, therefore, seems to have been his attempt to depict Germany as the subject of history. Viewing German history with the benefit of hindsight, he could choose which persons and events from Germany's past to use in order to represent those aspects of German identity he wanted to emphasize: both positive and negative. During World War II, the aggressive actions of Hitler and the Nazis throughout Europe made Germany into a historical subject but in a negative way. After the victory of the Allied Forces in 1945, Germany again became an object of history but also in a negative sense. Müller's texts represent both of these aspects of German history in his depiction of violence and conflict and thus reflect Benjamin's idea of the historical materialist. Benjamin writes:

Die Beute wird, wie das immer so üblich war, im Triumphzug mitgeführt. Man bezeichnet sie als die Kulturgüter. Sie werden im historischen Materialisten mit einem distanzierten Betrachter zu rechnen haben. Denn was er an Kulturgütern überblickt, das ist ihm samt und sonders von einer Abkunft, die er nicht ohne Grauen bedenken kann [. . .] Es ist niemals ein Dokument der Kultur, ohne zugleich ein solches der Barbarei zu sein. Und wie es selbst nicht frei ist von Barbarei, so ist

---

42("I have always been an object of history and therefore I am trying to become a subject. That is my main objective as an author. In Europe the drama has always been connected to history, especially due to its geographical location. Germany has been an object of history - more than France or Italy.")

43Uwe Wittstock refers to this violent cycle as "jener fatale Zirkel" in: Heiner Müller Revolutionsstücke, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1988, rev. ed. 1995) 123. This idea of a violent cycle is reminiscent of Büchner's idea of Geschichtsfatalismus.

44 The idea of Subjekt versus Objekt is reminiscent of Spengler's view of subject and object concerning political history. Spengler made the distinction that the subject in political history retains the "strength of leadership" for a given country both internally and externally and "[. . .] the shattering of existing authority [. . .] almost always
Benjamin considers the role of the historical materialist to reverse the interpretation of history and thus the roles of conqueror and conquered, of winners and losers, of subject and object. The conqueror is tainted by the stigma of barbarism because no goods or cultural assets, as he calls them, can ever be free from their past. This past, by its very nature of involving a conqueror and a conquered, or a subject and an object, respectively, thus embodies the stain of barbarism itself which is handed down from one generation to the next. Regardless of who is the subject or object at any given point in history retains the cultural assets which are and will remain forever tainted. The idea of "brushing history against the grain" implies a change or alteration in the interpretation of history. As Michael P. Steinberg writes about Benjamin in Walter Benjamin and the Demands of History: "By reading history against the grain, he reconfigured the historical topos as one of conflict" (4). Müller's texts are full of examples of this "conflict" between the conqueror and the conquered but it is not always clear to decipher which is which, as situations often change quickly. Benjamin wanted to see the future course of history altered in such a way that violence would end much in the same way that Müller wanted a revolution in order to alter history. Both of these occurrences, paradoxically, would first require violent acts which is depicted in Benjamin's use of the word "barbarism" in the above quote. Society is the opposite of barbarism while at the same time it is based upon results not in this new party's making itself the subject of domestic policy, but in the whole nation's becoming the object of alien policy - and not seldom for ever" (2: 369).

45("The plunder, as has always been the custom, is carried along in a triumphal procession. It is designated as cultural assets. They will have a distanced observer to deal with in the historical materialist. Because what he assesses as cultural assets, all of them, are for him from an origin about which he cannot think without horror [. . .] It can never be a cultural document without at the same time being one of barbarism. And since it is not free from barbarism itself, so it is also not free from the traditional process in which it fell from the one to the other. For this reason, the historical materialist dissociates himself from it according to the possibilities. He views it as his duty to brush history against the grain.").
barbarism given the fact that wars have been an extensive and recurring phenomenon in the course of history and in the development of civilization. The influence of Benjamin on Müller can be seen in the latter's manner of brushing history "against the grain" in the form of conflict in his Geschichtsdramen. As part of this aspect, the author offers neither solutions nor compromises, only conflict:


He was not looking for answers to historical conflicts, his interest lay rather in presenting these conflicts in order to better understand the dialectical processes of history and how they affected German identity. Especially in his early plays, his rebellious style is reminiscent of Büchner's Sozialdramen ("social dramas") and Brecht's epic theater using the stage as a didactic tool, Müller left the search for direct solutions up to the audience, as the conflict can only be resolved by them (Tschapke Einleitung 93-94). The idea of presenting conflict to the reader or audience is essential to reaching a true understanding of Müller's theater. Uwe Wittstock understood how important the role of demonstrating conflict was to Müller. In his Nachwort ("Epilogue") to the collection Heiner Müller: Revolutionsstücke he writes about the author:

Er versteht es meisterhaft, Positionen zu formulieren und doch Abstand von ihnen zu wahren: nie rückt er Antworten oder Lösungen in den Mittelpunkt seiner Stücke, sondern stets die noch unentschiedenen Konflikte, die Kontroversen. Wer glaubt,

46("I believe in conflict. I don't believe in anything else. What I try to do in my writings is to strengthen the consciousness for conflicts, for confrontations and contradictions. There is no other way. I'm not interested in answers and solutions. I don't have any to offer. I'm interested in problems and conflicts.")} The English
seiner habhaft zu werden, hält schließlich nichts anderes in Händen als eine seiner Masken (120).  

According to Wittstock, Müller was a master at presenting a given conflict in his dramas and creating just the right mixture of tension yet without in any way revealing his own viewpoint. By so doing, Müller demonstrated the ability to maintain a measure of separation between the author and his text: any attempt to pin a label onto Müller reveals itself as an illusion.

The practice of categorizing an author's works into specific phases should not limit the scope of the individual text or diminish the text's potential as a means of communicating to the audience or reader. A Geschichtsdrama does not and should not only be viewed in the narrow confines of a certain phase which has been determined by critics and not by the author, rather it should be allowed the freedom to speak on the author's behalf to future generations also. A single text can allow exponentially many different interpretations and meanings for the audience or reader of any given present and future time period. Even though Müller considered it "kompletter Unfug" (GI2 96) to classify an author's body of work according to different phases, such a classification remains an important aspect of a critic's analysis. Given the nature of literary criticism, some type of periodization of an author's oeuvre is desirable because it aids in the clarification of the author's intentions and helps support the critics' interpretations. For a study of Müller's Geschichtsdramen particularly, an awareness of what was occurring in the GDR and the FRG at the time of writing plays an essential role. However, rather than categorizing his dramatic works based primarily on a

---


47("He knows how to masterfully formulate positions but also to maintain a certain distance from them: he never places answers or solutions at the center of his dramas, rather continually the still unresolved conflicts, the controversies. Whoever believes to have gotten hold of one of his conflicts, ultimately holds nothing in his hands but one of his masks.")

48In his interview, "I don't know what's avant-garde: Interview with Eva Brenner", Müller responds to the question of how he would define the development of his work: "I would not define it at all. That question reflects the social democratic idea of linear progress, of linear development, and that's completely nonsensical. I could write a play similar to Hamletmachine tomorrow and then the next day write one like Lohndrücker <The
division into time cycles or time phases, it is much more accurate and more decisive for the quality of the analysis to approach Müller's plays according to their major themes, which has been the catalyst for this study with its focus on German identity. Depending upon which critic one reads, Müller's dramas may have decidedly different themes, or they may reflect the same ones in a different form.

I.5.1 Major Themes in Müller's Geschichtsdramen in Previous Scholarly Research

A little over a decade ago, in 1993, at a colloquium in Paris, the general consensus on the literary oeuvre of Müller reflected the view that scholarly research was still in the developmental stage, but progressing. As Theo Buck writes in the foreword to Heiner Müller - Rückblicke, Perspektiven: Vorträge des Pariser Kolloquiums 1993, an enhanced understanding of Müller's body of work is currently underway: "Die wissenschaftliche Auseinandersetzung mit Heiner Müller ist im Begriff, ein Fundament für gezielte Forschungen und somit für ein tieferes Verständnis zu errichten (8)." However, during the last decade, the status of literary research in regard to Heiner Müller has undergone a significant change. After reunification in 1990 and since his death in 1995, his reputation as one of the most important modern German playwrights has been steadily growing along with an accompanying increase in popularity of his dramas as material for research topics. Because his plays were also published and performed outside of the GDR, in the FRG, France, and in the USA, Müller enjoyed a certain amount of recognition and fame during his lifetime. His freedom to travel back and forth between both German countries earned him the nickname of "Müller-Deutschland", and as he himself stated in regard to this unofficial title in an interview with Lotringer entitled simply, "Mauern": "Ich stehe gern mit je einem Bein auf Scab>. This notion of periodization is complete nonsense" (Heiner Müller: Germania. Ed. Sylvère Lotringer. Trans. Bernard & Caroline Schütze. (New York Semiotext(e), 1990) 235). ⁴⁹("The scientific discussion about Heiner Müller is on the verge of establishing a basis for targeted research and thus for a more profound understanding.")
den zwei Seiten der Mauer" (Rotwelsch 64). Perhaps in some way his plays are able to strike a chord in Germans from both sides of the now-defunct wall and reunite them psychologically by helping them to overcome the cultural barriers wrought by time.

Müller's body of dramatic work is generally divided into various periods or phases which reflect not only the major theme of a given play, but also the year in which he started work on it, when applicable, as well as the year of publication. The subject matter in Müller's dramas has been highly dependent on the historical and political events in the GDR and has remained the main focus for most critics' analyses. As Schmitt points out, the volume of secondary literature on Heiner Müller had already become so vast ("fast unüberschaubar") that it is difficult to review it all (25). In his essay, "Zur Rezeption von Heiner Müller in DDR und BRD: Eine Erinnerung an das Verhältnis von politischer und ästhetischer Wertung", Matias Mieth similarly declares that: "Seit 1980 glich die Menge der Sekundärliteratur zu Heiner Müller einer Lawine" (604). However, in order to provide the reader with a basic understanding of the most prevalent themes in Müller's dramas, which will prove pertinent to the analyses of Germania Tod and Germania 3 in Chapters Four and Five, respectively, the following is a brief overview of some of the most important and lasting secondary literature based on the themes critics have found in Müller's plays. Four major themes have been identified and used as categories by these critics, namely: 1) Produktionsstücke ("production plays"); 2) Antikenstücke ("antiquity plays"); 3) Deutschlandstücke ("Germany or German history plays") and; 4) Revolutionsstücke ("revolution plays"). I would like to propose a fifth theme and corresponding category: 5) Deutsche Identitätsstücke, ("German identity plays"), a topic found expressly in Germania Tod and Germania 3.

This proposed category, Deutsche Identitätsstücke or "German identity plays", reflects, first of all, Müller's specific and deliberate use of the term "Germania" in each of

---

these two plays: in this way they differentiate themselves from those plays under category three, "Germany or German history plays". Secondly, the subject matter is not limited to the Second World War, as are the plays of the Wolokolamsker Chaussee cycle, or to the eighteenth century, Prussia, and the Enlightenment era, as is the case with Leben Gundlings. Although in both Germania Tod and Germania 3 the emphasis is on the twentieth century, the historical spectrum extends well beyond World War II: in the former as far back as the first century up through World War II and post-war developments in the occupied zones and then the establishment of the FRG and the GDR; in the latter back to a battle during World War I on which the title is based, up through the late twentieth century and developments after German reunification. Thirdly, the characteristics of twentieth century German identity are traced back to their origins in Germania Tod and presented as a portent for the future in Germania 3.

We start this presentation of themes in Müller's body of dramatic work in the mid-seventies with Wolfgang Schivelbusch's presentation of two categories in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ) from 12 November 1974: 1) Produktionsstücke and 2) Antikenstücke. Based on Müller's Schaffensphasen ("creative phases"), these designations advanced by Schivelbusch have provided a lasting foundation upon which contemporary and future critics have built their analyses of Müller's plays. The first category, consisting of Produktionsstücke written during the 1950s and early 1960s, focus on the social, political, and economic development facing the GDR in its early years, the 1950s: "Geschichten aus der Produktion" meint zweierlei. Einmal, daß es sich um Geschichten aus der ökonomischen Produktion handelt, zum zweiten, daß es sich um Geschichten aus Müllers schriftstellerischer

---

51 ("Since 1980 the amount of secondary literature on Heiner Müller resembles an avalanche.")
52 See also Wolfgang Schivelbusch, Sozialistisches Drama nach Brecht (Darmstadt: Luchterhand, 1974) 96-153.
53 The title is taken from the collection of Müller's plays published in the GDR: Geschichten aus der Produktion (Berlin: Rotbuch, 1974).
Produktion handelt". The second category, Antikenstücke, includes plays from the 1960s, which Schivelbusch referred to as "die Parabeln im antiken Kostüm ("parables in antique costume"). As its name indicates, and as it has survived until today, as seen in the studies by Teraoka (10), Allen (18), and Schmitt (25), et al, for example, this category includes those plays which are based on Greek tragedies, or adaptations of Greek and Shakespearean, and in some instances Brechtian plays.

In Heiner Müller from 1980, Genia Schulz found three major themes in his dramas, which correspond to categories three and four, Deutschlandstücke and Revolutionsstücke respectively, and in each of which she claims the GDR plays a major role: 1) Deutschland ("Germany"); 2) Revolution, Stalinismus und die "Kosten" der Revolution; ("Revolution, Stalinism, and the price to pay for a revolution") and; 3) der sozialistische Aufbau ("socialist development in the GDR") (11). Schulz's analysis encompasses seventeen of Müller's plays, which covers his entire body of dramatic work up to that time. In spite of the fact that it was published over twenty years ago, Schulz's work on Müller's Geschichtsdramen up to that point is helpful for a general overview and for a better understanding of the political influence on Müller's dramas. Although her analyses may lack the depth and detailed analyses of more recent interpretations, possibly because she dealt with seventeen plays rather than only two or three, they are the foundation on which much of the later critical work rested and still provide valuable insights into these plays and the political circumstances at each given point in time.

54("Stories from production" means two things: Firstly, that it deals with stories from the economic production, and secondly, that it deals with stories from Müller's literary production.")
55Allen refers to Schivelbusch's three categories in his article, however, he lists only two: Produktionsstücke and Antikenstücke. The generally accepted third category, Deutschlandstücke, was not presented by Schivelbusch in the FAZ article from 12 Nov. 1974).
A major point, which is often overlooked but mentioned by Schulz, is that Die Schlacht and Traktor were originally conceived by Müller as a drama in two parts, a Doppelstück:

Traktor, 1955-61 entstanden, über ein neues, ziviles Heldentum nach den großen Kriegsschlachten, ist erst zusammen mit der Schlacht - gleichsam als dessen Fortsetzung - uraufgeführt worden. Von Müller als Doppelstück verstanden, in der DDR auch so inszeniert und interpretiert, hat sich von Schlacht/Traktor in der Bundesrepublik nur die Schlacht durchsetzen können [...]. der Zusammenhang zur Schlacht wurde in der Bundesrepublik wie in der DDR nur so gesehen, daß als positiver Kontrapunkt zu den Greuelreihen, die die Szenen aus Deutschland unter dem Namen Schlacht vereinen, Traktor eine grundlegend veränderte Szene, den Beginn eines neuen Deutschland, zeigt (118).57

The last line of the above quote could explain why Traktor did not become popular in the FRG: it showed a new beginning was possible in the GDR and, as such, was the type of positive propaganda for the GDR that the FRG would not want to support; whereas Die Schlacht reinforced the image of good versus evil and let the readers in the FRG assume that they reflected the former.

In 1985, Arlene Akiko Teraoka presented her analysis of Müller's most recent publications at that time, Leben Gundlings, Die Hamletmaschine and Der Auftrag. She uses a postmodernist approach and concentrates on the poetic and aesthetic elements of Müller's plays while simultaneously investigating their political importance and implications (13). She successfully bases her analysis of Müller as a postmodernist on his comments in, "Der

---

57("Tractor, developed 1955-61, about a new, civil heroism after the great battles of war, first premiered together with the Battle - so to speak as its continuation. Understood by Müller as a double-play, also staged and interpreted as such in the GDR, of Battle and Tractor only the Battle was able to assert itself in the FRG [...]. the connection to Battle was seen in the FRG as in the GDR, only as that of a positive contrapoint to the series
Schrecken, die erste Erscheinung des Neuen: Zu einer Diskussion über Postmodernismus in New York", published in Theater heute from March 1979, but largely ignores his many interviews. In addition, she offers a list of three phases for Müller's plays in which she emphasizes their themes and dates of publication. Phase one covers the early 1950s to early 1960s, phase two includes the mid-1960s to early 1970s and, phase three consists of dramas from the mid-1970s to 1985 (9-11). Teraoka's phases one and two, Produktionsstücke and Antikenstücke, respectively, are based on those by Schivelbusch: the themes in phase one are the contemporary problems in industry and land reform in the developing GDR at a time when ex-Nazis lived and worked side by side with Communists in the pursuit of a single cause: the development of the GDR socialist state (9); the themes in phase two are Müller's "radical re-workings of Greek and Brechtian plays" (10). In phase three, which she rightly considers his "most complex, and politically perhaps most controversial work", she refers to their form as well as content: "historical-mythological-literary "montages"(11). She includes the remaining plays up until Müller's most recent drama at that time, Verkommenes Ufer Medeamaterial Landschaft mit Argonauten (1982). Her inclusion of Germania Tod and Die Schlacht in phase three is questionable given her definition of Müller's themes for this phase: "the issues of cultural colonialism and the exportation of revolution, the role of the intellectual in the revolutionary process, and specifically, the role of the European socialist intellectual in the contemporary struggles of the Third World" (11). This discrepancy suggests that further thematic distinctions are required in order to more accurately describe Müller's dramatic themes. Additionally, the year she gives for publication of Germania Tod, 1971, is not the "mid-1970s" which is the timeframe she lists for plays in this third phase. Most importantly, the fact that she neglects to mention or perhaps was unaware of the fact that Müller began to write some texts in the fifties, Die Schlacht, Germania Tod (as well as of horror which the scenes about Germany under the name Battle unite, in a foundation-forming altered scene, showing the start of a new Germany.”}
Traktor which is absent from her and some other lists in the FRG), but did not complete and publish them until the seventies, suggests that the critics have only more recently become aware of the complexity of Müller's work.

In his Nachwort ("Epilogue") in Heiner Müller: Revolutionsstücke, which appeared in 1988, Uwe Wittstock put forth his analysis of Müller's dramas based primarily on the theme of revolution, as the title and name of the third category indicates. In his view Müller's biography and historical and political events left a lasting imprint on his literary works and, as Wittstock notes, "Müllers Obsession ist die Geschichte" ("Müller's obsession is history") (115). In Müller's dramas of the seventies and eighties he finds the following themes: 1) Täter und Opfer der Geschichte ("historical aggressor and victim"), or in Spengler's and Müller's terminology, "subject and object"; 2) Hoffnung auf eine Revolution ("hope for a revolution") (117-120) and; 3) der Verrat an der Revolution ("the betrayal of the revolution") (117-120) (Mauser, Hamletmaschine, Der Auftrag). Wittstock makes the distinction between those plays Müller started in the fifties but did not complete or publish until the seventies and those plays he actually finished and published in the fifties: "[. . .] einzelne Szenen, kurze Dialoge und Text-Bruchstücke, die sich sprachlich und dramaturgisch erheblich von seinen übrigen Arbeiten unterscheiden" (121). Within this constellation he includes: Germania Tod, Die Schlacht/Traktor, and Verkommenes Ufer (121). It is interesting to note that Wittstock, like Schulz, also places Die Schlacht and Traktor together, which demonstrates his awareness of both the history and the complexity of Müller's dramas. He astutely understands that Müller used those plays, which Wittstock also refers to as Produktionsstücke (122), to present one image of himself to the public in the fifties, but kept another aspect of himself and his plays hidden until the right time came for their publication, which eventually occurred.

58 ("[. . .] individual scenes, terse dialogues and text fragments, which differ substantially from the rest of his work (texts) linguistically and theatrically.")
In 1991 Frank-Michael Raddatz published his book, *Dämonen unterm Roten Stern*, in which he concentrates on Müller's dramas from the seventies with a particular interest in the three *Geschichtsdramen* of the fourth category listed above, *Deutschlandstücke: Die Schlacht, Germania Tod, Leben Gundlings*. Thematically they revolve around Müller's "Deutschlandkomplex" ("Germany complex") which Raddatz calls "einer der gewichtigsten Themenkomplexe der 70er Jahre" ("one of the most important thematic complexes of the seventies") (46). He lists three categories which are the focus of his study: 1) die Auseinandersetzung mit Deutschland ("coming to terms with Germany"); 2) das europäische Revolutionskonzept ("the European concept of revolution"); and 3) weibliche Emanzipationsstrategien ("female strategies of emancipation") (1). *Germania Tod* is included in the first category and Raddatz's observations about the play in addition to insights into German identity will prove helpful in my own analysis. Raddatz is aware of the fact that Müller developed scenes for various plays in the fifties: "In *Die Schlacht* und *Germania* sind Vorarbeiten aus den fünfziger Jahren eingegangen" (52). He also refers to the fact, as does Schulz, that *Die Schlacht* and *Traktor* were performed together: "1974 wurde in der DDR *Die Schlacht* zusammen mit *Traktor* als Doppelstück uraufgeführt" (53). This aspect of these two particular plays as complements has repercussions for the placement of Müller's later plays as well, which will be discussed shortly.

In his book, *Drama und Dramaturgie Heiner Müllers zwischen 1956 und 1988*, published in 1992, Andreas Keller presents Müller's *Werkgeschichte* ("history of Müller's body of work") and *Werkschichten* ("layers of Müller's body of work"), which Schivelbusch refers to as *Schaffensphasen* ("creative phases") (FAZ). Keller's three categories are

59 ("Preparatory work from the fifties went into *The Battle* and *Germania.*")
60 ("In the GDR in 1974 *The Battle* premiered together with *Tractor* as a double-play.")
61 In 1989, Norbert Otto Eke had suggested an analysis based on *Werkschichten* ("text layers") as opposed to *Werkphasen* ("text phases") because the former term reflects the overlapping of various themes during the same time periods and allows for the possibility of a "chronologisch offenen Rezeptionsmodells" ("chronologically
based on specific timespans but also take into account the differences in content as well as form. The first category he refers to as "Produktions- und Lehrstücke" (production and didactic plays"), plays from the fifties up to the early seventies: Der Lohndrücker to Zement, 1956 to 1972, respectively (41). The second group consists of dramatic "Textmontagen und Collagen" ("text montages and collages") from the seventies: Germania Tod to Hamletmaschine, 1971 to 1977, respectively (41). The final group is based upon a third "Werkschicht" which distinguishes itself from Müller's earlier plays by the level of "Komplexität der Textkonstruktionen" ("complexity of text construction"); those are the plays from the early to mid-eighties; Der Auftrag to Bildbeschreibung, 1979 to 1984, respectively (41). He analyzes one drama from each of the three phases he lists; Germania Tod is a representative play from the second phase which will prove significant for my analysis. Keller's division of plays into these categories takes into account the fact that Müller started writing certain plays at an earlier date but did not publish them until years later. More importantly, as pointed out in Teraoka's model as well, the element of form plays a major role in the analysis of Müller's later plays.

In his book from 1999, Geschichte und Mythisierung, the aspect of form plays an important role in Rainer E. Schmitt's analyses of Müller's dramas. He refers to the following thematic categories in Müller's body of work which have been discussed above: 1) Produktionsstücke; 2) Antikenstücke; 3) Revolutionsstücke and; 4) Deutschlandstücke. Schmitt's focus is on the theme of German history, in particular World War II, in Müller's Geschichtsdramen: Die Schlacht, Germania Tod, Wolokolamsker Chaussee, and Germania 3. His study, as he himself mentions, has the added benefit of including plays from an earlier and a later period of Müller's work for purposes of comparison (25), which also comprises an essential aspect of my analysis. As he also recognizes, Müller often created works with differing forms open pattern of reception") (15). This system has found continued resonance in the nineties with critics such as Andreas Keller. Norbert Otto Eke, Heiner Müller: Apokalypse und Utopie. (Paderborn: Schönigh, 1989).
and themes during the same timeframe (27). Schmitt convincingly concentrates on the
creative aspects of Müller's plays and their origins and formation over a period of years,
using Müller's own statements from interviews until just shortly before his death in 1995.

Finally, Sascha Löschner has made an important contribution to this literary discipline
in *Geschichte als persönliches Drama: Heiner Müller im Spiegel seiner Interviews und
Gespräche* from 2002. Completed under the auspices of Frank Hörnigk, the book focuses on
the many interviews given by Müller during his lifetime and their association to his major
themes. Löschner organizes the interviews based on various relevant categories such as:
interviewer and time period; and he classifies the major themes in Müller's works based on:
geography, stages, and subject matter. Although Löschner refers to Müller's early dramas as
"Produktionsstücke", he also concedes that it is difficult: "einen inhaltlichen Entwicklungs-
prozeß im dramatischen Schaffen herauszuarbeiten" (41). He calls *Germania Tod* a:
"Patchwork aus scheinbar zusammenhanglosen Einzelszenen" which exemplifies Müller's
dramatic work of the seventies and beyond as non-conformist and divergent from both
aristotelian and brechtian forms (40-41). Referring to the deceased author as a: "Streit- und
Identifikationspunkt einer (deutschen) Kulturelite" (13), Löschner maintains that even after
his death, Müller's texts continue to provoke literary debates.

The difficulties that arise when one tries to fit his plays into one specific category or
type suggest that Müller's plays are often too complex to be defined by a one-dimensional
label. The term "synthetic fragment" refers to Müller's unorthodox style which he first
described in 1975 as: "der Versuch, ein Fragment synthetisch herzustellen" ("the attempt to
create a synthetic fragment") in *Ein Brief* ("a letter"), which is directed at the GDR theater

---

62 ("subject of controversy and identification of a (German) cultural elite"); ("to work out a thematic
development process in his dramatic productions")
63 ("patchwork of seemingly unconnected individual scenes")
critic Martin Linzer (Theater-Arbeit 125). Later, in a 1992 interview with Klaus Welzel entitled, "Wir brauchen ein neues Geschichtskonzept" ("we need a new concept of history"), Müller responded to a question about this so-called Methodik:


An artist, with his critical eye, who picks up his text again later and reads it, sees that there could be more written about it and in that sense, it is a fragment. But a writer does not sit down and say, intentionally, that he is now going to write a fragment. Should a writer die while he is in the process of writing a text, then that text he has left unfinished is generally considered a fragment. Some of Müller's texts may be considered "fragmentary" given their short scenes and seeming lack of cohesion, in particular Germania Tod and Germania 3. His overall works, however, are complete and in that sense cannot be considered fragments, even though some have an open ending. He did not believe in using the classical, closed form of a play, but rather preferred to experiment with the traditional aspects of a drama such as time, place, and plot and additionally with formal aspects such as language and form. He employed modern or even postmodern features, such as collage and montage. When combined with his favorite recurring topics, such as German history, World War II, the GDR and its development, revolution, Stalinism, and Russian history, the result is often a complex of

---

64 Ein Brief originally appeared in the literary publication, Theater der Zeit, 8/1975 as a response to Linzer's comments about Müller's dramaturgy, particularly Die Schlacht/Traktor.

65 ("[. . .] In an interview with a theater critic I said: "That is a synthetic fragment". Since then it has been haunting the whole field of secondary literature, that I produce fragments. That is total nonsense. No one can produce a fragment. One simply starts writing something and then one thinks, it is finished. And when one looks closer, it is a fragment. It is so ridiculous, that a theory developed around that. [. . .]")
overlapping themes with a mixture of theatrical techniques. In the following section, I discuss the reasons for my choice of plays and categorization of Müller's two plays.

I.5.2 Selection of Geschichtsdramen for this Study:

**Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann**

The one element most critics seem to agree upon even today is that the first phase of Müller's work are the Produktionsstücke and the second phase the Antikenstücke. Some critics refer to Deutschlandstücke and some to Revolutionsstücke, sometimes the various themes or the time periods overlap with one another. Germania Tod has been placed under the category, Deutschlandstücke because it concentrates on the themes of Germany and German history, even though it also contains revolutionary ideas to some extent and could, therefore, be considered under the category of Revolutionsstücke. Due to the overlapping of themes in Müller's dramas, the categorization of this drama is complicated. Schmitt places Die Schlacht, Germania Tod and Leben Gundlings in the category of Müller's dramas which deal specifically with the topic of German history (25). He chooses to exclude Germania 3 from this classification, opting rather for its combination with Wolokolamsker Chaussee to suit his emphasis on the Russian aspects in these two plays. While Schmitt is successful in accomplishing the goals he set out to achieve, his study neglects the aspect of German identity which, in my opinion, constitutes the very essence of these two Geschichtsdramen, as the use of the word "Germania" in each title clearly demonstrates. Thus the category of "German identity plays" which I am postulating provides the most accurate placement of both Germania Tod and of Germania 3. Because this study focuses on German identity in post-World War II and post-reunification Germany, the twentieth century and beyond, Leben Gundlings is not included. However, since Germania Tod and to a lesser extent Germania 3 include aspects of Prussia and Frederick the Great as part of Germany's social and political legacy, Leben Gundlings will be referred to where appropriate. Müller's interest in the Soviet
Union is reflected in his dramas *Zement* and *Wolokolamsker Chaussee*: the former deals with the formation of the Soviet Union and the latter with various aspects relating to it and World War II.⁶⁶

Müller's *Geschichtsdramen* that focus on specific aspects of German history: *Die Schlacht* (1951/74), *Germania Tod* (1956/71), *Leben Gundlings* (1976), and *Germania 3* reflect pan-German historical events which occurred before the division of 1949. But *Die Schlacht* and *Leben Gundlings* do not focus on Germany, i.e. "Germania" and German identity in the same, specific way as do the two plays in this study, which also have the added emphasis of observing German identity from the viewpoint of the GDR, i.e., from a Marxist perspective. *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3* both concentrate on German history: the former covers a time period of almost two thousand years; whereas the latter covers the twentieth century starting with 1919 until 1990. The emphasis is on the years 1942/45 through 1956, signifying specific historical events, as Roland Clauß writes in "Vom großen Anfang und vom schalen Ende. Zu *Der Lohndrücker* und *Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann*": Stalingrad, the war's end, and the XX. Plenary Session with its Entstalinisierung ("De-Stalinisation") (42). *Wolokolamsker Chaussee* concentrates on the Russian perspective of World War II and for this reason does not comply with the criteria for this study. Müller's earliest plays: *Der Lohndrücker* (1956), *Die Korrektur* (1957/58), *Die Umsiedlerin oder das Leben auf dem Lande* (1956-61), and *Der Bau* (1964) concentrate on the development of the GDR specifically and, therefore, could not be considered for this all-encompassing study of German identity, although certain aspects will be considered in my analysis wherever appropriate and applicable. I will show that the two *Geschichtsdramen* at the center of this study offer the best insights into German identity and, as the term "Germania" in each of

---

⁶⁶Müller's motivation for writing about the Soviet Union and an analysis of these two plays would make for a fascinating future study; a comparison of Russian and German characteristics and national identities could also prove to be very compelling, but does not lie within the scope of this study.
them demonstrates, Müller highlights those elements of German history which he believed had a direct influence on the development or obstruction of national identity.

I.5.3 The Mystery of "Germania 2"

Given the fact that the term "Germania" can be found in two of Müller's plays, the question arises: was there ever a "Germania 2"? The argument that the play Leben Gundlings could be "Germania 2" because it deals with German history, is a weak one considering its subject matter in comparison to Germania Tod and Germania 3. Though the subject matter in Leben Gundlings concerns German history, it does not correspond to the central themes in both of the "Germania" plays and their focus on German identity and the effects of World Wars I and II, Hitler, Communism, Stalin, the GDR, the FRG, and other more modern factors on the past, present, and future of German identity. Müller would most likely have included the word "Germania" in the title if he had wanted to consider Leben Gundlings as the second in a series of Germania plays.

Schmitt offers a very intriguing justification for his choice of plays, which he bases on a quote from 1986 by Müller: Die Schlacht as the precursor to Germania Tod, and Wolokolamsker Chaussee as the precursor to Germania 3 (24). In his interview with Edelmann Müller said: "Ich stelle mir ein Verhältnis vor wie Schlacht zu Germania. Da wäre die Wolokolamsker dann Die Schlacht, sicher in einer ganz anderen Form, aber in einer ähnlichen Struktur der Teile zueinander" (GI1 183). Although Müller did not refer specifically by name to his final published play in that quote, Schmitt has logically assumed that Müller was indeed referring to Germania 3 because that is the last known play he completed before his death. It is now well known that Müller often started work on plays but did not complete them until much later, as is the case with Germania 3 as well. At first glance, this proposed constellation might seem to contradict the relationship of Die Schlacht

---

67 ("I imagine a relationship as in that of The Battle to Germania. In that case the Wolokolamsker would be The Battle, certainly in a totally different form, but the parts would be structurally similar to one another.")
and Traktor as explained by Schulz and Raddatz. However, given the fact that Traktor was largely ignored in theaters of the FRG, while Germania Tod was performed, Müller may have been speaking about the reception in the West where a connection between Die Schlacht and Germania Tod would be understood. The references by Schulz and Raddatz serve as proof against an argument in favor of Die Schlacht as the first Germania play, or "Germania 1", and Germania Tod as the second Germania play, and Germania 3 as the final play in a series. Based on Schmitt's choice of plays and his placement of Die Schlacht with Germania Tod and Wolokolamsker Chaussee with Germania 3, it seems he did not consider the direct possibility of a "Germania 2".

Further, Clauß offers two interesting ideas about what he believes Müller considered to be "Germania 2": 1) either that Hitler's Germany constitutes the first and the GDR the second (43) or; 2) the Weimar Republic was the first Germany, Hitler's the second and the GDR the third, as in "Germania 3" (50). He bases the second version on the following quote by Müller: "Es ist ein Privileg für einen Autor, in einem Leben drei Staaten untergehen zu sehen. Die Weimarer Republik, den faschistischen Staat und die DDR. Den Untergang der Bundesrepublik Deutschland werde ich wohl nicht mehr erleben" (Krieg ohne Schlacht 361). However, Müller's use of the word "Staaten" is not automatically equivalent to his use of the term "Germania". It is my opinion that, given the subject matter in Germania Tod, he is referring here to the Germany that existed prior to World War II up until the era of Hitler's Germany and its defeat in 1945, followed by the subsequent division of Berlin along with the rest of the nation. The GDR, I believe, represents "Germania 2" for Müller based on his own view of it as a provisional state: "Ich hatte den Eindruck, daß die DDR etwas Vorläufiges war, ein Provisorium" (GI3 209) and his corresponding retrospective treatment of it in

---

68("It is a privilege for an author to see the collapse of three states in his lifetime: the Weimar Republic, the fascist state and the GDR. Most likely I will not experience the downfall of the FRG.") Hereafter I will abbreviate Müller's autobiography as KoS.
69("I had the impression that the GDR was something temporary, a provisional arrangement.")
scene one of **Germania 3**. Once the boundaries and the Wall "fell" beginning in November 1989 and with the official reunification on 3 October 1990, this second Germany no longer officially existed. The third Germany is, therefore, the reunified nation and its future which Müller depicts in **Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann**.

Schmitt's study includes detailed analyses of both **Germania Tod** and **Germania 3** as **Geschichtsdramen**, as well as the first comparison of both plays, which makes it a valuable source for the development of comparisons and contrasts in my study. Though he refers to the "typischen deutschen Nationalcharakter" ("typical German national character") (129), his study does not include the detailed aspect of German identity as the major focus of the analyses of Müller's two **Geschichtsdramen** as in my dissertation, which also includes the presentation of German identity as an element of this genre throughout the German literary periods since **Götz von Berlichingen**. Additionally, my analysis of both dramas presents the relationship between German identity and German "political" identity as depicted by Müller and how these two concepts are similar or different, negative or positive, and their relation to and effect on the genre of **Geschichtsdrama**.

In addition to his dramatic works, Müller wrote many poems which reflect important aspects of his life as well as German identity. Though Müller was not generally considered a poet, in his "Nachbemerkung" ("epilogue") to his collection of Müller's poems entitled, **Die Gedichte** ("the poems"), Frank Hörmigk emphasizes the significant role of poetry for this playwright: for a ten year period before he started to write dramas in the 1950's, he had written almost exclusively poems; then, during the last ten years of his life his creative skills again focused on poems with the exception of his final play (336). It is interesting to note, as Hörmigk also points out, that Müller included certain poems from the 1950's in his plays to

---

either emphasize or retract his ideas ("Nachbemerkung" 336). Because Müller's poetry thus represents a major contribution to his body of work, I will turn to his poems or lyrical texts throughout my analyses when applicable. Müller viewed poetry as a release from reality, a move into another dimension, as he expresses in the following quote: "Denn Lyrik ist Ausstieg aus der Wirklichkeit. Nur wenn man aus der Zeit aussteigt, kann man auf sie Einfluß nehmen" (Jenseits der Nation 43). He was looking at poetry as an art form which goes beyond the time element; i.e., a poem that is classic in the sense that it has a universal truth or meaning for the reader of any time: the same can be said of a well-written play and particularly in this case, Geschichtsdrama.

I.6 The Structure of My Dissertation

Until now there has not been a study devoted to the exploration of German identity in Müller's two plays which share the term "Germania". The purpose of this study is therefore to: 1) define their characteristics as Geschichtsdramen based on the literary tradition throughout German history; 2) examine the question why this genre suited Müller's purposes; 3) compare his use of the genre with that of previous authors of Geschichtsdramen; 4) examine Müller's use of form, style and language in each play; 5) examine the influence of Marxism on these two literary works based on the role literature played in the social and political life of the GDR from 1949-1989; 6) analyze Müller's use of German history to depict or explain post-World War II German identity in Germania Tod; 7) analyze Müller's use of German history to depict post-reunification German identity in Germania 3; 8) compare and contrast how the political and literary situations of the post-World War II era differed from that of the post-reunification era and; 9) how these differences or similarities affected German identity as evidenced in these two Geschichtsdramen.

71 For example: "Motiv bei A.S." in Der Auftrag and "Lektion" in Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann.
72 ("Because poetry means stepping out of the realm of reality. Only when one steps out of time can one influence time.")
In *Germania Tod*, Müller's tendency to reduce German history to its barest form in his literary search for the new German identity is obvious and at times overwhelming. The audience or reader is inundated with disturbing images of man's base instincts emerging with vital force in the form of cannibalism, the dead fighting other dead, torture, and murder as banal actualities of everyday reality. Although *Germania 3*, published over two decades later, contains significantly fewer violent and shockingly graphic scenes, it continues Müller's method of reducing historical persons and events to their skeletal form. However, this GDR author was facing a new set of circumstances given the reunification of the GDR and the FRG in 1990. This occurrence and its far-reaching repercussions altered the historical constellation and thus offered a very different perspective on German identity as compared to the period following Germany's defeat in World War II and the subsequent division of Germany. His search becomes even more relevant for the current generation of young Germans who are growing up in a unified Germany: for them the Berlin Wall is not a reality to be seen and touched on a trip to Berlin, but something to read about in history books and watch on television. Müller's obsession with German history and national sense of self is also of great interest as well as importance to citizens of other countries of the world, in particular Europe, who suffered most, first under the Nazi dictatorship, and then under the Stalinist regime. The *Geschichtsdramen* in this study are Müller's attempt to redefine national identity by looking to the past at the origins of Germany and the formation of the German nation, its characteristics, its attributes and significantly, its weaknesses. Müller did not shy away from presenting the worst and most vulgar aspects of German character and tradition in his search for answers to the questions which arose about Germany after the events of World War II and again after reunification. This genre was ideally suited to present his comparisons and research of German history and culture in order to discover its roots, both positive and negative. The historical events which occurred during his lifetime played a major role in
forming Müller the individual as well as Müller the playwright who created these two similar yet distinctive dramas.

The *Geschichtsdrama*, with its solid tradition in German literature, proved to be the ideal tool for Müller's search. By presenting the facts alongside the legends and myths of Germany's communal past, Müller compels the audience to evaluate the truth of these events and to reevaluate its own perception of Germany. As a barometer of current German issues, this study is, therefore, timely and reflects the current discussion about the essence of being German after reunification with a view to the future: the twenty-first century: a new century and a new era in German history. German authors before Müller had been drawn to this dramatic form in order to express their views, especially in times of major political or social events, crises, or changes. By so doing, they were making a statement, whether knowingly or not, about German identity in various situations of German history. In this manner, the *Geschichtsdrama* developed as a literary genre to reflect contemporary issues and to further understanding of historical events in German history. A thorough overview of the history and development of this genre and its significance to German literature is essential to my dissertation and is presented in detail in Chapter Two. In order to establish a pattern and to demonstrate its importance to the German sense of self, examples of the genre and their expression of German identity for each century and literary period, where applicable, comprise a major section of this chapter.

Because Müller's development as an author corresponds to the forty-year period of GDR existence, and because these two *Geschichtsdramen* contain both historical and political elements, a brief exposition of the literary tendencies, their dependence on and susceptibility to political currents, and their influence on Müller at the time he wrote and published each play is included in Chapter Three under the heading "Origins". In Chapter Three I shall first explore the genesis of both plays as well as examine the historical background of each in
depth. For *Germania Tod* the main events of this period include: the defeat of Germany by the Allied Forces, Germany's fragmentation into separate zones of occupation under external military rule, and the subsequent division into two Germanies under disparate governments. For *Germania 3* the main events are the growing dissatisfaction expressed by the younger generation, the increasing disintegration of the GDR's economic, political, and social infrastructure, the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, and the reunification of Germany in 1990.

This examination will be followed in Chapter Four by a close reading and interpretation of the literary text itself, *Germania Tod*, including its structure and language, as well as the relationship between its content and aesthetic presentation, taking into account probable author's intent. My analysis will focus on Müller's post-World War II perception of German identity based on the recent or modern German past, but including historical events dating back to the first century as well as mythical elements relating to Germany. The last step in the process will entail an examination of the moral and ethical questions raised by the play and their relevance during the time of the plot in the play, at the time of the genesis and first staging of the drama, at the present time, and possibly in the future. To this end, in Chapter Six, I shall examine the reception of the play by critics and the public, both in the FRG and the GDR, as well as the effects of possible censorship. My methodological approach is, therefore, eclectic: a mixture of New Criticism, New Historicism, and Rezeptionsästhetik.

In Chapter Five I shall present an analysis of Müller's Geschichtsdrama, *Germania 3* in his search for the new German identity given the changed conditions after reunification. This analysis will follow the methodological approach as outlined for Chapter Four, but it will concentrate on Müller's perception of what it means to be German based on four decades' existence of the GDR and the FRG, respectively, with special emphasis on the tensions present during the Cold War and the circumstances after 1990. The body of my dissertation
will thus consist of an analysis of Müller's two plays, *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3*, their significance as *Geschichtsdramen*, and how the author used them in his literary search for German identity in the post-World War II and the post-reunification eras, respectively.

Finally, in Chapter Six, the Conclusion, I will offer my final comments about both plays as *Geschichtsdramen* and how they are similar or different regarding style, language, metaphors, and images. I will compare and contrast Müller's perspective on German identity in the post-World War II play to his perspective in his post-reunification play, given the new historical constellation which he encountered at each of these eras. Special emphasis will be given to the the post-reunification years up until the time of his death in 1995, with special regard to the now defunct Communist state. This chapter will conclude with Müller's vision of Germany's future based on the past and the present as he experienced it shortly before his death.

In regard to English translations of Müller's texts, a small body of works exists consisting primarily of plays and poems for the non-German reader, thanks largely to the efforts of David Barnett, Matthew Griffin, Marc von Henning, Jonathan Kalb, Sylvère Lotringer, and Carl Weber. They offer the English-speaking audience or reader an excellent choice of Heiner Müller's own texts as well as some valuable analyses and interpretations. Although Weber has been translating Heiner Müller texts for over two decades, and Griffin has also contributed to furthering the awareness of Müller texts through translations and English language analyses, there is still a dearth of English language material concerning Heiner Müller and his texts, particularly of dissertations and critical literary analyses. The book by Jonathan Kalb, *The Theater of Heiner Müller*, in which he refers to *The Battle*, *Germania Death*, *Gundling's Life* and *Germania 3* as Müller's "German plays" (138), offers valuable insights into these plays and represents a further step in the process of establishing an English-based body of interpretation. Nevertheless, the choices available to those students
of German or comparative literature as well as to those literary critics whose command of the German language is not always sufficient to fully understand complicated or advanced German texts and studies by German critics are still limited. As an effort to help rectify this deficiency, my dissertation is designed specifically to offer the non-German speaking reader of Heiner Müller and those with limited as well as advanced German language skills access to important insights by literary critics thus far only available in German texts. In addition, it should promote increased awareness of and access to Müller's own texts, both literary and autobiographical. English translations are thus included for all German quotes and text excerpts. Essential to my dissertation are the essays and books by Carl Weber and Matthew Griffin, as well as others, for their excellent translations of many Heiner Müller texts and poems. I have included my own translations of those texts for which no English translation currently exists as part of my contribution to the field of modern German literary criticism to which Heiner Müller and his works are an essential but still not completely understood element. I have attached a special bibliography for non-German speakers which includes a complete list of Heiner Müller's texts in English translation and literary criticism: books, articles, and essays.
II. The Geschichtsdrama in German Literature

II.1 Exposition: The Prehistory of the Geschichtsdrama

Motto:
"Es gibt ein Drama mit historischen Stoffen. Aber ein "historisches Drama"? Gibt es das überhaupt?"

The above question posed by Friedrich Sengle in 1952 reflects the confusion which has long surrounded not only the genre Geschichtsdrama but also the various terminology for referring to a drama containing historical subject matter. In this chapter I will discuss the basic origins of this genre, its development throughout German literary history, and its significance to and as part of history. The relationship between history and literature is a topic which continues to fascinate philosophers, historians, writers, and literary critics as it has for centuries, as exemplified by no less a sage than Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). In the field of German literature, history has played an important role ever since the Heldendichtungen ("heroic literature") of the Germanic period in which epic tales of noble deeds and heroic acts were handed down from one generation to the next. Epic poems of this type, such as Das Hildebrandslied (approx. 810/820 A.D.) for example, generally depict the deeds of a specific national hero in a decisive singular battle with an emphasis on his own personal tragedy as opposed to primarily political or purely historical aspects (Wilpert 332-334). Thus their significance can be found not so much in their form as in their content: the emphasis was on a specific historical person, usually a warrior or leader in battle, and how this person reacted

---

1 ("There are dramas with historical subject matter. But a "historical drama"? Is there such a thing?") Friedrich Sengle, Das deutsche Geschichtsdrama: Geschichte eines literarischen Mythos (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952) 1.


3 Because these events took place during the time of the "Völkerwanderung", the term "national" here refers to the sense of loyalty to one Germanic tribe or leader and not in the modern sense to a nation state or a fatherland. See Wilpert, 333.
and was affected by the given event and circumstances. Since actual historical persons and events from the Germanic period became the subject matter for Heldendichtung, it can be considered one of the roots of this genre. These epic poems, songs, and stories were originally handed down orally, but they were eventually transcribed, and in this process were often embellished. The authors of these heroic epics served as "preservers, renewers, and interpreters of the poetic traditions of famous deeds believed really to have taken place" (Hatto 294) which serve as a parallel to Geschichtsdramen and their authors who have made their own literary contributions based on historical facts. In this way the Heldendichtungen thus constitute the ancient ancestor of or the prototype for the modern Geschichtsdrama.

On the other side of this historical coin and in contrast to the literary author, the task of the Geschichtsschreiber or "historian" is to chronicle historical events for posterity in what should be an objective manner, "sine ira et studio" as Tacitus (approx. A.D. 55-117) remarked. During the first century this Roman historian observed and wrote about the Germanic tribes, whom he had witnessed firsthand, in the second volume of his Annales (approx. A.D. 112-117). Tacitus, according to J.B. Rives in his book, Tacitus: Germania, is a "political historian" which means that his interest lies in "analysing the nature and effects of power" (45). Therefore, although a historian is supposed to demonstrate objectivity, even Tacitus' impressions were affected by various aspects of his personality and the historical and political situation in which he lived and wrote (Rives 45-47). His description of the Germanic tribes had a twofold purpose: firstly, to contrast their more virtuous social and personal life to the decadent behavior, in Tacitus' opinion, of the Romans and; secondly and most importantly, to warn the Romans that the Germanic tribes represented a danger to the Roman

---

4 No exact dates are available for the birth and death of Tacitus, nor for the genesis of his Annales, "his last and greatest work", but scholars generally agree that he was born either in A.D. 56 or 57, completed the Annales by A.D. 117, and died sometime thereafter, Rives pp. 44-45. See also Tacitus Annals IV, General Ed. Professor M.M. Willcock. Trans. by C.C.A. Shotter. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1989. "The Annales is the last surviving historical work of Tacitus, and may have been left unfinished at the time of the historian's death - possibly about A.D. 117" (5).
Empire and that they should be taken seriously as a potential threat (Mattingly 24-25).

Tacitus' perception of and report on many aspects of Germanic life, customs, and traditions paved the way for the reception of German identity in the Roman world and his works would have a lasting effect for centuries to come. The rediscovery of his *Germania* in a monastery in Hersfeld in 1455 was accompanied by a growing sense of national pride which would continue to develop. Eventually this nationalism would reach dangerous and exaggerated proportions during the Nazi regime. Thus the dangerous and ominous role which the Germanic tribes played for the Roman Empire throughout several centuries was resurrected in modern times when Germany proved to be a threat to modern Europe; this threatening character remained an integral element of German identity especially for its neighbors well into the twentieth century.

Another significant aspect of German identity is based on the legacy left by the literary work, *Das Nibelungenlied*, which combines both fictional and historical elements taken from the fifth and sixth centuries and elevates them to a mythical level. Estimated to have been written around the year A.D. 1200 in the period of the High Middle Ages by an unknown poet living in what is today Austria, *The Nibelungenlied* is a heroic epic poem based upon the sagas of Siegfried, of Dietrich von Bern, the historical individual Attila the Hun, and the historical fall of the Burgundians. Long considered the ultimate German *Nationalepos*, this tale has interested literary critics and researchers for centuries. The mythical elements relating to German identity in this poem had an impact on other German artists before Heiner Müller, such as Friedrich Hebbel, who wrote his own play entitled, *Die Nibelungen* (1861) and on Richard Wagner, who immortalized the *Nibelungenlied* in his famous opera. Even in the twentieth century, the legacy of the *Nibelungen* myth and its

---

5 Proof of the tale's enduring fascination can be seen in the excitement caused by the most recent discovery of an alleged fragment from *Das Nibelungenlied* by Charlotte Ziegler, archivist at the Zwettl Monastery in Austria.
continuing influence on German identity can still be seen in the cinematic adaptation by Fritz Lang (1924) and by the significant role the Nibelungen warriors play in Müller's *Germania Tod*.

During the seventeenth century, German authors were still influenced by the didactic Humanist plays of the Renaissance, or Märtyrerdrámen; their primary purpose was to teach a moral lesson, but they focused on Christian virtues and not on Germany or a German theme. For the Baroque period (1600-1720) the play, *Ermordete Majestät oder Carolus Stuardus* (1657) by Andreas Gryphius (1616-1664), is representative of a drama using historical material to offer such a lesson in morality; in this case the trial and execution of King Charles I in 1649 which rocked Europe, as a violation of the divine rights of kings. Authors of the Baroque period used well-known historical figures and events to further their didactic purpose, but they were not concerned with emphasizing German national themes. Only since the period of Sturm und Drang (1767-1785) ("Storm and Stress") and Johann Wolfgang Goethe's (1749-1832) *Götz von Berlichingen mit der eisernen Hand* (1773) has the "historical drama" or Geschichtsdrama taken up German history as its subject matter, and in this manner reflected directly upon specific historical events of the past, and indirectly upon the present and the future. Functioning as a mirror of German history, it has selected its topics from various eras in Germany's social and political development and, as such, reflects on German culture and history, and through its protagonists on specific aspects of German mentality and identity. Since the impact of Goethe's play in the late eighteenth century, this genre has established itself in the German literary tradition, a tradition which has continued to develop into the twentieth century and to the present day. Heiner Müller's *Germania Tod* strained audiences' expectations and critics' patience to the limits: In fact, the parallels

---

between the negative reactions to Goethe's Götz, considered the first example of this genre, and Müller's modern drama, two centuries later, which has been called the last of this genre, are remarkable, and not entirely without merit. Both Goethe and Müller shocked their contemporaries with radical dramas which did not conform to the literary conventions of their times. Thus since the late eighteenth century, throughout the twentieth century and most recently into the twenty-first century, this subgenre of dramatic literature has been extensively discussed, analyzed, interpreted, and reevaluated by authors as well as by literary critics.

II.2 An Ancient Argument: Historian versus Poet

The literary argument concerning the superiority of the historian over the poet, in fact, dates back to the fourth century B.C. and Aristotle. Throughout the centuries events of the past have been officially recorded by historians, but in the skilled hands of a talented author the Geschichtsdrama has tended to blur those lines of distinction; a fact which makes the definition of this type of drama so difficult and, therefore, so controversial. It was Aristotle who first pointed to the dichotomy between the historian and the poet and asserted that their tasks are different and that each serves a different function. In Chapter Nine of his Treatise on Poetics, Aristotle explains the main difference between the two: "[. . .] the historian relates what has happened, the poet what could happen" (Epps 19). The former is primarily concerned with recording historical events and the actions of historical persons for posterity;

---

6 I will use the German literary term Geschichtsdrama throughout my dissertation not only to avoid confusion, but because it most accurately describes this genre; compare to the terms "historisches Drama" or "Geschichtsdichtung mit historischen Stoffen" (Wilpert 344).
whereas the latter is most concerned with fictional events and characters and the myriad of possible scenarios. Aristotle goes on to write about the "tragic poet" who combines the poet and the historian: "Nor is he any less a tragic poet if he happens to portray events which have already happened; for certainly some of the things which have happened are such as would be probable and possible, which is the law the poet follows in making an imitation of them" (Epps 19-20). This quote seems to describe the theoretical foundation for a Geschichtsdrama quite accurately, as if Aristotle were paving the way for future debates. His definition further states that the poet's intent is to describe what could happen in a given historical situation by using a sequence of events that is credible (Cooper 31). Aristotle's definition of a tragic poet could be said to apply, at least in this regard, to the author of this type of drama, the Geschichtsdramatiker, since he is using historic persons and events which must be presented in a credible manner so that the audience will find the story plausible.

German playwrights and critics of subsequent centuries agreed with Aristotle and indeed considered his writings authoritative in defining the rules of tragedy and the author's use of historical matter in such plays. The eighteenth century German writer and critic, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781), generally considered an expert on the writings of Aristotle, in particular the Poetics, developed his own guidelines for the writer of a historical tragedy based upon those of Aristotle. In his Hamburgische Dramaturgie, Neunzehntes Stück ("Hamburg Dramaturgy, Nineteenth section") dated 3 July 1767 he writes:

10 See also Cooper, page 33: "And even if he happens to take a subject from history, he is none the less a poet for that; for there is nothing to hinder certain actual events from possessing the ideal quality of a probable or necessary sequence; and it is by virtue of representing this quality in such events that he is their poet." Potts, page 30: "And even if he happens to make a poem out of real events, he will not ipso facto cease to be a poet; for there is nothing to prevent some things that have happened from being in accordance with probability as well as possibility, in virtue of his poetic handling of them." Grube, page 19: "All this shows that it is the plot, rather than the verse, which makes a (tragic) poet, for he is a poet in virtue of his imitatio, and he imitates actions. He is no less a poet if he happens to tell a true story, for nothing prevents some actual events from being probable or possible, and it is this probability or possibility that makes the (tragic) poet.

11 According to Cooper, Aristotle stresses that the historian must employ a chronological sequence of events and may not exclude any. The poet, however, must and in fact is free to choose those events and only those out of a sequence which he feels are important to the telling of his story. This is an important distinction and indeed a very essential part of a Geschichtsdrama.
Nun hat es Aristoteles längst entschieden, wie weit sich der tragische Dichter um die historische Wahrheit zu bekümmern habe; nicht weiter, als sie einer wohleingerichteten Fabel ähnlich ist, mit der er seine Absichten verbinden kann. Er braucht eine Geschichte nicht darum, weil sie geschehen ist, sondern darum, weil sie so geschehen ist, daß er sie schwerlich zu seinem gegenwärtigen Zwecke besser erdichten könnte (77).  

This passage emphasizes that the author's intentions are illuminated by the historical aspects included in a given drama and by the manner in which he employs them. In other words, an author chooses certain persons and events from history because he has recognized their significance in relation to his contemporary situation and wishes to use them in an exemplary or explanatory manner. In another paragraph, it almost sounds as if Lessing were quoting Aristotle in translation in his lines about history, the tragic drama, and the importance of showing how a given character would react in a given situation rather than concentrating on the historical aspect only. Aristotle expressed his view in the following manner:

Poetry, therefore, is something more philosophic and of a higher seriousness than History; for Poetry tends to express rather what is universal, whereas History relates particular events as such. By an exhibition of what is universal or typical is meant the representation of what a certain type of person is likely or is bound to say or do in a given situation (Cooper 31-32).

Lessing's ideas are similar:

Auf dem Theater sollen wir nicht lernen, was dieser oder jener einzelne Mensch getan hat, sondern was ein jeder Mensch von einem gewissen Charakter unter

---

12 ("Now Aristotle decided long ago how far the author of tragedy has to be concerned with the historical truth, not further than it is with a well-written fable, with which he can combine his intentions. He uses a story not merely because it happened, rather because it happened in such a way that he could hardly write it better for his current purposes.")
gewissen gegebenen Umständen tun werde. Die Absicht der Tragödie ist weit
philosophischer, als die Absicht der Geschichte [. . .] (Hamb. Drama, 77). 13

Not only does Aristotle stress that there is a distinction between history and literature, he
promotes the latter as serving a higher objective because it relates "what is universal" about
man or mankind. Lessing, like Aristotle, emphasizes that the importance and indeed purpose
of a drama based on historical persons and events lies in the author's ability to effectively
demonstrate the reasons for a given character's actions or inactions, which by implication
include moral, ethical, and even spiritual aspects.

An author as well as a critic, Lessing promoted the creation of a German national
theater in his struggle against the imitation of the French style of theater on the German stage
so dogmatically pursued by Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-1766). Gottsched based his
ideas on Aristotle's teachings about the imitation of nature, or mimesis, and Horace's Ars
poetica. He believed that the classical French dramas of Racine and Corneille, for example,
embodied the theatrical forms laid out by Aristotle and Horace and that for that reason they
should serve as models for German writers. His goal was to improve the quality of German
drama, which was also Lessing's basic objective, but Gottsched was greatly criticized for his
strict adherence to rationality as opposed to the developing trend towards emphasis on
sentiment. Gottsched wrote his own play based on historical subject matter, Sterbender Cato
(1731/32) and although it is "doch ziemlich quellentreu" ("quite true to its sources"),
Gottsched remains primarily concerned with the morality of historical events: "die Moral
wird von Gottsched nie vergessen" ("Gottsched never forgets the moral aspect"), as Sengle
writes in Das deutsche Geschichtsdrama: Geschichte eines literarischen Mythos (20). Even
though it is not considered a masterpiece and does not qualify as one of the great Geschichts-
dramen of German literature, Gottsched and his drama deserve to be mentioned here because

13 ("In the theater we should not learn what this or that individual person did, rather what every person with a
certain character would do under certain given circumstances. The objective of tragedy is much more
his efforts were directed at improving the quality of the German drama and German theater, as his theoretical works indicate. In *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst vor die Deutschen* ("Attempt at critical creative writing for the Germans") (1730) he laments the fact that: 

" [. . . ] Unser Vaterland hat auch in der That noch nicht viel große Poeten hervorgebracht: weil wir in den großen Gattungen der Gedichte noch kein recht gutes Original aufzuweisen haben. Mit Uebersetzungen aber ist es nicht ausgerichtet [. . .]"; yet at the same time he expresses hope that this deficiency will soon be overcome: 

"[. . .] Es ist aber nunmehro mit vieler Wahrscheinlichkeit zu hoffen, daß wir bald mehr dergleichen vortreffliche Geister unter unsern Landesleuten erleben werden" (222-223).

He realized that German literature lacked originality but remained hopeful that this aspect would in time improve. Relating to the use of history in literature, neither Gottsched nor Lessing was in favor of depicting history in dramatic form because they did not believe the two could be successfully combined. Thus we can speak of a "negativen Einwirkung der Gottschedschen und Lessingschen Theorie auf die Entwicklung des Geschichtsdramas" (Sengle 19).

Fortunately, the *Geschichtsdrama* was able to assert itself as a genre despite the resistance of Gottsched and Lessing and their influence on literature during their lifetime.

During the period of Enlightenment in Germany (1720-1785), there was a second major effort concerning drama unfolding besides the improvement of the overall quality of German theater: namely the ever-increasing tendency to write about German themes using German characters. Even though Lessing did not write Geschichtsdramen, his comedy or Lustspiel ("comedy"), *Minna von Barnhelm oder Das Soldatenglück* ("Minna from Barnhelm or the Soldiers' Fortune") (1767), is a significant step in the advancement of German themes

---

14 ("Our fatherland has in fact not produced many great poets: because we do not yet have any really great originals to show in the genre of poetry. This is not accomplished, however, with translations.") ("But at this stage the hope exists that in all likelihood we will experience more of such splendid minds among our fellow citizens.")

15 ("negative influence of Gottsched's and of Lessing's theory on the development of the *Geschichtsdrama*"")
as credible subject matter. This play, which centers on the fictional characters of a Prussian officer and his fiancée following the historical Siebenjährigen Krieg ("Seven Years' War") (1756-1763), portrays one aspect of German identity, but it does not portray it in its entirety. Although it is neither a tragedy nor a Geschichtsdrama, it deserves a place here due to its author's contributions to the development of German literature as both a literary critic and an author. Additionally, his depiction of German identity: namely Prussian (military) characteristics, which Lessing comically satirizes but which Müller strongly criticizes two centuries later, are significant to this study. Lessing's play, with its portrayal of German characters, a German theme, and German national characteristics in their Prussian form, serves as the precursor to the evolving trend towards nationalism in German literature. Concerning the development of this particular genre and the advancement of a German national theme in German drama in general, both can be said to owe the next step in their progression to those German authors who took up and continued this literary tradition in their own, individual way.

II.3 Specific Examples from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century

This section traces the development of the genre from its recognized starting point in the eighteenth century through the various literary periods in German literature up until the post-World War II years. By referring to selected specific Geschichtsdramen, I will examine: 1) their importance to the development of this genre; 2) their significance to the questions of the German nation and German identity and; 3) their direct or indirect relationship to the work of Heiner Müller. In the course of the centuries the Geschichtsdrama has developed and adapted to fit the changing historical, political, and economic times and situations. This genre owes its development to the authors who wrote plays dealing with various historical figures and subject matter as their way of speaking out about their own times: dissatisfaction with the political and social aspects of their day led them to express themselves using this form of
drama. Thus by its very nature this genre reflects aspects, whether positive or negative, of the time in which it was written as well as its author's views on the world and Germany at that time. In this sense, whether consciously intended or not, these dramas offer a picture of German identity at the time, each of which is, however, colored by the author's own particular views on history and his distinct biographical experiences. As a well-read individual with an excellent knowledge of German literature, and as a playwright himself, Müller was intimately acquainted with the canon of German drama to which these plays belong, and they are referred to and reflected upon in his oeuvre. We, therefore, cannot read his works without being reminded of his great predecessors from Goethe to Brecht.

a) Johann Wolfgang Goethe Götz von Berlichingen mit der eisernen Hand (1773) ("Götz of Berlichingen with the Iron Hand")

Götz von Berlichingen mit der eisernen Hand by Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749-1832) appeared on the literary scene in 1773 and premiered on 14 April 1774 at the Kochsche Gesellschaft in Berlin. Due to its focus on German subject matter, which underscores the newly developing interest in German history at that time and the subsequently increasing use of German national themes, it represents the starting point for this study on Müller's Geschichtsdramen. The collection of essays by Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) in

16 Although some critics differ in their opinion as to which play constitutes the first official Geschichtsdrama, most modern critics agree that Götz von Berlichingen by Goethe is significant for the development of this genre. Elfriede Neubuhr, for example, disagrees with Friedrich Sengle's opinion that Götz von Berlichingen constitutes the first Geschichtsdrama because this classification would exclude historical dramas from the Baroque period, such as Andreas Gryphius' Carolus Stuardus; Elfriede Neubuhr, ed., Geschichtsdrama, Wege der Forschung 485 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980) 12-13. Sengle, Friedrich, Das deutsche Geschichtsdrama: Geschichte eines literarischen Mythos (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1952). See also: Walter Hinck, ed., "Einleitung: Zur Poetik des Geschichtsdramas" Geschichte als Schauspiel: Deutsche Geschichtsdramen: Interpretationen (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1981) 7-21 In the Introduction to his book, Hinck states that Sengle's thesis that Götz is the actual starting point of the genre Geschichtsdrama is correct but also problematic because history played a role in German literature before Götz. (8-10.) Hinck also criticizes Sengle because he gives the impression that Götz is an actual reconstruction of historical facts when in fact that is not the case (Hinck 9-10). This supposition by Hinck is not entirely without adequate grounds. Although Sengle does acknowledge that Goethe "scheut sich nicht, den Tod von Götz um mehrere Jahrzehnte vorzuverlegen" ("is not afraid to place Götz's death several decades earlier"), the critic Sengle seems more interested in the author's use of actual costumes and language for the premiere which gave the play an authentic historical aura (Sengle 38). Sengle seems to base much of his opinion on the reception of Götz by Goethe's contemporaries, in particular Möser, whose writings it seems Sengle read quite avidly. However, because Götz is the first drama which
Von deutscher Art und Kunst ("On German Manners and Art") (1773), helped spur interest in German history and further the development of German national themes. Published in the same year as Goethe's Götz, it continued the basic trend for the growing attention to a German national literature which had already been initiated by Gottsched and Lessing. The literary period known as Storm and Stress (1767-1785) represents a counter-movement to the Enlightenment period, which stressed the importance of reason over that of emotion. The writers of the Storm and Stress period were more concerned with the attributes of Original-genie ("original genius") and freedom: both of which are found in Goethe's drama Götz. The author took liberties both with the format of the play and the actual historical facts: he willfully rejected the Aristotelian unities of time, place, and plot or action and the corresponding French style of theater popular at that time in favor of an independent and freer style modelled on Shakespeare's plays. Although there are the traditional five acts, the play contains fifty-six scene changes which was unheard of then and made the play difficult to stage: some contemporary critics considered it a Lesestück ("play to be read") as opposed to an authentic drama for the stage.

Goethe's interest in creating a drama about Götz developed after he discovered and read the Lebensbeschreibung Herrn Götzens von Berlichingen ("biography of Mr. Götzen of Berlichingen") by Georg Tobias Pistorius, published in 1731. The historical Götz was born in approximately 1480, lost his right hand in a battle in 1504, as a result of which he wore an iron glove as a prosthesis, took part briefly in the peasants' revolt in 1525, fought on behalf of Emperors Maximilian I and Karl V, wrote his autobiography, and died in 1562 at the ripe age of eighty-two. Goethe's portrayal of his literary character differs from the historical Götz in ways which are decisive for the expression of German identity during that era. His main interest lies in depicting a man caught between two political and social systems: during the
first half of the sixteenth century, the feudalistic and the absolutist and; in the late eighteenth century, from the absolutist to the bourgeoisie. Goethe's generation was in favor of a change in the system of government from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie but was still caught in the middle. The absolutist way of life was restricting individual freedoms and the advancement of society, and this generation recognized that a change was needed. Götz's desire for freedom throughout the play and his dire warning about the future before he dies, expresses the sentiments and fears faced by Goethe and the other young writers of the Storm and Stress period.

Goethe wrote this play from the perspective of the eighteenth century about persons living and events happening in the sixteenth century: it would have been unwise and dangerous for him to openly criticize the ruling form of government and societal order and so he depicted another era to conceal this criticism. His drama is, therefore, an "Angriff auf die Herrschaftsstruktur der eigenen Zeit" ("attack on the structural hierarchy of his own time") (Schröder 33). He was writing for a younger generation with different ideas and ideals than those conservative values of the fading Enlightenment period, and his play reflects this more radical attitude. These "zornigen jungen Männer" ("angry young men") of this literary period, who were searching for more freedom for the individual in society, found their voice in Goethe's play as Werner Keller writes in "Drama und Geschichte" (304) ("drama and history"). This movement can thus be considered "eine literarische Rebellion" ("a literary rebellion") (SanJosé) since a social and political revolution in the individual German identity in the Geschichtsdrama. Goethe's Götz von Berlichingen serves as the starting point for our purposes.  

17Schröder also writes: [. . .] so heißt dies: 16. und 18. Jahrhundert, Gegenwart und Vergangenheit werden über- und ineinandergerollt, im 16. Jahrhundert entdeckt er einen vorbildlichen Mann, der genau das tut und leistet, was er an der eigenen Zeit vermisst [. . .] Mit dieser literarischen Tat leistet der junge Goethe also genau das für seine eigene Zeit, was sein Götz von Berlichingen mit seinen ritterlichen Taten für und gegen das beginnende 16. Jahrhundert ausrichtet. Beide kämpfen für die gleichen Ideale, nur kämpft Götz mit dem Schwert, Goethe mit der schwächeren Feder (30). "[. . .] Here it is: sixteenth and eighteenth century, present and past are mixed in and through one another, in the sixteenth century he discovers an exemplary man who does and accomplishes exactly that which he misses in his own time [. . .] thus with this literary deed the young Goethe achieves for his own era exactly that which his Götz von Berlichingen did with his knightly deeds for and against the beginning
territories for a united Germany modelled on the German Empire (which was theoretically still in existence but had lost all importance) had not yet occurred in Germany. This specific example thus serves to demonstrate the ability of the author to use this type of drama as a tool to criticize the present time by the presentation of historical subject matter.

The form of Goethe's drama plays a lasting and important role in the development of the Geschichtsdrama since it influenced contemporary as well as future authors of this genre. His realistic use of the Volk ("people"), for example, with the open expression of sentiments and ideas in prose and everyday language instead of in blank verse and elevated style, is an element which can be found in the Geschichtsdramen of subsequent authors, including Müller, as will be seen in the proceeding sections. Goethe portrays "das einfache Volk, d. h. die Bauern und Handwerker" and not "die bürgerlichen, städtischen Kaufleute" because the latter are allied with the princes (Schröder 35). Thus content and form are closely aligned as the author uses both to underscore his message; in this case, that Götz supports the rebels rather than the decadent princes and the Fürstbischof ("Prince Bishop") of Bamberg, whom he believes are leading the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation to destruction, and who also profit from the division of Germany and the weakness of the emperor. On the other hand, the rebelling peasants are not abiding by the rules they had agreed upon with Götz to stop causing wanton destruction and death: Götz is again caught in the middle but remains loyal to his Emperor and to the Empire. A similar constellation is found in Schiller's

---

18 ("the simple people, that means the farmers and craftsmen"; "the middle class, urban merchants")
19 The following line by Götz in Act 5: "Götz (allein). O Kaiser! Kaiser! Räuber beschützen deine Kinder" (102) demonstrates his allegiance to the Emperor while at the same time showing his opinion of the princes and their disregard for the German people. The following quote by Lerse depicts the cruelty of the princes: "Man hat mit unerhörten Exekutionen verfahren. Metzler ist lebendig verbrannt, zu Hunderten gerädert, gespießt, geköpft, geviertelt. Das Land umher gleicht einer Metzge, wo Menschenfleisch wohlfeil ist" (104). ("Götz (alone). Oh Emperor! Emperors are guarding your children.") ("One has gone ahead with shocking executions. Metzler was burned alive, hundreds were broken on the wheel, ran through, beheaded, quartered. The lands surrounding us are like a butcher shop where human flesh is cheap."). Historically, der Schwäbische Bund of the princes was known for its brutality and cruelty in its retaliation against the peasants (Heinz Schilling, Aufbruch und Krise: Deutschland 1517-1648 (Berlin: Siedler, 1998) 150.)
Wallenstein, Kleist's Prinz Friedrich von Homburg and Die Hermannsschlacht, Büchner's Dantons Tod, Hauptmann's Florian Geyer and Müller's Germania Tod, namely: the main characters or protagonists find themselves caught between diverse ideologies and circumstances which present them with the struggle for survival as well as forcing them to wrestle with the problems of loyalty, love, and service to the fatherland.

Goethe's disregard for the Aristotelian unities of time, plot, and place is an aspect of style which Goethe and Müller share, namely: an emphasis on innovation and experimentation even if it means breaking with the traditional Aristotelian rules and hitherto accepted dramatic and theatrical conventions. The works of Shakespeare, highly regarded by Goethe and his contemporaries, were also admired by Müller, who translated the texts of the great English playwright. Thematically, many correspondences can be found between Goethe and Müller: Götz and Weislingen were good friends in their youth and almost like brothers, but Weislingen betrays Götz. This brotherly betrayal theme is a precursor to Müller's portrayal of this aspect of German identity in his "Germania" plays, as well as some of his other plays. The Bauernkrieg ("peasants' revolt") (1524-1526) plays an important role in Goethe's play and was a significant, albeit unfulfilled, aspect of Germany's development according to Müller, who had closely studied Friedrich Engels' thesis on the Bauernkrieg. Whereas the portrayal of violence is included in Goethe's play minimally, Müller depicts it in its brutal reality. The element of death is treated with respect and dignity by Goethe, while Müller's treatment of death is shocking and graphic. Götz speaks of his son, whom he describes as "heiliger als ich" (111) ("holier than I"), but who, nevertheless, will not be able to save the future, which Götz sees with foreboding. Similarly, Müller also uses the targeted portrayal of children, the traditional symbol of hope for the future, to present his view for the future.
b) Friedrich von Schiller Wallenstein: Ein dramatisches Gedicht (1798/99)

("Wallenstein: A dramatic poem")

The next author in this study, Friedrich von Schiller (1759-1805), was a contemporary and friend of Goethe but had his own ideas about the portrayal and purpose of history in drama and the depiction of German identity. His views about the presentation of historical events in a drama are decidedly different than those of his friend and mentor Goethe. Whereas Schiller can be considered a "Verfechter der historischen Wahrheit" ("a defender of historical truth"), Goethe was not concerned with historical accuracy in Götz (Sengle 51).

Written and published in three separate parts during the literary period of Klassik ("Weimar Classicism") (1786-1832), the first part of Schiller's Wallenstein Trilogy, Das Lager, written in Knittelvers ("doggerel"), premiered on 12 October 1798 in Weimar at the Hoftheater as did the second part, Die Piccolomini, written in blank verse (iambic pentameter) on 30 January 1799 and the third and final part, Wallensteins Tod, also written in blank verse, on 20 April 1799. Schiller's enthusiasm for the study of the Dreißigjährigen Krieg ("Thirty Years' War"), which lasted from 1618-1648, stems from his overall interest in world history: it was while writing a study of this war in preparation for a professorship in history at the University of Jena, scheduled to commence in the spring of 1789, that his passionate interest in the historical character Wallenstein emerged. The author's plan to write a drama with Wallenstein as the protagonist required that he familiarize himself with previous dramas written about this subject matter and study the historical facts from every angle. His knowledge about Wallenstein and the Thirty Years' War is evidenced in his Geschichte des Dreißigjährigen Kriegs ("History of the Thirty Years' War") which he wrote between 1789 and 1792, immediately prior to beginning work on this drama about a great historical German figure.

Albrecht Wenzel Eusebius von Wallenstein (Waldstein) was born on 24 September 1583 in the region of Bohemia (now part of the Czech Republic). Militarily he served
Ferdinand II, King of Bohemia and Hungary, elected German Emperor on 28 August 1619. Due to his military successes on behalf of the Emperor in the course of the Thirty Years' War, Wallenstein received privileges, honors, and power from him, including being named the Duke of Friedland and supreme commander of the Emperor's army: he had become a wealthy and powerful man. The Kurfürsten ("electoral princes"), particularly Maximilian of Bavaria, whose support the Emperor needed in order to secure the succession of his son as emperor, feared Wallenstein's growing influence and complained to the Emperor that Wallenstein was abusing the power bestowed upon him. Backed by his vast army, Wallenstein took advantage of the German princes' lands and extorted monetary tributes from them to provide provisions and pay for his troops. At an electoral assembly in Regensburg in August 1630 the princes were able to convince Ferdinand II to remove Wallenstein from his command, due to military defeats of the imperial troops. In the following December, however, he was recalled to lead the Emperor's army against the victorious Swedish army under King Gustavus II Adolphus. In the course of his campaign Wallenstein was suspected of conspiring with the Swedes against the Emperor and was thus considered a traitor. The element of intrigue surrounding Wallenstein and his murder in February 1634 at Eger in his own bedroom allegedly at the Emperor's command further raised the questions of duty, loyalty, and treason to a national level and are prime components of Schiller's trilogy. These elements of duty, loyalty, and treason are themes which Müller deals with in his Geschichtsdramen as well: a soldier's duty, a worker's duty to society, and society's duty to its citizens.

Schiller bestowed the characters of his Geschichtsdrama with a majesty and a grandeur that would never again be seen in such measure. He attributed the German identity with great virtue and dignity in the character of Max Piccolomini, who chooses death on the battlefield rather than having to live with the guilt of betrayal. Schiller presents Wallenstein as a man of nobility and greatness, but because of courtly intrigue and his own indecision, he
is overtaken by events that cause his ruin. As a loyal subject and nobleman, loyalty to his Emperor is uppermost in the main character's thoughts, and so Schiller presents any action against the Empire as having been forced upon Wallenstein. Thus he remains loyal to his sovereign, although doubt is cast upon his actions and reputation. Schiller depicts his murder as a result of intrigue, due in great part to Octavio Piccolomini, former friend, who had once shared a brotherly relationship with Wallenstein. Because Schiller saw drama as an artform intended to enhance reality or to recreate reality in a more idealistic manner, yet not willing to alter the overall historical accuracy, he invented the character of Max to fill the noble role unsuited to the historical Wallenstein. Schiller portrays a man with faults, who is ultimately overtaken by historical events due to his lack of action. Max seemingly took action and the power of history into his own hands through his death, but even his choice to die was a result of powerlessness against the forces at hand.

Schiller's drama expresses his views about the idealism and nobility of the individual and man's struggle with his fate and with history. Götz appeared sixteen years before the French Revolution and Wallenstein approximately a decade following this major event in European history. Although this revolution was at first celebrated by the younger generation in the neighboring countries, the reign of terror which followed upon its wake left nothing to be idealized and indeed such internal terror was a force to be feared. Whereas Goethe's Götz dies prematurely as a result of his imprisonment and lack of freedom in the literal as well as philosophical sense, Schiller's Wallenstein dies as a "Produkt der Geschichte" ("product of history") (Schröder 93). The death of the fictional character Max, however, imparts the drama with a sense of freedom and honor: thus a noble death. The theme of death and in particular the idea of "dying a noble death" develops an even more pivotal role relating to German identity as the next play in this discussion demonstrates.
c) **Heinrich von Kleist Die Hermannsschlacht (1821) ("Hermann's Battle")**

The literary works of Heinrich von Kleist (1777-1811), like those of Müller, have their basis in his biography: he was born into Prussian nobility and was destined to serve in the Prussian Army but went against family tradition and resigned. The historical events in Kleist's day were strongly connected to his writing and particularly the events and actions taking place in and concerning Prussia. Napoleon's victory over and subsequent occupation of Prussia left an indelible mark on German identity: the resulting Befreiungskriege ("wars of liberation") (1813-1815) helped the German states to develop a greater sense of "nation" and unity. Not only is this historical reality decisive for an understanding of two of Kleist's dramas, Die Hermannsschlacht and Der Prinz von Homburg, it is also, as Schröder writes: 

"[. . .] so tief mit dem Lebenslauf dieses Dichters, seinen Stationen und Gesinnungen verflochten, daß man in keiner Weise von ihm absehen kann" (117). In this way, Kleist is similar to Müller because the latter's biography was also strongly influenced by historical events occurring during his lifetime within Germany and their influence is reflected in his Geschichtsdramen as well. Kleist lived at a time when Prussia suffered defeat at the hands of Napoleon, 1806/1807, and the country was occupied by the French enemy which corresponded to and helped further the "[. . .] allgemeine nun erwachende nationale Bewußtsein [. . .] " ("general newly awakening national consciousness"), as Ernst von Reusner writes in his epilogue to Prinz Friedrich von Homburg (89).

**Die Hermannsschlacht**, a five act drama written in blank verse, deals with the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest which occurred in 9 A.D. between three Roman legions, led by Quintilius Varus, the Roman viceroy or governor assigned to Arminius or Hermann, the leader of the Cheruscan tribe, who had also fought in the Roman army. Kleist uses this historical battle and its players to represent Napoleon's occupation of Germany. Thus

---

20 ("[. . .] so deeply entwined in the biography of this writer, his life stages and convictions that they cannot by any means be ignored.")
Hermann stands for Germany, Varus the vassal of Augustus for the foreign enemy and oppressor Napoleon, and Marbod, the leader of the southern tribes and ally of Hermann represents the Austrian emperor, whom Kleist hoped would come to Germany's rescue. Due to Napoleon's occupation of Vienna, and Austria's declaration of war against France on 9 April 1809, the play could neither be performed nor printed at the time of its completion. It would not be until Ludwig Tieck's efforts in 1821 that this drama would finally be published, but its premiere would have to wait almost another two decades until it was finally performed on 29 August 1839 in the Detmolder Hoftheater.

Although Kleist spoke French and enjoyed French literature, a commonality at that time, he hated Napoleon and his occupation of Prussia and other German states (Hohoff 102-103). In this drama he is concerned with representing the ideals of freedom and justice and ridding the German lands from the yoke of its oppressor. Varus, in his role as Roman General representing the Roman Emperor Augustus, meets Arminius midway in the play in act three, scene five. The conflict between Arminius and Varus as Germanic brothers or tribal members, which Tacitus describes in his Annales and Müller integrates into Germania Tod, plays a major role in Kleist's Geschichtsdrama. Although Kleist chooses to depict a cordial encounter rather than following Tacitus' account in which the two "brothers" argue vehemently, Hermann's aim throughout the drama is to defeat the enemy Varus: "Varus und die Kohorten, sag ich dir; / Das ist der Feind, dem dieser Busen schwillt!" (5,14) ("Varus and his cohorts, I tell you; / That is the enemy, that keeps this heart beating!"). Hermann is ready to use any means, including treachery, to terminate any tribal member with extreme prejudice who has allied himself with the Roman enemy and is thus a traitor to the fatherland. Kleist represents the Cheruscan leader Hermann as: "Germaniens Retter und Befreier / Von Roms Tyrannenjoch!" (5,13) ("Germania's savior and liberator / From Rome's tyrannical oppression!"). He portrays Hermann, and thus German identity, as treacherously clever or
deceptive on behalf of his mission to save the fatherland from the foreign enemy and from any internal traitors. This internal division or German discord plays a significant role in this drama and so represents an important aspect of German identity and German heritage, which is also an integral part of Müller's representation of and search for German identity. Hermann lies to the other tribal leaders about his supposed pact with Augustus, but is careful not to deceive Marbod and even sends his own sons as hostages. They would be killed by Marbod himself if he suspects any act of treachery: thus honor to friends and allies is also represented as an important element of German identity. Following in the footsteps of Goethe and Schiller, Kleist also depicts the common people: "Volk jeden Alters und Geschlechts" ("people of every age and type"), which is to remain a significant aspect of the Geschichtsdrama.

d) **Heinrich von Kleist** **Prinz Friedrich von Homburg: Die Schlacht von Fehrbellin** (1821) ("Prince Friedrich of Homburg: The Battle at Fehrbellin")

Prinz Friedrich, a five act drama also written in blank verse, is the last play Kleist finished shortly before he committed suicide together with Henriette Vogel on 21 November 1811. The character of the play's protagonist is based on two separate persons and events: Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia (1772-1806), a nephew of Frederick the Great, and Karl von Francois (1785-1855), a Prussian officer. The Prince was guilty of insubordination in the battle at Saalfeld in 1806, which resulted in his death and the subsequent defeat of the Prussian army at Jena and Auerstedt (Hamacher 85). Karl von Francois was court-martialed and sentenced to death for unsheathing his saber against his superior; however, after having been marched to his execution and blindfolded, he was pardoned by King Friedrich William III at the very last moment (Hamacher 88). Kleist combined both of these historical persons and events to create his character, the Prince of Homburg.
Kleist shows us a Prussian officer who is willing to die in order to regain his dignity, which he had previously lost by begging to be spared from death. In this way, Kleist is also somewhat akin to Schiller in the sense that both portray some aspect of an officer's personal views about war, duty, and life. The author's sobering and realistic portrayal of a man contemplating his death at his open grave is the centerpiece of this play: in contemplation of his death, the Prussian officer realizes the importance of honor and duty to his prince and fatherland. Kleist supports the sovereignty of the monarchy at the expense of the individual officer's ability to think and act for himself. Homburg's disobedience of military orders, whether conscious or not, resulted in victory but provided substantial reason for his condemnation. An important aspect of German identity found in Homburg is the blind obedience to orders from their superiors expected of German officers and soldiers without regard to the morality or the logic of the order given. Indeed this blind obedience and absolute subservience to authority are the very traits which Müller later satirizes in Germania Tod and Germania 3: he even quotes from Homburg in the latter. Those same characteristics which Lessing comically satirizes in Minna von Barnhelm: duty, honor, and strict obedience in the military sense, are presented in Homburg as noble characteristics which all Prussian soldiers and especially officers should respect. Homburg's words to his fellow officers: "[. . .] Ich will das heilige Gesetz des Kriegs, / Das ich verletzt', im Angesicht des Heers, / Durch einen freien Tod verherrlichen![. . .]" (5,7) ("[. . .] I want to glorify the holy law of war, / That I have broken, in the presence of the army, / through a voluntary death![. . .]") testify to his recognition that he broke the most important military rule: he disobeyed a direct order. When Kottwitz says to the Kurfürst ("Electoral Prince"): "Bei dem lebendgen Gott, / Du könntest an Verderbens Abgrund stehn, / Daß er, um dir zu helfen, dich zu retten, / Auch nicht das Schwert mehr zückte, ungerufen!" (5,9) ("By the living God, / You could stand at the edge of doom, / But he, in order to help you, to save you, / Would not even draw his sword, unless
ordered!"), he confirms the absolute subordination of the Prince of Homburg to the rules of sovereign authority. Perhaps to a greater degree than intended, Homburg has been so utterly tamed that he would risk losing his sovereign rather than commit another act of insubordination: such blind obedience would have catastrophic consequences for Germany's future.

Kleist raises another pertinent concern in this play: namely the right of the Prussian i.e., German, to defend himself against the French invader: "Es ging um die Frage des Rechtes zum Aufstand gegen die napoleonische Fremdherrschaft" (Schröder 120)."21 Prussian military commanders, such as Major Schill and the Duke of Brunswick, had made bold but unsuccessful attempts to precipitate a war of liberation by leading their troops against the French occupiers without the consent of the Prussian monarch, Frederick William III. He was pressured in vain by his advisors and generals to issue a proclamation to his people to drive the French troops out of the country. The author questions the relationship of the officers and princes to the monarchy and their role in Prussian society, which was a daring task given the powerful position of the monarchy at that time. For Kleist, Prussia stood for Germany: he showed in his Hermannsschlacht that he was thinking in German terms.

Prinz Friedrich von Homburg was finally published by Ludwig Tieck in 1821, but due to censorship it had its premiere outside of Prussia under the title, Die Schlacht von Fehrbellin, on 3 October in the Wiener Burgtheater under the direction of Josef Schreyvogel. Censorship came from the Prussian monarchy, in particular from a descendant of the historical Prince Homburg, Princess Wilhelmina, who expressed concern for the reputation of her Prussian ancestor, and the King himself, who prohibited it in Berlin after three performances (Reusner 95). A drama in which a Prussian officer faints at the sight of his grave and begs for mercy from his sovereign does not do justice to the virtues embodied in the Prussian

21 ("It was a question of the right to rebellion against the Napoleonic foreign occupation.")
military code, and so the Princess' reaction can be understood. Any questioning of the sovereign's authority, as raised in the drama, is also reason enough for the monarch to have banned its performance. However, they failed to perceive Kleist's ultimate message that Homburg is finally ready and willing to accept his execution for his military "sin" because he recognizes the importance of the sovereign authority; simultaneously the Electoral Prince is portrayed as a wise and honorable sovereign due to his decision to pardon this rehabilitated wayward officer. The censorship of Kleist's play indicates "eine direkte politische Wirkung des Stückes" ("a direct political result of the play") which represents a new element for this genre (Schröder 116). Ulrich Weisstein's idea from "Das Geschichtsdrama: Formen seiner Verwirklichung" ("the Geschichtsdrama: forms of its realization") that this drama can only marginally be considered in this genre given its happy end (13) has some legitimacy. In this sense it is certainly not similar to most of the other plays included in this chapter which end in the death of the protagonist (Brecht's dramas are the other exceptions). This play touched a nerve of the current time and situation, but the author did not live long enough to face the repercussions of his political storyline.

Kleist lived at a time when Prussia suffered defeat and occupation by the French dictator, Napoleon, and Müller lived through the dictatorships of Hitler and Stalin and the division of Germany by foreign powers. Both authors reflect upon contemporary events while writing about treason and treachery and Germany's fight for survival against both the foreign occupier and the treacherous enemy within. Although Geschichtsdramen in the subsequent literary period disguise their political criticism in foreign persons and events, they nevertheless have a strong presence and exert a powerful force.

e) Georg Büchner Dantons Tod (1835) ("Danton's Death")

Georg Büchner (1813-1837) is the youngest German author in this study, who succumbed to typhus at the tender age of twenty-three. In his short lifespan he created some
of the most unforgettable plays and his contribution to modern German literature remains undisputed. In a letter he wrote to his family while in Straßburg dated 28 July, 1835, Büchner explains his belief that total accuracy in the presentation of the historical facts is essential in order to elevate the drama. He writes:

[. . .] der dramatische Dichter ist in meinen Augen nichts, als ein Geschichtsschreiber, steht aber über Letzterem dadurch, daß er uns die Geschichte zum zweiten Mal erschafft und uns gleich unmittelbar, statt eine trockne Erzählung zu geben, in das Leben einer Zeit hinein versetzt, uns statt Charakteristiken Charaktere, und statt Beschreibungen Gestalten gibt. Seine höchste Aufgabe ist, der Geschichte, wie sie sich wirklich begeben, so nahe als möglich zu kommen. [. . .] Der Dichter ist kein Lehrer der Moral, er erfindet und schafft Gestalten, er macht vergangene Zeiten wieder aufleben, und die Leute mögen dann daraus lernen, so gut, wie aus dem Studium der Geschichte und der Beobachtung dessen, was im menschlichen Leben um sie herum vorgeht. Wenn man so wollte, dürfte man keine Geschichte studiren, weil sehr viele unmoralische Dinge darin erzählt werden, müßte mit verbundenen Augen über die Gasse gehen, weil man sonst Unanständigkeiten sehen könnte [. . .] (Sämtliche Werke und Briefe, II 443-444). 22

The author's task is not to consciously teach a lesson in morality, as it was in the Humanist and Baroque periods, rather his interest lies in presenting historical facts so accurately that the members of the audience may learn something about the world around them by observation. Büchner views the playwright as a type of historian who presents historical

---

22 (“In my eyes, the dramatic author is nothing but a historian; is positioned, however, above the latter due to the fact that he creates history for the second time and instead of a dry narration, he places us directly into the life of a time, gives us characters instead of characteristics and <instead of descriptions> gives us forms. His greatest task is to depict and make history as close to reality as possible [. . .] The writer is not a teacher of morals, he discovers and creates forms, he brings past times to life, and people may learn from what he writes, as well as from the study of history and by observing what goes on around them in human life. If one wanted to do that, one would not be allowed to study history, because very many immoral things are recounted in it, one would have to walk down the street with his eyes covered, because otherwise one would be able to see too many obscenities [. . .]”)
persons and events in such a realistic manner that they are believable as well as animated. His ability to use actual facts and dialogue in a precise way without making his characters appear ingenuine or artificial allows him to present the past not only accurately, but endows his characters with a sense of realism, especially when facing their impending death. Similar to Büchner, Müller was also aware of the immoral aspects occurring throughout daily life, particularly in times of war and its aftermath, and did not hesitate to portray these repulsive, often shocking, yet realistic circumstances.

Büchner was among the most politically engaged of the authors in this study: conditions were conducive for political fervor due to the *Vormärz* ("pre-March") period which resulted in the literary movement, *Das junge Deutschland* ("Young Germany") (1830-1850). Politically engaged and fervent, Büchner devoted more time to illicit political pursuits than to his academic studies in the field of medicine. What the young men and authors of the Storm and Stress period felt years earlier, Büchner and his contemporaries, in particular young male students, were experiencing and expressing during this era. Germany's European neighbors were also experiencing social and political unrest in 1830, such as the "Juli-Revolution" in Paris and the revolt of the Belgian people against the sovereignty of the Netherlands, for example. At a time when social conditions were oppressing the masses, the unrest in Büchner's native region of Hessen with "Szenen wie aus dem Bauernkrieg" ("scenes as in the peasants' revolt") (Hauschild 24) threatened to further unravel society. Students with an active interest in social and particularly political issues joined together in the *Burschen-schaften* ("students' associations"); whereas the short-lived radical wing "Germania" also included non-students, mostly *Handwerker* ("craftsmen") (Hauschild 47). Although Büchner chose not to join the forbidden student organization, he helped to establish the short-lived *Gesellschaft der Menschenrechte* ("Society for Human Rights"), which had been designed to further the pursuit of radical reform of the government. His dissatisfaction and criticism of
the social and political situation found expression in his revolutionary political pamphlet, Der Hessische Landbote ("The Hessian Messenger") (1834), which had to be secretly printed and distributed. Revised and altered without Büchner's prior knowledge or permission by Friedrich Ludwig Weidig (1791-1837), a revolutionary German patriot, its main inflammatory message, "Friede den Hütten, Kreig den Palästen" ("Peace for the huts, war against palaces"), centers on the unfair materialistic discrepancies between the rich and the exploited poor peasants in the region of Hessen.

The French Revolution of 1789 offered Büchner a covert manner to express his views about the current social and political situation in Hessen, and the resultant drama was so far ahead of his time that it was not staged for another six decades. Dantons Tod, a four-act play written in prose, did not premiere until 5 January 1902 in Berlin at the Belle-Alliance Theater and the Neue Freie Volksbühne. Büchner's skilled use of the masses in his Volksszenen ("folk scenes") to portray average citizens and their opinions represents the further evolution of this aspect of the Geschichtsdrama, which will continue to play an ever-increasing significant role in this genre. As a social critique, his drama reflects the aspect of German identity in the representation of the bourgeoisie, nobility or aristocracy situated against the folk, the masses, or the common people of the nation, who are struggling to survive. The Volk ("folk") can thus be considered the third character in Büchner's drama after Danton and Robespierre (Hauschild 72). As a testament to the political turmoil common throughout German history and particularly strong in Büchner's day, the author's choice of protagonists vividly demonstrates the divergent political ideologies which helped to shape -- or at times hinder -- the nation's development. Müller claims that Büchner's presentation of Danton and Robespierre is in keeping with the German tradition of writing: "Dramen der deutschen Teilung" ("dramas about German division"), which is also strongly evidenced in the Nibelungs, Schiller's Die Räuber, Goethe's Faust, and, in modern times, Brecht's fragment, Fatzer, by the characters
Fatzer and Koch (KoS 310). The extent to which Müller's dramatic style was influenced by Büchner is best measured by the extent to which Brecht's early work was influenced by this young, rebellious, German author from the tumultuous early nineteenth century. In an interview with Olivier Ortolani entitled, "Georg Büchner: Die Verweigerung des Überblicks" ("Georg Büchner: The denial of perspective"), Müller states: "Es war so, daß ich Büchner eher durch die Brille von Brecht gelesen habe. Brecht war dann der große Eindruck so ab 1947/48, und da gab es eine klare Verbindung zwischen den frühen Stücken von Brecht und Büchner" (69).

Comparing a post-war theater production of Woyzeck to a film viewing of Baal a short time later, Müller was struck by the similarities between the straightforward and direct style of the two texts, a characteristic he later incorporated into his own dramas. His lasting admiration for Büchner is based on what he calls:

> [. . .] die Verweigerung des Überblicks oder die Verweigerung der Weltanschauung, bevor man die Dinge gesehen hat. Es ist eher ein erschrockener Blick auf die Dinge, auf die Wirklichkeit, die man immer nur partiell sehen kann. [. . .] Die Distanz entsteht dann aus dem Schrecken über das Detail" (69).

Büchner presents various moments in the life of a given character, which are most often moments of fear, anxiety, or desperation. Thus the audience or reader, who sees these terrifying instances as in a close-up or under a microscope, retreats from the shock. Müller learned this technique from Büchner but developed it further for his own dramas, which rely on the shock effect based on the gruesome and terrifying images he portrays in them.

Another important characteristic of the Geschichtsdrama is the portrayal of death, which Büchner uses in a similar manner as his predecessors Goethe, Schiller, and Kleist, for

---

23 ("It was so, that I read Büchner more from Brecht's perspective. Brecht was the great influence then from 1947/48, and there was a clear relationship between the early plays of Brecht and Büchner.")

24 ("[. . .] the denial of perspective or the denial to view the whole world, before one has seen everything. It is more a terrified look at things, at reality, which one can always see only partially. [. . .] The distance then develops from the terror surrounding the detail.")
example, but which Müller uses primarily to shock his audience. A noble demise serves as a reflection of personal integrity and unwillingness to conform to a principle other than the one in which the main character believes: Götz and his final words expressing freedom, Max as a refusal to conform or to abandon his idealistic principles, and Homburg as the recognition that by accepting his death, he will sustain his integrity. Danton not only accepts his own death at the guillotine, he welcomes it as a confirmation of his life. Müller, on the contrary, presents death in its most gruesome and ignoble forms and circumstances. The next author in this study also uses the element of death as an expression of his own social and political beliefs and historical viewpoint.

f) Gerhart Hauptmann Die Weber: Schauspiel aus den vierziger Jahren (1892)  
("The Weavers: Drama from the Forties")

The dramatic texts of Gerhart Hauptmann (1862-1946) depict the social and economic misery prevalent throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Die Weber, written in prose using the realistic regional dialect, was published in 1892 during the literary period of Naturalism (1880-1900) and premiered on 26 February 1893 in Berlin at a private performance in the Neues Theater. The central conflict stems from the antagonism between the collective, namely: the weavers and their capitalist exploiters. Based upon the historical revolt in the summer of 1844 by a group of poor and desperate weavers in the region of Silesia, their uprising was abruptly and brutally ended by the intervention of the Prussian army. With this drama, the social aspect has finally entered into this genre as never before and thus gives it a modern stance as Schröder remarks: "[. . .] das soziale Drama wird zum Geschichtsdrama, das Geschichtsdrama stellt sich erstmals als soziales Drama vor" (249).

Until the appearance of Hauptmann's play, only in Die Soldaten (1776) by Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz (1751-1792) and Büchner's Woyzeck (1878), had social criticism and class

25("The social drama becomes a Geschichtsdrama, for the first time the Geschichtsdrama presents itself as a social drama.")
distinctions played such a pivotal role in a German drama. Although neither is a Geschichts-
drama (the former is in fact a tragi-comedy), there is a connection in the subject matter, namely: social criticism. Like Büchner, Hauptmann recognized the social injustice of his day and this drama was his attempt to draw attention to the problem. Considered by critics to be "das erste moderne deutsche Geschichtsdrama" ("the first modern German Geschichts-
drama") (Schröder 245), Die Weber owes its existence in part to the author's predecessor, Büchner, whose works Hauptmann read and admired. Thus the development and evolution of this genre is built upon the legacy of previous authors and their dramas; Hauptmann's drama helped pave the way for the later modern dramatists of Geschichtsdramen in the twentieth century. Müller borrows the name "Hilse" from his predecessor's drama for his character, Franz Hilse, who represents one aspect of the German proletariat in his drama, Germania Tod. Gustav Hilse, who, because of his religious convictions, refuses to partake in the revolt, dies an unexpected and ironic death at the end of Die Weber, when he is killed by a stray bullet and thus can go to his heavenly reward. Although inspired by Hauptmann's character Gustav Hilse, Müller's Hilse represents an expression of his author's distinct and different purpose, which will be explored in greater detail in Chapter Four.

g) Gerhart Hauptmann Florian Geyer: Die Tragödie des Bauernkrieges (1896)
("Florian Geyer: The Tragedy of the Peasants' Revolt")

Florian Geyer: Die Tragödie des Bauernkrieges premiered on 4 January 1896 at the Deutsches Theater in Berlin. Undoubtedly inspired by Goethe's Götz, Hauptmann attempted to achieve a greater degree of realism by recreating the language and style of the early sixteenth century. Like his literary forefather Schiller, he engaged in extensive historical studies for this purpose. Similar to the subject matter in Die Weber, Hauptmann was primarily concerned with representing conflicts not between individuals, "sondern Gruppen innerhalb der Nation" ("rather groups within the nation") as Fritz Martini writes in his
epilogue to this drama (163). Geyer was a Franconian knight who fought in the army of the 
Schwäbische Bund ("Swabian Confederation") as a Landsknechtsführer ("leader of mercen-
aries") against Götz von Berlichingen. Born in approximately 1490, he was killed on 10 
June 1525 at the order of his brother-in-law Wilhelm von Grumbach. As a devoted follower 
of Luther's teachings, Geyer took a leading role in the peasants' revolt in order to further 
reforms to help the peasants, although Luther himself chastised and condemned the peasants 
for rising against their masters.

This drama not only represents "ein historisches, soziales und nationales Drama", the 
significance of its plot can also be found in its "immer wiederkehrenden, nur im Tod 
endenden Konflikt" (Martin 155). In a similar way as Müller later writes about conflict, 
particularly internal German conflict, Hauptmann focuses on showing the troubling aspect of 
a country plagued by continuing inner political turmoil and social unrest. Even though 
Germany had finally achieved unity at the hands of Bismarck in 1871, at the time Hauptmann 
 wrote this drama the political landscape in Germany was marked by various political factions 
vying for control. As a result of the continued progress of the industrial revolution, new 
social and political problems surfaced which needed viable solutions. The social problems of 
the mid-nineteenth century presented in Die Weber had multiplied and evolved due to new 
technological advances. Whereas Goethe's Götz focuses on a Reichsritter ("knight of the 
Holy Roman Empire") who faces a new era and unwillingly gets involved in the peasants' 
revolt, the character of Florian Geyer represents a man whose desire to improve the social 
situation for his fellow countrymen, also confronted with a new era, results in his eventual 
defamation and death at the hands of his own "brother". This inability of the Ger-
mans to 
work together and overcome their differences for the amelioration of the German nation is 
thus reflected in this drama and will later be an important theme for Müller. As the subtitle of 

26 ("an historical, social and national drama") ("continuously returning, only in death ending conflict")
Florian Geyer indicates, the underlying theme of the drama is "die Tragödie des Elends der deutschen Nation" (Martini 169), which has its origins in the peasants' revolt of the sixteenth century and was further exacerbated by the Thirty Years' War. This sixteenth century war is at the heart of the next Geschichtsdrama in this study.

h) Bertolt Brecht Mutter Courage. Eine Chronik aus dem Dreißigjährigen Krieg (1939) ("Mother Courage. A Chronicle from the Thirty Years' War")

Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956), one of the most famous German writers in modern times, wrote this play in 1939 while living in exile. Mutter Courage, consisting of twelve Bilder or scenes written in prose with interspersed songs, premiered in Zurich at the Schauspielhaus on 19 April 1941. The drama focuses on the relationship to and effects of war on the title character, Anna Fierling, known as Mother Courage, and her three children. She earns her living as a Marketenderin or business woman who follows the troops with her covered wagon and trades with them. Considering the role war has played in Germany and in the German-speaking lands throughout the centuries and particularly in the twentieth century, this drama remains "von unverminderter Heutigkeit" ("from unlessened actuality") as Walter Hinch writes in "Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder: Ein kritisches Volksstück" ("Mother Courage and her children: a critical national play") (93). Only once does the main character express anger about the war, at the end of scene six: "Der Krieg soll verflucht sein" ("The war shall be damned.") (1408). Her anger has been temporarily awakened because she feels helpless: she does not know where her sons are and her daughter has just been attacked again. By the end of the play, however, Courage's main interest has reverted back to capitalizing on the war, as her final line indicates: "Ich muß wieder in Handel kommen" (1437) ("I have to get back into business"). In fact she has just performed a business transaction by giving the peasants money for the burial of her daughter; with neither tears nor emotion she has coolly managed the

27 ("the tragedy of the misery of the German nation")
elimination of this final "ware" or "merchandise": her daughter's corpse. With this matter-of-fact attitude, the author demonstrates that the character has not learned any lesson from her trials and tribulations and the loss of her three children, Schweizerkäs, Eilif and Kattrin. In the Prologue to his drama, Brecht writes about this character and her inability to learn:

Solang die Masse das Objekt der Politik ist, kann sie, was mit ihr geschieht, nicht als einen Versuch, sondern nur als ein Schicksal ansehen; sie lernt so wenig aus der Katastrophe, wie das Versuchskarnickel über Biologie lernt. Dem Stückschreiber obliegt es nicht, die Courage am Ende sehend zu machen -- sie sieht einiges, gegen die Mitte des Stückes zu, am Ende der 6. Szene, und verliert dann die Sicht wieder --, ihm kommt es darauf an, daß der Zuschauer sieht (1443).

Brecht has come to the very heart of the matter concerning war and the common people: the average citizen is helpless in the face of a war forced upon it by its leaders. War, in this case the Thirty Years' War, can thus be considered the antagonist in this drama. Courage, as the protagonist and representative of the average citizen, is helpless to fight against the war and instead, chooses to exploit it. The audience is aware, however, that this is an illusion: in reality the war destroys her family and will eventually destroy her. When Brecht wrote this drama in exile in 1939, Hitler was on the brink of beginning the Second World War. Brecht knew only too well about the warlike character of the Germans, thirsting for revenge after the humiliation of defeat, and he intended this drama as a warning about the dangerous effects of war on the common people. Given Germany's history, German identity has been severely affected by the many facets of war, which find ample expression in Müller's Geschichts-dramen. Brecht had a major and lasting influence on Müller which makes an understanding of Brecht's literary work essential to the analysis of Müller's dramas.

28 ("As long as the masses are the object of politics, they can only look at what happens to them, not as an experiment, rather as a destiny; they learn so little from the catastrophe, as the laboratory rabbit learns about biology. It is not the author's duty to make Courage see at the end -- she realizes something, about the middle of
i) Bertolt Brecht Leben des Galilei (1955) ("Life of Galilei")

The third version of Leben des Galilei, consisting of fifteen Bilder or scenes written in prose, premiered on 15 January 1957 in Berlin at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm. Not only is it a modern Geschichtsdrama from the twentieth century, it was written by a fellow Marxist and founder of the Berliner Ensemble, of which Müller would later become the director. The Marxist view of history is an essential aspect of this drama, along with the growing threat of the modern world and in particular of modern science to mankind. In his essay, "Das Geschichtsdrama", Peter Zahn writes:

Brecht's Galilei (Erstfassung 1938/39) wird wegen der historischen Gestalt im Mittelpunkt und der mit dieser verbundenen Begebenheit, der Begründung und Unterdrückung der modernen Physik, als Geschichtsdrama eingestuft [. . .] Die Wirkung Galileis auf die moderne Zeit und deren Wissen (das Wissen um die physikalische Machbarkeit und Anwendung der Atombombe wird in die späteren Fassungen eingebracht) werden so mit der historischen Situation und deren Vertretern verbunden, daß sich erkennbare Zusammenhänge ergeben. Die Sicht auf die Geschichte wird mit einem neuen Sehen verbunden (132). Zahn expresses the idea that a Geschichtsdrama is fixed in a specific time period in the past, but that the author's perspective from the vantage point of his time affects his view and portrayal of historical events. Brecht reformulated his intention based on his new perspective and thus changed the message of his play which resulted in the third and final version. This final version reflects the view that science and the intellectual have betrayed mankind: "Zum Hauptthema des Stückes war nun, durch den Atomschock, eindeutig der "soziale Verrat" des drama, at the end of the sixth scene, and then loses sight of it again --, his main interest is that the audience realizes.")

29("Brecht's Galilei (first version 1938/39) is classified as a Geschichtsdrama because of its concentration on a historical character and the event, the foundation, and suppression of modern physics connected to him. [. . .] Galilei's impact on the modern time and its knowledge (the knowledge about the physical capability and application of the atom bomb is inserted into the later versions) are so connected to the historical situation and
Instead of presenting science as a positive contribution to society and the future of mankind, Brecht represents it here, in the character of Galilei, as a negative force and as a traitor to mankind which will eventually destroy man and society. Werner Keller writes about Brecht's portrayal of the main character:

Doch unter dem Schock des Atombombenabwurfs auf Hiroshima und Nagasaki verändert Brecht seinen Protagonisten von Grund auf: Galilei ist nicht länger ein illegaler Kämpfer, der widerrufen hat, um weiterforschen zu können, sondern ein Feigling, der die Wissenschaft "heimlich wie ein Laster" betreibt (331).

Brecht was so deeply shocked by current events that he rewrote his drama to reflect these occurrences as a warning to mankind; in effect, a modern lesson in twentieth century morality; similar to yet worlds apart from the didactic plays of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Given the impact of this genre on German literature, which has endured from the late eighteenth (Götz) until the end of the twentieth century (Germania 3), a close examination of literary critics' attempts to identify its characteristics, development, and tradition will aid in the ensuing analyses of Müller's two Geschichtsdramen.

In summary, I have presented Geschichtsdramen from Germany's literary past which are significant for the development of the genre as well as for their expression of German identity based on Germany's unique history. Each of the dramas represents the individual author's perspective on and relationship to his own respective era. The evolution of the genre is based on the form, style, language, plot, characters, subject matter, and historical persons and events chosen by each author for a given drama. I have chosen those plays which are its representatives that recognizable correlations are the result. The view of history is connected with a new way of seeing.

30("The main theme of the play, due to the atom shock, obviously had now became that of "social betrayal" by the scientist and by science in the seventeenth and twentieth centuries.

31("The main theme of the play, due to the atom shock, obviously had now became that of "social betrayal" by the scientist and by science in the seventeenth and twentieth centuries.

32(Wissenschaftlers und der Wissenschaft im 17. und 20. Jahrhundert geworden (Schröder 260)."
significant to German history and best exemplify German identity in relationship to the genre and to Müller's Geschichtsdramen, Germania Tod and Germania 3. Although the form and style have evolved since 1773, the radical form of Goethe's Götz finds its echo in Müller's dramas; while Schiller's representation of "brotherly" betrayal and deceit is an essential theme found in Müller's works. The significance of the Germanic brothers to German identity and the origins of the German nation, about which Müller writes, are present in Kleist's Die Hermannsschlacht. The image of the perfect officer and the exaggerated sense of duty and blind obedience which Müller criticizes can be found in Kleist's Homburg, in which these attributes are considered necessary and justifiable. Müller's extensive use of the Volk and street scenes have their origins with Büchner, who excelled at their portrayal in Dantons Tod. The presentation of social and economic problems which Müller considers important date back to Hauptmann's Die Weber. The tragedy of war and the death and destruction it brings, one of Müller's central themes, can be found in Brecht's Mutter Courage. His Leben des Galilei, in which he refers to the elements of social and political responsibility, are important underlying themes in Müller's dramas as well.

In all of these dramas discussed above, historical facts and persons served as the original inspirational impetus, but the authors go far beyond merely relating a story from the past: they are not Geschichtsschreiber, even though their dramas represent a given and fixed period in time and now belong to history themselves. Instead, they endow their subject matter with a more profound aspect which makes each Geschichtsdrama unique and the characters immortal. The individual author's choice of historical characters, plot, and subject matter generally reflects the political and social situations during the lifespan of each playwright. Thus these dramas not only engage with important aspects from German history, they also reflect upon Germany's development as a nation and the evolution of German identity. A

31 ("But affected by the shock of dropping the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Brecht profoundly altered the character of his protagonist: Galilei is no longer an illegal fighter, who has recanted in order to be
given writer's perception of a problem in society and his desire to enact change is often the
catalyst for his choice of historical subject matter. His sense of social responsibility as an
intellectual and representative voice of German identity leads him to create a drama which
expresses his concerns, worries, disappointment, and disillusion with Germany's past and
present, yet may also include his hope, vision, or fear for Germany's future. Müller's
Geschichtsdramen embody these characteristics while also combining elements from
previous dramas of this genre relating to form, style, and subject matter in his individual
search for German identity. Current or contemporary German identity is based on the past, as
is the case with any and every nation and individual. Therefore, a comprehensive under-
standing of identity must include a retrospective look at the persons and events of Germany's
past who played a major and decisive role in the political, social, and cultural development of
the nation: these elements are found in the Geschichtsdramen presented above. Major events
included in these dramas, which are also significant for Müller's dramas, are the peasants'
revolt, the Thirty Years' War, and Prussia's historical role. Major themes found in previous
dramas of this genre which are also important in Müller's dramas include: war and the lessons
of war, duty, honor, service to the fatherland, betrayal, brothers, unity, division, revolution,
the need for social and political reform, and individual responsibility to society. As is the case
with earlier authors of Geschichtsdramen, Müller brings his own unique style and
individuality to his dramas while simultaneously building upon those dramas from the past.
In addition to presenting an overview of these Geschichtsdramen, in the following section I
present the views and interpretations of the genre itself by past and current literary critics,
since an understanding of their various opinions is essential to my analysis of Müller's
dramas.

---

able to continue his research, rather, he is a coward who pursues science 'secretly like a vice'."
II.4 The Views of Modern Critics Concerning the Geschichtsdrama:

Defining the Undefinable

Many essays and books have been written which deal with the subject of this genre and offer various definitions and criteria while referring to and building upon the ideas of their predecessors. While it is beyond the scope of this study to offer a comprehensive overview of the secondary literature with the aim of arriving at a concrete definition of this genre, in order to promote a better understanding of the Geschichtsdrama in general and Müller's dramas in particular, the proceeding is a brief chronological summary of the pertinent theoretical writings of some of the most important literary critics of the twentieth century and their main points about the relationship between history and literature, especially in regard to the Geschichtsdrama.

In his essay entitled, "Der Dichter und die Geschichte" ("The Author and History") from 1928, Karl Viëtor notices that "Die Frage nach dem Verhältnis des Dichters zur Geschichte wird von jedem Zeitalter neu gestellt" (361). The age-old discussion begun by Aristotle and renewed by Lessing about the task and merit of the historian compared to that of the writer of history continues into modern times. Viëtor compares the art of historiography with that of writing literature: the latter contains more truth than history, he claims, because it contains the "Wahrheit der Idee" ("the truth of the idea") about mankind and the "Wesentliche seines Wesens" ("the essence of his being") (365). The influence of the philosophy of Expressionism on Viëtor is quite evident: the author of a Geschichtsdrama combines historical facts or truth with what he considers the essence of human existence, his vision of the true meaning of being human. Whereas the historian deals with facts and circumstances, the writer reaches into the heart and soul of those human beings and their

---

32 ("The question about the relationship of the author to history is posed anew by each era.")
actions which comprise historical events and attempts to bring the truth to the surface. Viëtor expresses his main idea as follows:

Das Allgemeine -- dies ist es, was die Dichtung, wie an aller Wirklichkeit, auch am geschichtlichen Gegenstand sichtbar machen will. Und dies Allgemeine ist die Idee des Menschen, das Unbedingte, das der Grund des Weltmysteriums ist (365).³³

The universal, as he terms it, represents the basic structure of man and mankind; indeed it comprises the essence of human nature and serves as the subject for great literature. By the use of history and historical persons and events, literature, or more precisely the author, attempts to present the universal truth about mankind to society. "Dichtung" therefore elevates mankind by its representation of the "truth" or "essence" concerning mankind, but at the same time this "essence" is also historically determined. Because history or historical writing is only concerned with "dem einmal Geschehenen und Niewiedergeschehenden" (367),³⁴ what remains is an element fixed in time which can no longer be manipulated or altered: thus its essence has been established. The author who chooses historical subject matter to shape his drama, the "Herr der Geschichte" (370) ("lord of history"), uses historical persons and events to suit his purpose of revealing a historically determined truth about some aspect of man and mankind. Although Viëtor did not refer directly to the term Geschichtsdrama, his ideas correspond precisely to this genre and its continuous development and the subsequent discussion by other literary critics.

The controversial critic and Germanic philologist, Benno von Wiese, also concentrates on the significance of history in drama in his essay entitled, "Geschichte und Drama" ("History and Drama") from 1942, written at a time when the victorious German armies had conquered most of Europe and history seemed to favor their efforts. His basic opinion, which is similar to that of Viëtor's "truth of the idea", is that the author who chooses

³³("The universal -- this is what literature wants to make visible in all reality, and also in the historical subject. And this universal is the idea of the human being, the absolute, which is at the base of the world mystery.")
to include history in his drama is not simply recording historical facts but is looking for and representing "eine eigentliche, echte und innere Wahrheit" ("an essential, real and inner truth") about mankind; in this manner, the writer of a Geschichtsdrama functions as the "Spiegel der Menschheit" ("mirror of mankind") (386). The following question posed by von Wiese at a critical moment in German history is as relevant today as it was then, over six decades ago: "Was kann die Dichtung und in unserem besonderen Falle das Geschichtsdrama für die Geschichte leisten?"35 This question can be answered using his own words:

Stärker als andere dichterische Gattungen bleibt das Drama mit den oft sehr widerspruchsvollen politischen und sozialen Zuständen eines Volkes verflochten. Ja man kann geradezu sagen, daß, wer erfahren will, was ein Volk seinem innersten Wesen nach ist, seine tragisch-dramatische Dichtung befragen sollte. Die Dichtung wird hier zur Antwort auf die Fragen, die die Geschichte an uns stellt (395) [. . .] Es gibt Geschichtsdramen, die durch die Gewalt des Wirklichen erschüttern, und andere, die durch die Kraft der Idee überzeugen wollen" (397).36

Von Wiese is obviously referring to the drama of Goethe and Schiller, but his description can be applied to Müller's as well, since he presents "the violence of reality" in a way that is both shocking yet honest, though not always historically accurate. Von Wiese believes that the importance of this type of drama is not only based on its relationship between the past and the present, but also on its significance as a harbinger of the future: "Aber nicht nur Vergangenheit und Gegenwart verschlingen sich im geschichtlichen Drama, so daß beide in eines

---

34 ("something that happened only once and never again")
35 ("What can literature, and in our special case, the Geschichtsdrama, achieve for history?")
36 ("More intensely than other literary genres, drama remains intertwined with the often very contradictory political and social circumstances of a people. One can even frankly say that whoever wants to discover the inner essence of a nation should consult its tragic-dramatic literature. Literature in this case becomes the answer to the questions which history asks of us [. . .] There are Geschichtsdramen which are disturbing due to the force of reality, and others, which want to convince through the power of the idea.")
Until this point in time the general discussion concerning this genre had focused primarily on how the author presents past events to reflect his contemporary situation when writing his play. Now, von Wiese mentions a further essential attribute of a Geschichtsdrama: namely the interplay of past, present, and future which may not be readily apparent given the focus on the past.

The events of a nation's past are always of interest to future generations because the past constitutes part of a nation's identity. Von Wiese explains the connection of the development of this genre to the development of a nation:

_Denn die Entwicklung des Dramas ist selber ein geschichtlicher Vorgang und als solcher untrennbar in das Werden einer Nation und ihrer völkischen und staatlichen Gemeinschaftsformen verflochten [. . .] Das geschichtliche Drama aber wird zum symbolischen Spiegel des Schicksalsganges einer Nation, den es in ein dichterisches Bild verwandelt. In diesem Sinne kann die dramatisch historische Dichtung selber ein Stück nationaler Geschichte sein, in der die frühe Einheit von Sage und Mythos in anderer Gestalt und in subjektiv gewordener Weise nachklingt (395)._  

His repeated use of the word "mirror" in the two phrases, "Spiegel der Menschheit" and "symbolischen Spiegel des Schicksalsganges einer Nation", makes clear that the significance of a Geschichtsdrama lies in its representation of two primary elements: 1) the overall condition of mankind at various times and; 2) the national picture or situation of Germany and its inhabitants at a given moment in time. The additional attribute of such a drama looking to the past, reaching to the present, and being able to extend into the future provides an all-encompassing overview of German identity that is unmatched by any other literary

---

37("However, not only the past and the present become inextricably entangled in the historical drama <Geschichtsdrama> so that both are perceived as one, but the past and the future as well.")
38("Because the development of the drama is itself a historical process and as such it is inseparably intertwined in the evolution of a nation and its folkish and governmental forms of community [. . .] The historical drama <Geschichtsdrama>, however, becomes the symbolic mirror of a nation's course of destiny, which it transforms
genre. Von Wiese refers to this genre as "eine relativ junge und sich allmählich entwickelnde Sonderform des Dramas" ("a relatively young and gradually developing special form of drama") (381). So while Germany had no national drama of its own due to its earlier particularism and lack of a strong, cohesive central power, so too the rather slow and hesitant development of the genre reflects the retarded development of the German nation. Von Wiese implies that only with the arrival of the Führer and the Nazi state has a strong central power been established, which should lead to a proliferation of the Geschichtsdrama. Germany had indeed always been a conglomeration of independent states and, even after the establishment of the Second Empire by Bismarck, it was a federal state in which tribal and national allegiances vied for power. With the Anschluß ("annexation") of Austria and his conquest of other German-speaking territories, Hitler did indeed form a strong Großdeutschland ("large Germany"), but it was not based on popular will. Rather, its foundation rested upon terror and propaganda, conquest, and the elimination of all people under Nazi control who did not adhere to their inhuman ideas and who did not obey orders without question. Von Wiese had jumped on the Nazi bandwagon and his ideas concerning the development of this genre are based on the political realities of that time as seen through the eyes of a Nazi.

Although von Wiese is considered "einer der erfolgreichsten Germanisten im Nachkriegsdeutschland", according to Gerhard Lauer in his essay, "Benno von Wiese (1903-1987)" (221), his reputation has been tainted by his enthusiastic participation in the NSDAP as early as 1933. In his autobiography from 1982, Ich erzähle mein Leben. Erinnerungen, his tendency to downplay his Nazi background is one of the main reasons for the resultant castigation by some of his peers. The historical truth is that during the Nazi regime: "[. . .] verknüpfte er wie so viele seiner Kollegen zielstrebig die eigene persönliche Karriere mit dem Nationalsozialismus und verdrängte nach 1945 ebenso zielstrebig das eigene Tun in into a literary image. In this sense, the dramatic historical literature itself can become a part of the national history, in which the early unity of legend and myth reverberates in a different form and in a subjective way."
diesen Jahren [. . .]" (Lauer 224). There is a parallel here to Müller, who, after the
dissolution of the GDR, was accused of collaborating with the Stasi. Although Müller
rejected this accusation and denied any wrongdoing, the reproach and the uncertainty remain.
It cannot be denied, however, that von Wiese was in fact an active member of the NSDAP
during its twelve year regime and promoted their literary ideas of nationalism, history, and
the nation, applying them to literature. In spite of his active association with the German
fascist past, and because of his talent and knowledge, after 1945 he was able to maintain his
career as a professor, even earning additional honors from German and international
universities.

In 1952, ten years after the publication of von Wiese's article and following the end of
World War II, Friedrich Sengle postulated his theory about the Geschichtsdrama in his book
titled, Das deutsche Geschichtsdrama: Geschichte eines literarischen Mythos. His use of
the term "literary myth" in the title implies that the theories about this genre did not live up to
its reality or even that it had ceased to or did not exist at all. Indeed he confirms this notion
with the words: "Die höchste Gattung und der höchste Gegenstand -- das war das deutsche
Geschichtsdrama lange Zeit. Ein kaum mehr verständlicher, aber sehr wirksamer und fruchtbare Mythos. Seine Entfaltung, seine Herrschaft und sein Verklingen ist der eigentliche
Gegenstand dieses Buches" (3). In his opinion, this genre developed, reached its zenith, and
faded away in a timespan of approximately a hundred years: from 1760 to 1860 (3). These
years do in fact correspond to the period when Geschichtsdramen were written by the great
German authors and dramatists: Goethe, Schiller, Grabbe, Hebbel, Kleist, and Büchner. A
great number of inferior historical dramas were published in the second half of the nineteenth

39 ("one of the most successful Germanists in post-World War II Germany")
40 ("[. . .] he resolutely combined, like so many of his colleagues, his own personal career with National
Socialism and after 1945 he equally resolutely suppressed his own actions during these years [. . .]")
41 ("The highest genre and the highest subject matter -- that was the German Geschichtsdrama for a long time.
Hardly any more understandable, but a very effective and prolific myth. Its development, its domination and its
gradual disappearance are the actual themes of this book.")
century, especially after the founding of the Second German Empire, but it was not until the modern playwrights Hauptmann and Brecht came along that this genre could again boast of greatness. Müller's *Germania Tod*, on the other hand, has led some critics to suggest the end of this genre has arrived, which seems to make Sengle's reference to "literary myth" plausible. Nonetheless, Sengle's views reflect the most significant aspects of the most traditional Geschichtsdramen and thus remain an invaluable resource for every serious study of this genre. The reason Sengle offers for the absence of a solid development of the Geschichtsdrama during the period of Humanism in Germany in contrast to Elisabethan England with Shakespeare is: "[. . .] daß es in Deutschland keinen politischen Mittelpunkt gab, der die nationale Kultur ebenso gefördert hätte wie der englische Königshof" (9). The lack of a strong central power in Germany during this period, Sengle believes, stunted the growth and development of this genre as well. According to Sengle: "Rein geistesgeschichtlich gesehen waren mit Renaissance und Humanismus auch in Deutschland die Voraussetzungen für das eigentliche Geschichtsdrama gegeben" (8), but given the weak and underdeveloped political situation in Germany, this development did not take place. As Viëtor had also postulated, there is a strong connection between the evolution of both the Geschichtsdrama and the German nation. As firsthand witnesses to contemporary events of their own respective eras, the renowned authors who chose to depict history in their dramas have left posterity with lasting images of past times.

In 1976 Werner Keller published his essay, "Drama und Geschichte" ("Drama and History"), with an emphasis on how playwrights use the past to explain contemporary events. He considers the relationship of a dramatist to history to be markedly different from that of a historian to history: whereas the historian tries to maintain distance from the material he is

---

42("[. . .] that in Germany there was no political center which could have advanced the national culture as did the English royal court.")
43("Considered purely from the point of view of intellectual history, the preconditions for the essential Geschichtsdrama were present in Germany during the periods of the Renaissance and Humanism.")
writing, the playwright does exactly the opposite in that: "der Dramatiker sein Selbst dem Geschichtsstoff bewußt einprägen will" (302-303). An author of Geschichtsdramen is not a writer of pure historical fact, he rather uses this medium as a means to find a truth about the human condition and to make a statement about it, as both Viëtor and von Wiese claim. As Walter Hinck also states in "Einleitung: Zur Poetik des Geschichtsdramas" ("introduction: about the theory of poetry of the Geschichtsdrama"), the author's intention plays a major role in his choice of historical subject matter and is influenced by the individual historical situation of the author:

Es sind die - individuellen und zeittypischen - Erfahrungen des Autors im Hier und Heute, die diese Sinn-Vorgabe bestimmen; es ist die besondere geschichtliche Situation, aus der und für die er geschichtliche Vergangenheit zurückruft (13).

Every author of a Geschichtsdrama experiences his own time and place in a specific way through events and memories unique to his own situation and perspective. In order to relate these experiences in a meaningful form, he chooses some person or act from the past which corresponds to his situation in time or which he believes offers an appropriate parallel or basis for comparison. The "Hier und Heute" reflects the author's social and political situation of his particular day, but it also demonstrates the limited space man possesses in which to act: "history" for any given author is limited to his "here and now", the space in time in which he lives. The decision to write a Geschichtsdrama is based upon events occurring in the author's world and his perspective about them. As Werner Keller describes this phenomenon:

In der Tat: Der Geschichtsdramatiker handelt von der Vergangenheit und meint seine Gegenwart. Wenn der junge Goethe den Götz schreibt, versucht er, einer

44("[. . .] that the dramatist deliberately wants to imprint himself onto the historical subject matter.")
Using the example of Goethe's Götz, Keller stresses the intention of an author to make a declaration about his own era. Though the world he creates belongs to another time and place, the message he delivers is one about his contemporary society. The author's decision to use historical persons and events in his drama elevates the importance of his message or intention.

In the introduction to the collection of articles from 1980 on Geschichtsdrama in the series "Wege der Forschung" of the Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft the editor, Elfriede Neubuhr, makes the same point as Lessing and is echoing Aristotle when she maintains that the intent of the author in writing a Geschichtsdrama is more important than the actual historical subject matter (4). She defines two types of historical plays: the first she calls a historisches Drama ("historical play") which is determined by its subject matter; and the second she considers a true Geschichtsdrama or geschichtsdeutendes Drama ("a play which interprets history") which is determined by its intent (5).

Neubuhr quotes several German authors, among them Franz Grillparzer, Christian Grabbe and Friedrich Hebbel to make her point that the author's intent, his Geschichtsdeutung ("intention") is the decisive factor for categorizing his play as a Geschichtsdrama. The subject matter and cast of characters of a drama is subordinate to the author's intent and can be changed or manipulated (Neubuhr 4-5). Therefore, the author of such a play is allowed a certain amount of freedom when creating his characters and can choose from various

45("The experiences of the author in the here and now - individual and characteristic and typical for his time - determine this predetermined meaning; it is the special historical situation, out of which and for which he recalls the historical past.")

46("In fact: the writer of a Geschichtsdrama deals with the past and means his own present. When the young Goethe was writing Götz, he was attempting to live up to an earlier epoch in language, spirit of the time, local color, etc., but the actual impulse aims at creating a contrast to his own time.")
sources in his search for historical information about past persons and events. As Aristotle wrote, in the field of tragedy there are cases where only one or two of the personages are familiar to the audience, while the rest have been invented by the poet or author (Cooper 32). This characteristic ideally suits this genre, as evidenced in Wallenstein in which, in addition to the historical figures, Schiller created the fictional characters of Max Piccolomini and Thekla Wallenstein. Neubuhr emphasizes that the Geschichtsdeutung is of primary importance in a drama of this genre (4-5). In this way, the historical subject matter becomes a tool in the author's hands to further his literary purpose and his political and ideological agenda.

As the examples in the previous section indicate, some authors of the nineteenth century continued writing Geschichtsdramen about past German historical figures, but also about significant political events that affected Germany. Throughout the nineteenth century this genre achieved great importance by its emphasis on the major political events of the time due to the texts written during the literary period referred to as Das junge Deutschland. Authors such as Büchner (Dantons Tod), Grabbe (Napoleon oder Die hundert Tage) (1831) and Grillparzer (Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg) (1872) developed a preference for historical subject matter due to their interest in, dissatisfaction with or involvement in history, politics and the developments occurring in contemporary European society (Neubuhr 15). In the twentieth century, which has had its share of dilemmas, conflicts and wars, the literary tradition of using past events and persons to make a point about something in the present continued. If creating characters or events in addition to the use of actual historical figures allows the author to make his point more clearly and convincingly to his contemporary audience, then his play can be considered successful.

On the other hand, however, the author of a Geschichtsdrama does not have the freedom to alter well-known historical events or personalities which have been recorded as facts and are accepted as such, to the extent that they are decidedly different and fly in the
face of the audience's expectations. In his book from 1940, *Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos: Grenzfragen zur Gegenwartsform des Dramas*, Julius Petersen emphasizes that such action would be a misuse of historical subject matter:

> Es wäre ein unzulässiger Mißbrauch geschichtlicher Namen, wenn mit ihnen Ereignisse oder Charaktere verbunden würden, die dem unumstößlichen Sachverhalt widersprechen. Dabei würde sowohl der Sinn des Geschehens als auch der organische und kausale Zusammenhang zwischen Charakteren und Ereignissen, der sich geschichtlich erwiesen hat, zerrissen (7).47

Considering that the author of a *Geschichtsdrama* chooses the historical subject matter because of its reference to his own situation, it would make more sense for him to sway the audiences by using the known facts in support of his ideas.

Additionally, there is a non-literary element which plays a significant role not only in the formation of but also in the reception of this type of drama: namely, the timeline element of each *Geschichtsdrama*. According to Paul Michael Lützeler in the prologue to his essay, "Friedrich Hebbels Agnes Bernauer: Ein Geschichtsdrama zwischen Politik und Metaphysik", the timeline consists of three periods: 1) the actual time period of the historical event; 2) the historical time period of the author and; 3) the current time period of the reader or audience (179). There might even be a fourth timeline element directly or indirectly associated with the play, namely: a futuristic or prophetic aspect. It is essential for an understanding of this genre to recognize these time factors since they determine why the author chose the historical topic or characters he did, what his message to his audience may have been, and how future audiences may choose to interpret his play. The literary aspects of

---

47 ("It would be an inadmissible misuse of historical names if they were to be attached to events or characters which contradict the irrefutable facts. In that way, the meaning of events as well as the organic and causal correlation between characters and events, which has been historically proven, would be disrupted.")
this genre are: 1) the written records of the original historical events; 2) the author's work as part of an artistic tradition and; 3) the reception of the play (Lützeler 179). The three non-literary elements: the historical event, the author's period, and the time of reception, form a bridge to the three literary factors: the written records, the author's literary work, and the critical and scholarly reception of the play, to make a critical interpretation possible.

The first element, the historical records, is decisive in the writing process because the author's resulting view of history depends in part on how history is defined or has been passed on through Geschichtsschreibung ("historical writing") (Neubuhr 384-385). It is an important element of this type of drama that the author is looking to the past for similarities to contemporary events, or at least for an analogy between past and present. A drama from this genre has a message or universality which may be hidden, however, depending on the contemporary political circumstances faced by the author. In times of political turmoil or dictatorship, an author may choose to write this type of play because he can better camouflage political views and circumstances as Herbert Lindenberger asserts in Historical Drama (7). Büchner, for example, chose to write about the French Revolution and its aftermath to more safely express his views on political revolution at a time when Germany was undergoing political upheaval and revolts. By contrast, the authors of post-World War II, at least in the FRG, no longer had to fear repercussions when speaking out against their government. Authors in the GDR, however, were still subjected to censorship and had to tread the waters of expression more carefully: Müller's delay in completing Germania Tod, for example, is a direct result of this censorship.

The significance as well as influence of historical elements not only affect the author, in this case, Heiner Müller, but additionally, the critic who is also "geschichtsgebunden" ("fixed in history"). Jost Hermand and Helen Fehervary have written about Müller's works since the early sixties, as they state in the foreword to an anthology of their articles from
1999, Mit den Toten reden: Fragen an Heiner Müller, (vii) a compilation of essays published by each of them primarily in the seventies about Müller's plays from 1955 and 1975. The reason they give for including the original date of publication for each essay corresponds to the discussion in Chapter One about the relevance of dates when classifying Müller's plays. They feel that the role of history is so important in his plays that their own interpretation of the events and situations from their historically fixed point of view must be included in their analyses as well. They write:

Unter den Titeln aller Aufsätze - ob nun der auf Deutsch oder ursprünglich auf Englisch geschriebenen - steht daher stets die Jahreszahl ihrer Abfassung oder ihres ersten Erscheinens. Bei einem Buch über die Dramen Kleists oder Büchners wäre das vielleicht nicht so wichtig gewesen. Aber bei Aufsätzen über einen Gegenwartsautor wie Heiner Müller, wo jede Aussage zugleich ein Bekenntnis über ihn einschließt, erschienen uns die Herkunftsdaten als unverzichtlich. Schließlich ist bei der Behandlung eines solchen Stückeschreibers jede Äußerung nur dann wirklich konkret, wenn sie zu ihrer Geschichtlichkeit steht (Vorwort VIII).

What they are discussing here is the fact that Müller is a Marxist and that the critics, when writing about him, also betray their political orientation. Therefore, their essays must also be considered from a historical perspective: even though they might no longer be true, they are still important for the interpretation of the literary works within their historical timeframe.

The literary critic needs to look at each aspect, the historical facts as given by historians and

---

48 The term "konkret" comes from Brecht who wrote "Die Wahrheit ist konkret" - but it is "concrete" within its Marxist philosophy which is also historical and rests on its "Geschichtlichkeit" ("authenticity" or "historical relevance").

49 ("Under the titles of all the essays - whether they were originally written in German or English - the year of its composition or its original publication is therefore always included. Given a book about the dramas of Kleist or Büchner that maybe would not have been so important. But in regard to essays about a contemporary author like Heiner Müller, where every statement includes at the same time a confession about him, it seemed to us that the dates of origin are indispensable. After all, in the treatment of such a playwright every observation is only then really factual if it owes up to its historical basis.")
the drama itself in order to get a fuller picture of events, of time, of the truth: these two elements complement each other and together they present the totality.

II.5  **Jürgen Schröder's Modified Criteria for the Interpretation of Geschichtsdramen**

In his collection of lecture notes, *Geschichtsdramen: Die "deutsche Misere" -- von Goethes 'Götz' bis Heiner Müllers 'Germania'? Eine Vorlesung*, Jürgen Schröder expresses the desire that he hopes to learn from them:

> [. . .] gewisse Aufschlüsse über die deutsche Geschichte und Mentalitätsgeschichte der letzten zweihundertzwanzig Jahre, **Aufschlüsse** -- keine Antworten, Botschaften und Handlungsanweisungen. Denn Geschichtsdramen sind ja nicht nur selber historische Dokumente, konzentrierte Zeugnisse unserer Vor- und Bewusstseinsgeschichte, sondern auch eigenartige Erkenntnismodelle von Geschichte, potenzierte Geschichte und Geschichtsreflexion. Sie thematisieren und problematisieren jeweils genau jenes Verhältnis von Gegenwart und Vergangenheit, in dem wir selber zu ihnen stehen und um dessentwillen wir sie befragen (6-7).

The search for clues to German identity begins with the study of Geschichtsdramen because, as Schröder eloquently explains, they are filled with the German past both in their content and in their own historicity as witnesses of events. They function as a microscope of the German past and thus allow the curious eyes of students of German literature to peer in and discover new aspects about German identity.

In his search for clues to understanding the German mentality and uncovering the essence of German history, Schröder presents an all-encompassing list of criteria pertaining to this genre, which he designed to aid in the categorization as well as analysis of these types

---

50("I hope to learn certain revelations from them about German history and the history of the mentality for the last two hundred and twenty years, revelations - not answers, messages and directions (recipes). Because not only are Geschichtsdramen historical documents themselves, concentrated testaments of our prehistory and history of consciousness, but also unique models for understanding history, concentrated history, and reflections about history. They demonstrate the themes and problems and in each case exactly that relationship between the present and the past in which we ourselves stand to them and for which purpose we consult them.")
of dramas (9-11). This list of criteria has been modified by Rainer E. Schmitt in his book, *Geschichte und Mythisierung: Zu Heiner Müllers Deutschland-Dramatik* (21-22) in order to help him in his analysis of Müller's *Geschichtsdramen*. The following list of questions, primarily based on Schröder's original format, but also reflecting certain aspects of Schmitt's alterations, has been specifically reconfigured to serve the purpose of this dissertation.

1. Origins of the play:
   When and where did the author write it? What were the social, political, and economic conditions in Germany, i.e., in the GDR and in the FRG at the time of origin and again at the date of publication? How does the author deal with these elements? What are the implications of the play for the time in which it was written and/or published? What are its implications, if any, for the present and for the future of Germany?

2. Analysis of the play:
   What can be said about the structure of the play? Is the structure of the play classical? How are the scenes formulated? What is the author's style? Does the structure and content of the scenes reflect this style? How does the language reflect this style? What metaphors does the author employ? How do they reflect upon German history? What aspects of Marxism can be detected in the play?

3. Reception of the play:
   How was the play perceived at the time of publication? Was the play performed in the GDR and/or in the FRG? Was the play subject to censorship? Was the play popular? Why or why not? What were critics' views at the time? What are critics' views today?

4. German identity in the play:
   How does the play reflect German identity? Is it positive or negative? What is it based upon? Which historical persons or events are depicted? Do they represent positive or
negative aspects of German identity? How do Müller's views about German identity in *Germania Tod in Berlin* compare to those in *Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann*? What historical aspects have changed? How does Müller deal with these changes?

Chapters Four and Five will focus on answering these questions in detailed analyses for each play. In order to provide a better understanding of his presentation of German identity, below is an overview of Müller's views on history and drama.

### II.6 Heiner Müller and the Politics of Writing

In his dramas, *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3*, the East German writer Heiner Müller presents parallels between historical persons and events and his current, post-World War II and post-reunification situations, respectively. Even though he lived and wrote in the GDR, much of his chosen subject matter is taken from the German past which was shared by both the FRG and the GDR. Despite the fact that much of the content refers to contemporary German political aspects occurring in the GDR, Müller never considered himself a political writer. He certainly wrote about political topics and events and had his own opinions about political matters, but he did not function merely as a voice for a political party or a state. On the contrary, he was very critical of the ruling party, the GDR government, and Stalin. As Müller describes it:

> Das Problem ist das verantwortungslose, leichtfertige Verhältnis zur Politik. Oder besser: das Un-Verhältnis zur Politik. Ich bin kein politischer Schriftsteller [. . .] Man kann sich schreibend zur Politik verhalten, aber man kann nicht politisch schreiben. Politik war für mich beim Schreiben immer nur Material - genauso wie Sexualität zum Beispiel *(GI 3 150).*

---

51 (“The problem is the irresponsible, thoughtless relation to politics. Or better: the non-relation to politics. I am not a political writer [. . .] One can take a written stand in regard to politics, but one cannot write politically. Politics was always merely subject matter to me when writing - just as sexuality, for example.”)
While Müller always maintained that he was not a "political writer," it becomes clear to the reader that his interest in politics extends beyond mere subject matter in his texts. Indeed, he used political events and persons as the thread out of which his plays were woven not only because they suited his affinity for history, or because they were appropriate for this genre, but rather, he chose them because they mirrored important political and historical events occurring during his lifetime, primarily in the GDR. As a politically responsible writer, Müller felt it was his obligation to at least present these events for his and future generations. As Arthur Holmberg explains in his essay, "Heiner Müller: The Political Beast: A never-before-published interview with the late German writer":

[. . .] Büchner, Brecht and Müller not only wrestle with politics, they do so in provocative ways that shatter conventional dramatic structure. They're willing to slap their audiences in the face and drag them kicking and screaming into new aesthetic realms. It is Müller's ability to hammer politics into art that explains why he continues to disturb, shock and seduce audiences (62).

Following in the footsteps of Büchner and the authors of Das junge Deutschland, Müller used the Geschichtsdrama as a vehicle to express the political situation of his time. He also continued Brecht's legacy of helping the audience to learn from the play or, at the very least, to reflect upon current times. Although he never offered any explicit solutions to problems, the texts of this modern author's plays do offer the reader the opportunity to evaluate various historical situations, to reflect upon them, and perhaps to interpret them in light of the reader's own time and situation. As Lindenberger writes in The History in Literature, the continuity between the past and the present is a central assertion in history plays of all times and styles (6). In this historical sense, Müller is a master at finding parallels from the German past and applying them to his own era.
In his texts, Müller strained to the limits of what was considered acceptable or allowable under GDR censorship. Asked once if he considered a dictatorship as a challenge to the artist Müller responded: "Besonders für Dramatiker. Die großen Zeiten des Dramas waren selten Zeiten der Demokratie. Es waren meist die Zeiten der Diktatur" (GI3 156-157). Müller maintains that living in a dictatorship brings out the best in artists because under conditions of repression, they are forced to look clearly at the social and political situation and to take a stand one way or the other: either for or against the given dictatorship. Müller was an avid reader of the classical Greek and Roman, as well as of European, plays and very much aware of the political and repressive situations in which some of those great writers created their masterpieces. In German literature from Goethe's day under autocratic rule by counts, dukes, and kings, through the French occupation of Germany by Napoleon, through the harsh repression of the revolutionaries in Büchner's day, during the Third Reich, and up to Müller's day in the GDR, the Geschichtsdrama has been able to serve as a means of artistic expression during periods when censorship made open political debate impossible. On a personal level, historical events caused fear and anxiety (Angst) in Müller, but as an artist, he recognized the importance of history as an essential element of his work.

II.6.1 Müller's Obsession with German History

Müller's childhood was dominated by Nazi terror and the destruction wrought by the events of World War II. After the defeat of the Third Reich, he participated in the rise and fall of a state founded on Marxist ideology and anti-fascism, and living as an adult in the GDR, he experienced the incompatibility of ideology and reality. His strong affinity to German history stems not only from his firsthand knowledge and his study of historical events, but also from the ensuing desire to understand these events and their resulting influence on German identity. He tended to emphasize the distinction between an author and his text. As

52 ("Especially for playwrights. The great times for drama were seldom during democratic periods. They were usually during periods of dictatorship.")
Müller stated in his post German reunification interview with Wittstock: "Man muß ausgehen von der Trennung zwischen Text und Autor" (GI3 158). With these words Müller implies that the critic has to distinguish between the meaning or message of a text and the personal opinions and experiences of the author himself. In the prologue to his book, A Heiner Müller Reader, Carl Weber reiterates Müller's idea when he writes that the critic's task is one: "which must separate the work from the author's personal life, even as it is forged from that life's experience [. . .]" (xxiii). The meaning of the text is part of the literary work, while the private remarks of an author are part of his biography. This does not mean that they cannot be congruent or overlap in certain instances but they can also be totally different. However, Müller also believed that the experiences of an author in his personal life may influence the choice of subject matter in his text, as his description of "Staat als Gewalt" as a "Grunderfahrung" indicates (GI3 154). In a quote from 1976, Müller clearly states that the author's personal experiences influence the delineation of historical characters in a given play:


At this point in time, he strongly believes that his work, particularly the portrayal of his historical characters, has been or would be influenced by events in his life. He goes even one step further and proclaims that objectivity can no longer be considered an aspect of a Geschichtsdrama, which makes sense given the characters and topics in his plays. Müller's

53("One has to assume there is a separation between text and author.")
54 See Chapter One, page 5.
55 ("[. . .] I only meant that in the creation of a historical person my own biography also slips in. Even when I write about Müntzer or Luther or somebody else, I am writing about myself. And I believe that it is becoming more and more important that, as an author, one is less and less allowed to keep oneself out of it. The concept of objectivity is totally void of meaning.")
choice of subject matter for his texts and particularly for his Geschichtsdramen can, therefore, be logically attributed to his own personal biographical experiences. Biographical aspects infiltrated the choice of topics and the portrayal of characters in the dramas listed above:

Kleist was very much affected by events during his lifetime and Büchner's focus on the topic of revolution is a direct result of the mood at the time in which he lived. The major aspects of Müller's plays revolve around the historical events he witnessed, particularly those of World War II and then in the GDR. His experiences during the Nazi and Stalin dictatorships left their mark on him and led him to describe his interest in German history as an "obsession":

> Mein Hauptinteresse beim Stückeschreiben ist es, Dinge zu zerstören [. . .] Die deutsche Geschichte war eine andere Obsession, und ich habe versucht, diese Obsession zu zerstören, diesen ganzen Komplex. Ich glaube, mein stärkster Impuls ist der, Dinge bis auf ihr Skelett zu reduzieren, ihr Fleisch und ihre Oberfläche herunterzureißen. Dann ist man mit ihnen fertig (GI1 102).  

His use of the term "obsession" betrays the strong emotions he brought to his Geschichtsdramen; indeed, they have their own dynamics and speak powerfully about German identity. Müller seems to personify history as his choice of the words, "Skelett" and "Fleisch" in the above quote indicates. German identity can only be unveiled after the basic element, the skeleton, has been revealed through his destruction of the layers surrounding German history. He attempted to replace the old criminal i.e., Prussian and Nazi past with the new socialist awareness developing in the contemporary GDR by shedding light on these dark periods in German history. In his opinion: "Leute müssen zu ihrem eigenen historischen Hintergrund Zugang haben. Das Gedächtnis der Nation sollte nicht ausgelöscht werden. Man tötet eine Nation am gründlichsten, wenn man ihr Gedächtnis und ihre Geschichte auslöscht" (GI1

---

56 ("My main interest when writing plays is to destroy things [. . .] German history was another obsession and I have tried to destroy this obsession, this whole structure. I believe my strongest impulse is to reduce things to their skeleton, to rip away their flesh and exterior. Then one is done with them.")
Therefore, he did not shy away from presenting those historical figures which, in his view, had a particularly debilitating effect on the German nation, especially the Prussian monarch Frederick II and the Nazi dictator Hitler. In order to accomplish his task, Müller presented historical events in such a way -- using the techniques of *Zusammenschieben der Epoche*, *Zeitraffer*, and *Anachronismus* ("telescoping of an epoch," "compacting of time," and "anachronism," respectively) -- that the past blends with the present to create a future-oriented view. He explains:


Examples for his technique can be found in *Germania Tod*: Hitler as a vampire threatening the activist being honored for his efforts at building up the GDR in "Brandenburg Concert 2"; and the Nibelung warriors who appear at the battle of Stalingrad alongside the German soldiers and officers, followed by the appearance of Caesar and Napoleon in "Tribute to Stalin 1"; and Rosa Luxemburg appearing to Hilse in the final scene. In the opening scene of *Germania 3*, Müller places Thälmann and Ulbricht at the Berlin Wall while they discuss its fall, yet guards are shooting at GDR citizens attempting to flee over the Wall to the West; and in "The Measures Taken 1956", Müller includes historical events into one scene which actually occurred either earlier or later in time, such as Harich's arrest and Brecht's death.

57 ("People should have access to their own historical background. The memory of a nation should not be extinguished. One kills a nation most thoroughly by extinguishing its memory and its history.")  
58 ("One conclusion is [. . .] that one telescopes the epochs, viewing history, the historical past, in a type of compacting of time. With that comes the question, if nowadays one needs anachronism for the Geschichtsdrama. [. . .] I believe [. . .] that one cannot write about history anymore without anachronisms. I mean, being able to write about history, so that the description is future-oriented.")
Müller's use of anachronism in both of these dramas focuses on depicting events and persons from German history and their ultimate effect on the creation, development, and eventual downfall of the GDR and the possible repercussions for Germany's future. In the following quote Müller does not refer directly to history, but it is implied in the context:


Here again, as in the above quote, he uses the technique of personification but he is now referring to the "project" i.e., play or more specifically, Geschichtsdrama, which is based on historical events and his own memories. His reference to the completed "project" as a "corpse" from which he has been freed by the act of writing could be interpreted as the memories which haunted him and about which he wrote. The implication is that Müller preferred to write about German history rather than talk about it as a means of catharsis. In Rotwelsch, Lotringer supports the claim that Müller wrote about history in order to free himself from the past as well as to free the past from the present and future: "[. . .] er will die (vor allem: deutsche) Geschichte 'bis auf die Knochen freilegen, um zu verhindern, daß in Schuld und Unterdrückung das Verbrechen überlebt' " (84). Müller's interest in writing about German history was to expose it down to its skeleton or bones because it is through guilt and suppression that the crime itself survives. The crime must be exorcised, so that it cannot occur again in the future, possibly under different circumstances: it does not mean that the memory of the crime should be erased, but rather its presence as a threatening possibility must be eradicated. The crime mentioned here could be interpreted as the acts of violence perpetrated in the name of a state or a party: Nazi crimes under the Nazi dictatorship and

---

59(" Whenever one talks about a project prematurely, one loses the impulse to actually write down the text. And when it is done, then it is as if one were referring to a corpse, a dead body. Through writing I get rid of them.")

60("He wants to expose history (especially German history) 'down to its skeleton in order to prevent the crime from surviving as guilt and suppression.'")
crimes during the Communist dictatorship in the GDR; the terror that pitted brother against brother and created millions of victims. Müller implies in the above quotes the hope that he could rid himself of his obsession about German history if he could break it down and expose its structure. But the question remains if Müller ever got over this obsession: it is doubtful given that his final play is also concerned with German history and the future of Germany and German identity. As a writer in the classical sense, Müller was interested in finding a universal truth, as writers have done before him throughout the ages. Thus, although influenced by Müller's autobiography, his *Geschichtsdramen* have their own dynamics and should be interpreted within the confines of the genre as such.

### II.6.2 Müller's Views about the *Geschichtsdrama*

Müller's preference for writing plays was appropriate to his self-declared obsession with German history and his interest in contemporary political and social events: this genre proved to be optimally suited to this task. In addition, the characteristics of a play were more appropriate to his personality than prose, as he admitted: "Beim Prosaschreiben ist man ganz allein. Man kann sich nicht verstecken" (GI1 93).\(^{61}\) He did not feel comfortable writing prose because he had the feeling that it did not offer him enough protection i.e., his opinions would have been exposed and could have gotten him into trouble. If he had written prose texts, he would not have been able to express his views freely and intuitively, as he could through the medium of dialogue. In creating dialogue to be spoken by historical figures, he was uninhibited: "Beim Stückeschreiben hat man immer Masken und Rollen, und man kann durch sie sprechen. Deshalb ziehe ich Drama vor - wegen der Masken. Ich kann das eine sagen, und ich kann das Gegenteil sagen" (GI1 94).\(^ {62}\) Writing plays gave him the added advantage of showing different angles of the same story. By letting his characters speak for him, he was able to express various viewpoints without necessarily giving away exactly which one was

\(^{61}\)("When writing prose one is all alone. One cannot hide oneself.")

\(^{62}\)"
his own, an important aspect considering censorship in the GDR. As a politically aware playwright, Müller used the technique of masks not only to protect himself, but simultaneously as a forum to present and explore the political and social conditions in the GDR as he perceived them.

Müller, because of his own idiosyncratic definition of the genre, did not care much for the concept of Geschichtsdrama. In his opinion every drama has in it the element of being timely or contemporary and can, therefore, be classified in this category: "Geschichtsdrama ist ein Begriff, mit dem ich praktisch nicht viel anfangen kann, weil vom Theater her gesehen jedes Drama ein Gegenwarts- und damit ein Geschichtsdrama ist" ("Geschichte und Drama" 48). The reason Müller gives for his opinion is that the audience, as well as the author who wrote it, automatically put the play into a context based on their life and their historical situation. This certainly does not hold true for all plays since many are neither timely nor contemporary, nor does their plot revolve around historical events or a historical character which is the main prerequisite for a Geschichtsdrama. In Heiner Müller: Apokalypse und Utopie, Norbert Otto Eke stresses the prevalence of history in Müller's plays which mirrors the urgent aspect of his dramatic art (15) and corresponds to Müller's views of depicting historical events. For Müller, writing about history meant writing about his own times and contemporary events which is, however, essentially the function of a play of this genre. Even though he himself did not like to be defined as an author of a specific literary genre -- a dislike he shares with many authors who feel constrained by such a classification -- he did write Geschichtsdramen and may, therefore, be called a playwright of Geschichtsdramen in spite of himself.

62 ("When writing plays one always has masks and roles and can speak through them. That is why I prefer drama - because of the masks. I can say one thing and I can say the opposite.")

63 ("The concept "Geschichtsdrama" is one to which I really can't relate because looking at drama from the theatrical perspective, every play is about the present and is therefore a "Geschichtsdrama.")
Another reason he gave for his reluctance to refer specifically to the genre is that events move very quickly in this modern age which results in situations that are rapidly changing and altering their form. He states:


Again, Müller totally misses the point: writing a Geschichtsdrama does not mean that the playwright tries to recreate history on the stage. The historical events are the material with which he works but he presents his own interpretation and does not have to describe exactly ("sauber abschildern") the historical characters and the sequence of events. Secondly, time is always fleeting and progressing at a rapid pace, as the Romans already noticed: Tempus fugit. At the time Gryphius wrote his drama about Cromwell and King Charles, Ermordete Majestät oder Carolus Stuardus in 1657, events were moving as quickly as they are today. These historical events had taken place in 1649 and already almost a decade had passed between the time in which events actually occurred and the year the drama was available to the public. Grabbe also altered his Napoleon as European events changed dramatically before he had time to publish it. And thirdly, it is not the task or mission of an author to present a solution to a problem or situation he is treating in a play: he is neither a prophet nor a statesman. If he

---

64("That has to do with my definition of history perhaps. I no longer believe that one can take one's time today and work with past historical material because time is urgently pressing. Very decisive solutions must be found very quickly now for problems which perhaps cannot be solved any longer in fifty years. And I would consider
should offer a solution -- which is his prerogative -- it is just as valid or invalid as that of any other person. What Müller apparently means is that specific problems which existed during his time might no longer be problems fifty years later, as ironically, has proven true for the GDR and the problems of development he wrote about in his plays in the 1950s, for example. Müller's Marxist view of the concept of history was such that historical events and persons were part of a larger historical picture. Therefore, he did not consider them important enough to have a Geschichtdrama written only about one event or one individual. His play, Leben Gundlings is an excellent example to substantiate his view: as the title indicates, it is not only about one person, rather reflects the effects various persons from different given time periods had on events in the overall scheme of German history.

Like Sengle and Viëtor, Müller also perceived the relationship between Germany's development as a unified, sovereign nation and the evolution of the Geschichtdrama. Referring to their interconnectedness Müller said:

Es gab immer eine Diskrepanz zwischen Stoff und Form. Ganz anders als bei Shakespeare, der eine nationale Geschichte hatte als Voraussetzung. Es gab in Deutschland keinen nationalen Stoff, weil es keine Nation gab. Das war in Frankreich auch wieder anders. Da gab es eine Nation, deshalb gab es die Möglichkeit, mit antiken Modellen nationale Stoffe zu erzählen. Das gab's in Deutschland aber nie (Ortolani 74).

This lack of unity and stability haunted the German political landscape for centuries and strongly affected the literary landscape as well. In his two "Germania" plays Müller combines various elements and persons in a long chain of historical events to express his ideas about

---

65 ("There was always a discrepancy between subject matter and form. Very different than with Shakespeare, who had a national history as a pre-condition. In Germany there was no national subject matter, because there was no nation. That was different in France as well. There a nation existed, therefore, the possibility was present to tell a national story using ancient subject matter. But that was never a possibility in Germany.")
Germany, nationalism, and German identity. This unconventional, modern playwright did not choose one individual to write about, as was the habit of earlier German writers, such as Schiller's *Wallenstein* or *Maria Stuart* (1801) or Kleist's *Homburg*: rather, his presentation resembles that of Büchner's in *Dantons Tod* or Hauptmann's in *Die Weber*. Whereas Schiller and Kleist stress the individual, Büchner and Hauptmann concentrate on depicting the masses, and Müller, using Marxist terminology, focuses on the proletariat. In addition, Müller shares with Büchner the technique of representing a broad variety of persons from various classes but with a special emphasis on the ordinary man, the common people in the so-called *Volksszenen* ("folk scenes"). Müller's main focus, however, as the term in the title of both plays indicates, is specifically on "Germania" meaning Germany: but not just the nation of his present day, rather the concept of Germany, its development, and how it became a divided country. In this way his two plays at the center of this study stand apart from earlier *Geschichtsdramen* by other German authors and are decidedly unique. This specific dramatic form gave Müller the opportunity to express his views about historical events while at the same time enabling him to explore various possible reasons for certain actions and responses by a broad array of individuals. Whether he believed in the literary term or not, the fact remains that he did write *Geschichtsdramen*: he used historical persons and events in a very specific manner to relate the past to the present, thereby conveying a message for the future.

A closing quote here by Müller explicitly defines his views on the importance of drama as a means of communication and interaction:

[. . .] Aber die Zustände sind ja nur die Anlässe, um Leute zueinander in Beziehung zu bringen, in irgendeine Konfliktbeziehung, und sie reflektieren zu lassen über Möglichkeiten, diese Zustände zu handhaben oder zu verändern. In meinem Stück *Der Bau* zum Beispiel ist der Anlaß absolut lächerlich, genauso belanglos wie die Schlachten im *Homburg*. Das Kraftwerk, das gebaut wird, ist nur da, um die Leute
auspacken zu lassen, was sie so auf dem Herzen oder im Kopf haben. Und das ist 
überhaupt, was Dramatik lebendig hält, wenn sie lebendig bleibt: dieses Kontinuum 
der menschlichen Existenz. [. . . ] Das ist der lebendige Kern bei jedem 
Theaterstück ("Geschichte und Drama" 51). 66

The purpose of a play is to offer the public or society the opportunity to observe how the 
characters on stage, who have been placed in a given setting -- and in a Geschichtsdrama in a 
given historical situation -- react. As Aristotle and Lessing wrote centuries earlier, the basic 
premise of a drama has not changed; only the style and theatrical techniques. A drama 
functions as a message-bearer and as such is a dynamic, vital force. If history's purpose were 
to destroy human relationships, as Müller maintained, 67 then theater's purpose is to 
reestablish these relationships and allow the human continuum to proceed and further 
develop.

Even though this genre has evolved since the eighteenth century, the themes and 
characters chosen by the authors for their respective Geschichtsdramen have remained fairly 
constant: war, soldiers, officers, the Volk or nation, a nation's fate, an individual's destiny, the 
history of a nation intertwined with the personal history of an individual, honor, and death. 
Death has always played a pivotal role in dramas of this genre and is a central element in the 
Geschichtsdramen of Müller as well. An individual's death, personal losses, and tragedies are 
seen as part of the broader view of world history: whether destiny, fate or coincidence, a great 
man (in some instances a great woman) is always an object of history, being acted upon by 
history: a victim of circumstances, of fate, of destiny. But in that brief moment of time in 
history, when events occur that touch an individual's life, that person must react -- then and

66("But the circumstances are only the occasions for bringing people together in some relational conflict, and to 
let them reflect on the possibilities for dealing with or for changing these circumstances. In my play The 
Construction for example, the occasion is absolutely ridiculous, just as insignificant as the battles in Homburg. 
The power station which is being constructed is only present so that people can express what is in their hearts or 
in their minds. And that is the thing which keeps dramatic art alive, if it remains alive: this continuum of human 
existence [. . . ] That is the living soul of every play.")
only then is he acting as a subject. Either the given individual shows greatness of spirit, even though perhaps doomed to die, or the individual is left to lament his ignoble fate. In either case, after that one point of acting as a subject, the individual returns to his role as an object as time moves on and history forgets about him: only historians take note of that person and sometimes the authors of Geschichtsdramen. The author is interested in portraying the historical character of a given person: Schiller, for example, believed in the nobility of man and idealized him; whereas Grabbe believed it is history that made Napoleon great, not Napoleon himself. Benjamin's angel of history, who is witness to the general human suffering from afar, sees neither human greatness nor heavenly intervention in history: he sees only the destruction left behind by the pernicious deeds of man: the acts of man which comprise historical events. The writer of a Geschichtsdrama, however, takes a closer look at one specific event and person from the past in his search for the inviolate human spirit. He attempts to put tragic events into terms others can understand; to make sense of the tragedy, the death and destruction; to find a general truth or higher purpose. Mankind has always had the desire to know what will happen in the future and looking to the past is the next best thing: perhaps one can learn something from the past to help with the present and thus improve the future. Müller's use of drama, therefore, combined with his choice of German historical subject matter led him to create two enduring dramas, Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann, which would speak to present and future generations and more importantly, would allow readers and audiences to formulate their own ideas about German history and German identity. Müller's obsession with German history, coupled with his impulse to reduce things to their simplest form in order to be done with them, produced these very interesting yet complex Geschichtsdramen, in which he exhibits his intense and complex relationship with German history as well as offering new insights into German

67 See Chapter One, page 11.
identity following the aftermath of World War II and reunification in 1990, respectively. In the next chapter, I discuss the origins of these two dramas, including the social, economic, and political background at the time Müller wrote and published each of them.
III. Origins of Müller's Geschichtsdramen:

Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann

III.1 Exposition

Motto:
"Meine Hoffnung ist eine Welt,
in der Stücke wie Germania Tod in Berlin
nicht mehr geschrieben werden können,
weil die Wirklichkeit das Material dafür nicht mehr bereithält."¹

After the defeat of the German armed forces and the end of the Third Reich, it seemed that German citizens could again speak freely, and authors could again write freely; or could they? Germany was no longer a free, sovereign nation, rather every aspect of German political, social, and cultural life was controlled by the Besatzungsmächte ("occupation forces") who emphasized denazification and reeducation of all German citizens. The concept of Stunde Null ("zero hour") that was born with Germany's defeat by the Allied Forces and christened by the official end of the Second World War on 8 May 1945 resulted in apprehension and uncertainty about the future of the German nation. The mood in the country at that time was one of confusion concerning German identity and indeed fear for its very survival and future existence. Having been divided into four occupation zones by the controlling powers, Germany's fear of losing its sovereignty was not without reason, in the same way that the German citizens' concern of perhaps forever losing their identity was equally justified.

Between 1945 and 1949 the ideological differences between the United States and the Soviet Union caused an estrangement of the wartime allies and led to the development of the Cold War. As a result, in 1949 two ideologically different states were established and the once...

¹ ("My hope is a world where plays like Germania Death in Berlin can no longer be written because reality no longer provides their subject matter.") The next line is: "In diesem Sinne danke ich der Stadt Mülheim für den Preis." ("With this in mind I thank the city of Mülheim for its prize.") The above quote was part of his thank you speech upon receiving the Dramatikerpreis ("Dramatists Prize") from the city of Mülheim in 1979 for Germania Tod in Berlin and is taken from: Theatertoday, 10/1979 (Velber: Friedrich, 1979) 14. See also: Frankfurter Rundschau 1979/13.9. The English translation of this quote is taken from: Heiner Müller, "Mülheim Address” Explosion of a Memory: Writings, ed. and trans. Carl Weber (New York: PAJ Publications, 1989) 89-92.
The United Nations was divided into the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in May and October, respectively. The rebuilding of German society, economy, and cities occurring in both the FRG and the GDR was accompanied by the reconstruction of German identity which, however, was developing along different paths. Writers who had lived in exile during the Third Reich as well as some of those who considered themselves members of the innere Emigration ("inner emigration") assembled in October 1947 in Berlin to voice their concerns about the state of the German language and literature and thus the literary forum, Gruppe 47 ("Group 47") was formed. Even among these German writers, however, differences of opinion seemed to be based upon differences in political ideology. In his essay, "Divergence and Convergence: An Outline of Literary Developments in the Two German States", Ralf Schnell refers to this meeting as little more than: "a harbinger of the process of division" (298). Declared Marxists, such as the authors Johannes R. Becher, Bertolt Brecht, Anna Seghers, and Friedrich Wolf, expressed their desire and choice to reside in the GDR. In 1950 der Deutsche Schriftstellerverband (German Writers' Association") or DSV was established in the GDR under the direction of the governmental Kulturbund ("cultural coalition"). In May 1952 at the 3. Schriftstellerkongreß ("Third Writers' Congress") the DSV was founded: it was supported by the government for the purpose of furthering Socialist Realism and the role of the working class in literature. Its primary practical function, however, was to maintain control over the GDR authors, and particularly to monitor the literary as well as political content of their texts. The DSV developed its own monthly journal entitled, Neue Deutsche Literatur or ndl, which appeared alongside the other major literary forum in the GDR, Sinn und Form, published bi-monthly by the Akademie der Künste. Whereas both publications, still in existence today, carefully upheld the interests of

---

2Originally established by the Prussian Elector Friedrich III of Brandenburg, later the Prussian King Friedrich I, it developed heightened status during the age of Enlightenment under Friedrich Wilhelm II. During the Weimar Republic it housed the artistic intelligence of Germany until its evolution was halted by the Nazis during the thirties. In 1950 an East Berlin Academy was established, and in 1954 a West Berlin Academy. Müller was elected President of the former in 1990. Finally, in 1993, the two Academies were united.
the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands ("Socialist Unity Party") or SED, Sinn und Form was more intellectual and liberal than ndl (Emmerich 444) and, therefore, enjoyed a more elevated literary status.³

The construction of the Berlin Wall in August of 1961 literally cemented the physical break between the two Germanies, and their divergent ideologies would become increasingly apparent in the respective national literatures as well. Heiner Müller referred to the culmination of these political and historical events in the title of his play as the "death of Germany in Berlin": it was in this atmosphere of confusion coupled with renewal that he began writing Germania Tod in Berlin. The sense of confusion resulted from the ideological differences surfacing which caused Germans to question their values, expectations, and identity given the utter failure of the German leadership both leading up to Hitler and during the Third Reich. The emerging political boundaries developing in the form of the Cold War further added to the feeling of confusion. The concept of renewal, on the contrary, reflects the Germans' desire to make a new start, begin with a tabula rasa, following the downfall of the Third Reich and to avoid the political mistakes of Germany's recent past. The motto by Müller from 1979 introducing this chapter clearly expresses his hope for the future of Germany and especially for the GDR at that time, but the path to this future was clouded by the German past, as Müller demonstrates in this play. As a literary product of the post-World War II era and the subsequent division of Germany into two separate nations, not only does Germania Tod reflect the current mood at the time he started writing it, but it also serves as a Zeitraffler ("compacting of time") (GI1 36) for German identity covering the span of German historical progress dating back to Germanic times and up through the fifties in the twentieth

³Other literary publications of the GDR include: Weimarer Beiträge, Zeitschrift für Germanistik,, Sonntag, and Theater der Zeit. Another literary organization is "PEN", the acronym for: "Poets, Essayists and Novelists" which was internationally established in 1921; J.R. Becher founded the German "PEN-Zentrum" in 1947. In 1949 it was divided into two organizations, one in West Germany and one in East Germany, respectively. Even after reunification, the PEN-Zentrum of the GDR was initially interested in maintaining an East German identity (Emmerich 455), and the two separate groups did not officially join together until October 1995.
century GDR. The situation faced by Germans caught in the middle between East and West, i.e., between the two major world powers, the USA and the Soviet Union, reflects the ideological and economic struggle between the socio-political ideologies of capitalism and communism which found its expression in the Cold War. The following section presents a brief overview of the political situation from 1956 until 1977 and how events during this time period affected the literary situation and the writer, Heiner Müller.

III.2 A New Era Begins with the Division of Germany:

Political and Literary Aspects of Life in the GDR

Müller wrote the conceptual scenes for *Germania Tod* in 1956, but did not complete the play until 1971. It took another six years until it was published in a Sonderheft ("special edition") of the literary periodical *Theater heute* and simultaneously in West Berlin as a book, *Rotbuch* 176. The year 1956 was witness to various significant East European (Soviet and German i.e., GDR) events: the XX. Parteitag ("Twentieth Plenary Session") of the Soviet Union's Communist Party in which the deceased Stalin was criticized. After the Soviet dictator was officially dethroned both politically and ideologically at the Plenary Session, a process now known as "de-Stalinization", historians were encouraged to reexamine Stalinist interpretations of history (Dorpalen 320); the situation for writers, however, was still precarious. The Hungarian revolution the same year was crushed by the Soviet army, which clearly demonstrated that the Soviet empire was not willing to relinquish its hegemony and control over its satellite states, nor was it prepared to give up its ideological supremacy and authority over the intellectual life of the population of these states. This is readily apparent by even a cursory glance at the literary life in the GDR. In *Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Literatur seit 1945*, Ralf Schnell lists three aspects which dominated the cultural and literary policies in the GDR starting in the 1950s and lasting throughout most of its existence which show the Soviet influence: 1) the fight against formalism; 2) the doctrine of Socialist Realism
and; 3) the preservation and cultivation of the classical heritage (117). Because formalism stressed the form of a literary work in its analysis rather than its underlying or expressed ideology, it did not find favor with the GDR government. The preferred literary style was Socialist Realism, which did not allow for experimental theater or for individualism (Wilpert 767). Germany's cultural heritage, especially the legacy left by but not limited to the classics of Goethe and Schiller, played an important role in the GDR Kulturpolitik. In his essay, "Literature without Taboos: Writers in East Germany since 1971", Hamish Reid points out similar aspects affecting GDR literature: 1) the Cold War; 2) Socialist Realism and; 3) the affirmation of the values of Germany's cultural past, namely: the culture and literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (102). Schnell lists exclusively literary characteristics; whereas Reid also includes the political aspect of the Cold War. Schnell continues:

Dabei war von entscheidendem Einfluß für die 50er Jahre die marxistische Literaturtheorie, die der ungarische Philosoph Georg Lukács bereits während der Zeit seines Moskauer Exils, in den 30er Jahren also, im Auftrag der KPdSU entworfen und begründet hatte. Lukács' Zentralbegriff heißt "Widerspiegelung"

[. . .] Das Kunstwerk hat - so der an Hegel wie an Lenin geschulte ungarische Marxist - die Aufgabe, die "Totalität des Lebens" in "allen wesentlichen, objektiven Bestimmungen" aufzudecken (117).!

An important concept in Lukács' theory of reflection or mimesis is the emphasis on "objective" as opposed to "subjective" elements. Müller's style of expression tended more towards the latter and was, therefore, not in accordance with Soviet literary doctrine.

Although Müller had developed the concept for this Geschichtsdrama in the mid-1950s, he did not complete it at that time because he justifiably believed that it would not be

---

4 Theater heute, Jahrbuch, 1976/77.
5 ("In this respect, of decisive influence for the 1950s was the Marxist literary theory, which the Hungarian philosopher Georg Lukács had developed and established at the request of the KPdSU already during the period of his Moscow exile in the 1930s. Lukács primary concept is called "reflection" [. . .] The mission of the work
published or staged given the demands and expectations of the SED in the fifties and sixties. As he said: "Mit Germania habe ich 1956 angefangen, das heißt, auch hier sind die ersten Szenen ziemlich alt, ich habe sie später nur zusammengestrichen" (KoS 254). Even before he wrote the scenes for Germania Tod, he had started another Geschichtsdrama in 1951 entitled, Die Schlacht ("The Battle") subtitled, Szenen aus Deutschland ("Scenes from Germany"), which he did not complete until 1974. These two plays are similar in style, format, and content: each consists primarily of graphic, violent short scenes which focus on specific moments in German history with an emphasis on the struggle between fascism versus communism. Müller offered the following reason for the delay in the completion of these two early plays: "In den 50er Jahren hatte ich kein Instrumentarium, das in eine Theaterform zu bringen, bzw. in der DDR kein Theater dafür. Die herrschende Ästhetik war Stanislawski, Lukács" (KoS 253). The Soviet literary influence at that time was so strong that Müller, whose style reflected characteristics of the avant-garde and the postmodernists rather than that of the accepted Russian literary style of social realism, had no chance of having his works, Die Schlacht and Germania Tod, performed on a GDR stage. The aesthetic theory of Lukács and the theatrical conventions expounded by Stanislawski, which concentrated on presenting a Marxist truth to the audience by using classical plays and storylines in a traditional way, were at odds with Müller's unorthodox and deliberately shocking style. According to Wolfgang Emmerich in Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR, the Soviet influence was a decisive factor in those early years of the GDR theater. He writes:

In der Regie- und Schauspielkunst folgten die führenden Leute der ersten Jahre (Maxim Vallentin, Gustav von Wangenheim) Methoden des sowjetischen Theatermachers K. S. Stanislawski, dessen höchstes Ziel auf dem Theater die

---

6 ("I started with Germania in 1956, which means that here also the first scenes are rather old, later I only had to condense them.")

7 ("The Soviet literary influence at that time was so strong that Müller, whose style reflected characteristics of the avant-garde and the postmodernists rather than that of the accepted Russian literary style of social realism, had no chance of having his works, Die Schlacht and Germania Tod, performed on a GDR stage. The aesthetic theory of Lukács and the theatrical conventions expounded by Stanislawski, which concentrated on presenting a Marxist truth to the audience by using classical plays and storylines in a traditional way, were at odds with Müller's unorthodox and deliberately shocking style. According to Wolfgang Emmerich in Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR, the Soviet influence was a decisive factor in those early years of the GDR theater. He writes:

In der Regie- und Schauspielkunst folgten die führenden Leute der ersten Jahre (Maxim Vallentin, Gustav von Wangenheim) Methoden des sowjetischen Theatermachers K. S. Stanislawski, dessen höchstes Ziel auf dem Theater die")
>>Wahrheit der Empfindung<<, die Präsentation einer >>neuen Wahrhaftigkeit<< in der Schauspielkunst war. Diese psycho-physische Technik der Darstellung von Emotionen, Leidenschaften, Konflikten und Taten auf der Bühne sollte, angewendet auf die besten Stücke der Klassiker (z.B. Shakespeares >>Hamlet<<), nicht nur individuelle, sondern auch gesellschaftliche Wahrheit offenbar machen und damit erzieherisch wirken (96). ⁸

Following the guidelines set by Socialist Realism, the primary goal of the theater was to be didactic and pedagogical, to present the public with societal i.e., communist values which could be applied to everyday life. Although Lukács ultimately lost favor with the GDR government after 1956 due to his participation in the Hungarian uprising of the same year, it took a longer period of time for his influence on literature to fade.

Emmerich also points out that Lukács and Stanislavski, however, were not the only forces at work in the theater: "Sicherlich, die Theater widmeten sich nicht nur dem kulturellen Erbe im Geiste der psychologisierenden Stanislavski-Schule. Antifaschistische Zeitstücke und Geschichtsdramen wurden gefordert und, sofern sie entstanden, auch gespielt“ (96-97). ⁹ Primarily exile literature which focused on the struggle against the Nazis and their racist policies and inhuman attitudes, such as Friedrich Wolf's drama, Professor Mamlock (1933), was put on stage (Emmerich 97). Müller's scenes for Germania Tod, with their violent, vulgar actions and ambiguous portrayal of the Nazis and the Communists, are not educational in the Communist sense, as is his "production" play, Der Lohndrücker (1956) and

---

⁷("In the 1950s I had no means (instrument/tool) to bring that into a theatrical form, respectively in the GDR no theater for it. The dominant aesthetics were <those of> Stanislavski, Lukács.")
⁸("In the art of directing and acting, the leading persons of the early years (Maxim Vallentin, Gustav von Wangenheim) followed the methods of the Soviet theater-director K. S. Stanislavski, whose main goal in the theater was the "truth of empathy", the presentation of a "new veracity" in dramatic art. This psycho-physical technique of representing emotions, passions, conflicts, and actions on the stage, applied to the best dramas of the classical authors (for example, Shakespeare's Hamlet), should unveil not only an individual, but also the social truth and thus have a pedagogical function."")
⁹("Certainly, the theater was not only dedicated to the cultural heritage in the spirit of the psychological view of the Stanislavski-school. Anti-fascist period plays and Geschichtsdramen were requested as well and, in so much as they were created, were also performed.")
his revised version of *Die Korrektur* (1957), for example. Due to their compliance with the acceptable literary norms, these plays were well-received by the party functionaries and earned Müller and his wife Inge the "Heinrich Mann Prize" in 1959. The diatribes and vituperations on historical Germany found in *Germania Tod*, however, are directed at the underlying customs, beliefs, and political systems of the German past, which, in Müller's opinion, eventually led to the rise of Hitler and his party during the Weimar Republic and the subjugation of the KPD to Stalin and the Soviet Union in the Soviet occupation zone and later the GDR. Thus this "Germania" play did not comply with the literary-political standards dominant in the GDR at that time and, therefore, could not be completed until those policies changed in the early seventies. Not even his play, *Zehn Tage, die die Welt erschütterten* ("Ten days which shook the world"), which he co-authored with Hagen Stahl, exhibited the type of propaganda the Ulbricht government was looking for to further establish its own brand of GDR-*Kulturpolitik*. Hermand discusses Müller's early play in his article, "Zehn Tage, die die Welt erschütterten: Müllers Bekenntnis zu Lenin". He writes that the authors tried to look critically at the course of the revolution:

> [. . .] wollten Müller und Stahl ihrem Stück durch deutliche Bezüge auf die inneren Konflikte der DDR eine nicht zu übersehende aktuelle Note geben, indem sie nicht den endgültigen Sieg oder Revolution, sondern den schwierigen, ja geradezu aufreibenden Kampf [. . .] in den Mittelpunkt rückten (103).10

The emphasis in this play is on the reality of the struggles among various groups inside the party vying for power rather than on the ultimate success of the revolution; therefore, it could not be viewed as a propaganda play for the GDR government. However, the feeling that Müller and Stahl were siding with Lenin and his idea of a "dictatorship of the proletariat" (Hermand "Zehn Tage" 104) led to Müller's problems with the Ulbricht leadership. After the

---

10("Müller and Stahl wanted to give their play an obvious current flair through clear connections to the internal conflicts in the GDR, by not putting the final victory or revolution in the central position, rather the difficult, indeed, downright exhausting struggle.")
1961 premiere of Die Umsiedlerin oder Das Leben auf dem Lande ("The settler or life in the country") which he rewrote and renamed Die Bauern ("The peasants") in 1964, Müller was expelled from the DSV and was not reinstated again until 1988. This play, with its references to the tyrannical Prussian heritage still present in the "new" German nation of the GDR, elements of which are also present in Germania Tod, was perceived as too radical and too dangerous by the party functionaries. In particular, his description of the birth of the GDR was considered radical and vulgar. Thus Müller became a "Dramatiker ohne Bühne" ("dramatist without a stage") until the early seventies and the premiere of Zement (Emmerich 158). Without membership in the DSV and the accompanying assigned Steuernummer ("individual tax code"), an author was not eligible to receive social benefits such as medical care, pension, and vacation opportunites. Exclusion from this organization also generally resulted in difficulties relating to publication which further resulted in overall isolation for the author. In 1973 the DSV changed its title to Schriftstellerverband der DDR or SSV but its main function as a literary watchdog remained until its abolishment in 1990. In 1965 at the SED's Eleventh Plenum or Plenary Session of the Central Committee, which is known for its intense criticism of German cultural life, Müller was strongly reprimanded and his play, Der Bau ("The construction site"), with its realistic depiction of the discrepancies present in the economic and social development of the GDR, was banned. As a result of these continuing political and ideological differences and harassment, Müller, according to Hermand: ". . .] igelte sich in den letzten Jahren der Ulbricht-Ära mehr und mehr in einer Lebensform ein, die fast einer Inneren Emigration glich, aus der er erst nach dem Regierungsantritt Erich

---

11 "Die neue Zeit -- die Spätgeburt, in letzter / Minute und mit fremdem Bajonett / Der Mutter aus dem kranken Leib geschnitten --"[. . .] / So sah sie aus, die neue / Zeit: nackt, wie Neugeborene immer, naß / von Mutterblut -- / Beschissen auch" (50). Die Umsiedlerin oder Das Leben auf dem Lande. Texte 3. (West Berlin: Rotbuch, 1975) 19-111. ("The new era -- the delayed birth, at the last / minute and with a foreign bayonet / Cut out of the mother's sick womb -- [. . .] / That's what it looked like, the new / time: naked, as newborns always are, wet / from mother's blood -- / shitty also").
During these years Müller turned to writing plays based on the Greek classics, while he waited for a change in the political and literary climates.

A decade after the initial construction of the Berlin Wall, the year 1971 brought significant change to the GDR literary scene. When Ulbricht stepped down and Honecker took over as leader of the SED in 1971, the general impression was that cultural policy would finally be able to breathe a bit more easily as the "tight controls and repressive tactics" of the former would be replaced by a "more relaxed literary landscape" under the latter as Carol Anne Costabile-Heming writes in: "Texts and Contexts: GDR Literature during the 1970s" (36). At the Sixteenth Plenum or Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the SED on 3 May 1971, "the Ulbricht era had come to an end" as Alexander Stephan writes in his article, "Cultural Politics in the GDR under Erich Honecker" (31). In stark contrast to Ulbricht's cultural policies, Honecker's administration now encouraged writers to experiment with new forms and to engage in a "schöpferischen Meinungsstreit" ("creative discussion") (GDR Monitor 2 Appendix 125). Reid writes about this changing political climate and the developing international relations in 1971:

So much for the pre-1970 taboos. As we see, they related both to themes and to styles of writing. In June 1971 the Eighth Party Congress of the SED took place. Erich Honecker, the man who had led the witchhunt against Biermann and Co. in 1965, had taken over from Walter Ulbricht as First Secretary and de facto Head of State. The GDR was on the brink of a breakthrough in international relations, which was to lead to full diplomatic recognition by the West and membership of the United Nations in 1973. A new image was required (102).

---

12("Müller isolated himself more and more during the last years of the Ulbricht era and assumed a lifestyle that could almost be compared to an "inner emigration", from which he emerged again only after Erich Honecker acceded to leadership.")
After two decades of existence, the GDR was experiencing a political evolution: the Ulbricht-era was finally ending. Tight restrictions and total control were being replaced by more open policies which, though not complete, provided a brief respite as well as hope for Müller. Honecker repudiated the former policies of his predecessor when he said: "Wenn man von der festen Position des Sozialismus ausgeht, kann es meines Erachtens auf dem Gebiet von Kunst und Literatur keine Tabus geben" (Reid 125).\(^\text{13}\) The belief or hope for greater artistic freedom, created in part by Honecker himself in what is referred to as his "no taboos" speech, was eventually belied by subsequent repressive actions of the Party against those writers felt to have gone beyond the acceptable standards set by Honecker's new cultural policy. Although a certain amount of increased tolerance and some concessions had been granted the GDR writers overall, particularly more freedom to publish in the West, by the mid-seventies writers again experienced governmental repression, exemplified by the expulsion of Reiner Kunze from the SSV and the forced expatriation from the GDR in 1976 of Wolf Biermann, who had moved from Hamburg to the GDR in 1953 because of his strong socialist and Marxist beliefs. Müller, along with other leading GDR authors,\(^\text{14}\) included his name on an official petition to have Biermann reinstated, but to no avail: sanctions and further restrictions followed, with the result that there was a mass exodus of GDR authors to the FRG.

**III.3 Origins of *Germania Tod in Berlin***

Fifteen years after Müller had written the initial scenes for *Germania Tod*, the situation in the GDR, both politically and culturally, had evolved but only to the extent that Müller could finish this play, although in spite of these new developments it would not be performed in the GDR until 1989. In the FRG, however, it enjoyed its premiere in 1978, one year following its already mentioned publication in *Theater heute*. Ernst Wendt, who

\(^{13}\) ("If one proceeds from an established position of Socialism, then there can be, in my opinion, no taboos in the area of art and literature.")

\(^{14}\) The other signatories of the "Biermann-Resolution" dated 17 November 1976 include: Sarah Kirsch, Christa Wolf, Volker Braun, Fritz Cremer (sculptor), Franz Fühmann, Stephan Hermlin, Stefan Heym, Günter Kunert, Rolf Schneider, Gerhard Wolf, and Jurek Becker.
produced and directed its premiere in the Münchener Kammerspiele on 20 April 1978, believes that this play, as well as some other prose texts by Müller, reflect his efforts to delve into the German psyche. He writes that this play is Müller's attempt to discover:

[. . .] wer wir sind; woher wir kommen; in was wir verstrickt sind; was wir versäumt haben oder schon wieder zu verspielen uns aufmachen. Müller höhnt darin alle Tugenden, die von den Nationalideologen als der deutschen schönste und ureigenste gefeiert worden sind: Treue, Gehorsam, Pflichterfüllung, Mannesmut und Ritterlichkeit. Er entblößt denen, die so gern als Nibelungen sich spiegeln, die wahre Fratze [. . .] (Wendt 260-263).

Müller's primary interest, according to Wendt, was to use the past in order to discover what it means to be German from a German's point of view: to find out who the Germans are, where they come from, and where they are going. In other words: the past, present, and future of German identity. These timeframes are important elements which contribute to a citizen's sense of national identity. They acquired an increased significance for German citizens given the legacy of Hitler and the National-Socialist regime after World War II and the subsequent division of Germany. The virtues listed in the above quote had been praised and put to a perverted use most recently by the Nazis as traditional German characteristics and, as such, as being innate and even unique to the German race. Müller rejects this claim and uses the myth of the Nibelungs as representative of these German characteristics to satirize their supposed greatest virtues in the scene which depicts the German soldiers at Stalingrad. Müller's portrayal of these soldiers has similarities to a fragment by Brecht entitled Fatzer (1927-1929) for which he prepared the stage version in 1993 at the Berliner Ensemble. He believed that: "Fatzer ist natürlich der beste Text von Brecht überhaupt, die Essenz einer

---

15("[. . .] who we are; where we come from; in what we are caught up in; what we have missed or are already about to gamble away again. Müller heaps scorn on all those virtues, which were celebrated by the national ideologies as the highest and most essential to Germans: loyalty, obedience, performance of duty, male courage, and chivalry. He unMASKS those, who so like to present themselves as Nibelungs, and shows them their true face [. . .].")
nachbürgerlichen Erfahrung" (KoS 226). While cowering in his World War I foxhole, the title character, the proletarian Fatzer, realizes that his real enemy is the bourgeoisie or middle class on the homefront and decides, therefore, to desert the army, taking three of his fellow soldiers, all proletarians, with him. Brecht's ideological and literary influence on Müller is obvious given that the subject matter and characters represented in Fatzer are similar in nature to those in Die Schlacht and Germania Tod and apparently inspired Müller when writing these texts.

Although Müller was greatly influenced by Brecht's originality and unique style, he also found himself in the shadow of Brecht's legacy, and his texts were often measured against those of his predecessor. After Brecht died prematurely in 1956 at the age of fifty-eight, his legacy was left to live on in his numerous literary works as well as his epic style of theater which he demonstrated at the Berliner Ensemble, the GDR theater he had established with Helene Weigel in 1949. Müller, who later became the director of the Berliner Ensemble and was director until shortly before his own death, thirty-nine years later than Brecht's, had the privilege and fortune to develop and expand his own style and not be labeled merely an imitator of Brecht, although Müller's characters, style, and subject matter were certainly influenced by his predecessor. Schnell writes: "Als einzigem Dramatiker der frühen DDR gelang es Heiner Müller (geb. 1929), bereits mit seinem ersten großen Stück, Der Lohndrücker ("The scab") (1956), dem Bannkreis Brechts zu entkommen" (162). During the sixties, Müller wrote other plays which were acceptable to the party functionaries and enabled him to continue his development and increase his reputation as a significant writer and playwright. He possessed the ability to use the raw material from the fifties to create some of his best literary work during the seventies, including Die Schlacht and Germania Tod. In Dämonen unterm roten Stern Frank Raddatz writes that: "[. . .] Müllers Anfang der

16 ("Fatzer is of course the greatest of all Brecht's texts, the essence of a post-bourgeois experience.")
It is Raddatz's thesis that Müller incorporated these text fragments into viable plays and was able to improve upon them, thus increasing his aesthetic productivity. By his utilization of the old scenes and texts, Müller built upon his original ideas while at the same time adding to them from his knowledge gained through fifteen years of experience and observation. In the introduction to Carl Weber's book of translations, *A Heiner Müller Reader*, Tony Kushner describes Müller's aesthetics of writing: "Müller did not deviate far from the path he began to pursue in the early 1950s. Although he took many detours and sometimes seemed to reverse his tracks, it is evident that his early views were shaping much of the later work" (xxii). The focus of these early texts or scenes was the establishment of the GDR and its early development, including the nation's "prehistory" and ideological background. Most significant, however, is Müller's rejection of Brecht's style, the epic theater, and the creation of his own satirical style during the fifties. The impetus for many of Müller's texts were often inspired by the literary texts of others, as he himself admitted. He describes his inspiration by other literary sources in his 1995 interview with Peter von Becker, "Die Wahrheit, leise und unerträglich": "Ja, ich kann nichts erfinden. [. . .] Nichts erfinden heißt für mich: keine Geschichten erfinden. [. . .] Ich brauche immer ein Material, das mich anstößt, mit dem ich arbeiten kann [. . .] Wenn ich eine Geschichte höre, dann kann ich aus der alles mögliche machen. Aber ich kann die Geschichte selbst nicht erfinden" (10). Müller's inspiration is not to be confused with borrowing or copying: familiar with world literature, his unique style reflects the influence of many great

17("Heiner Müller (born 1929) is the only playwright of the early GDR who succeeded in breaking out of Brecht's sphere as early as with his first great play, *The Scab* (1956).")
18("[. . .] Müller's enterprising recourse to his earliest literary output in the early seventies confirms the argument also presented here, that the "late work" begins with an appropriation of his own sources of aesthetic productivity.")
writers and their various artistic forms, including but not limited to: Anna Seghers (1900-1983), Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956), Antonin Artaud (1895-1948), Samuell Beckett (1906-1989), T. S. Eliot (1888-1965), and Vladimir Mayakovsky (1893-1930).

Müller's search for a new German identity took him on a journey to the past where he found ample situations he could use as parallels to events in contemporary Germany i.e., the GDR. Germania Tod and Germania 3 reflect Müller's insights about German identity portrayed by German historical figures and events and their effects on Germany in the past, the present, and the future. Müller was familiar with the relationship of terror, war, and death throughout Germany's history and the resulting effects on Germany identity. In 1986 in the interview titled, "Der Weltuntergang ist zu einem modischen Problem geworden" ("The end of the world has become a popular problem"), he explains his views about the root of Germany's problems, which are closely connected to Brecht's ideas, which in turn reflect Marxist ideology. In connection with the comment by Brecht in his annotation to Mutter Courage Müller says:


19("Yes, I cannot invent anything. [. . .] To invent nothing means for me: not inventing any stories. [. . .] I always need material, that prompts me, with which I can work. [. . .] Whenever I hear a story, then I can make anything based on it. But I cannot invent the storyline myself.")

20Brecht writes: "In den Bauernkriegen, dem größten Unglück der deutschen Geschichte, war, was das Soziale betrifft, der Reformation der Reißzahn gezogen worden. Übrig blieben die Geschäfte und der Zynismus (Werke 1443). ("In the peasants' revolt, the greatest misfortune of German history, was, relating to the social aspect, the
The title character in Brecht's drama, Mutter Courage, which deals primarily with business of war, reflects his cynicism. The cause of this cynical attitude dates back approximately a hundred years before the Thirty Years' War; namely to the Reformation and the peasants' revolt of the early sixteenth century. A nation develops slowly and needs time to evolve: the problem Marx and Engels, and later Brecht and Müller, saw in these events from German history is that the earlier failure of the peasants' attempt to improve their social and economic situation had long-lasting repercussions on the evolution of the German people and subsequently on the nation's lack of development. The Reformation, which initially brought hope to the oppressed peasants, ended in their brutal suppression and did not bring about social and economic changes: thus the Reformation only retained religious significance. Any social improvements, which would have furthered the peasants' cause at that time, would also have had a positive effect and influence on later generations of German workers. The course of the development of the German nation would have been drastically altered but in a positive manner. The peasants of the sixteenth century, who listened to Martin Luther and believed his teachings applied to them and their own historical predicament, were full of hope when they started their insurrection. This hope turned to bitter disappointment after their ultimate and bloody defeat by their will to fight was broken. They had to accept the rule of the nobility and the church, but they no longer believed in the ideology justifying their exploitation and suppression. Grinding their teeth, they gave in to the inevitable, but developed a cynical attitude in relationship to their superiors, the cynicism of which Brecht speaks.

21("The peasants' revolts were the earliest revolutions in Europe and therefore were the most forcefully suppressed. The nation never fully recovered from it. Then came the Thirty Years' War, which crushed the nation's character. Germany never recovered from that either. Then in 1848 we had a last chance, to gain annexation to Europe. But the bourgeois revolution was also struck down. Thus Germany never found its connection to Europe. And now the country is suspended between East and West, and it is always fearful of not
Müller, a fellow believer in the communist or proletarian cause, adds to Brecht's interpretation of the German condition. In his historical analysis, Müller uses several terms that imply a degree of identification with one Germany: "dieses Volk", "den Volkscharakter", "Deutschland", "hatten wir". Following Marxist ideology, he lists the peasants' revolt as the earliest revolution on European soil and seems to blame the ruling powers of each given era for blocking the political development of Germany: its political and social development stagnated due to the continued suppression of its revolutions. The time dimension tends to extend backwards in the sense that Müller demonstrates a trend of the ruling party or government to suppress its people and exploit them while at the same time not providing them with the essentials of a humane or comfortable existence. The unsuccessful revolt of the sixteenth century and later, of the 1848 revolution, hindered Germany's ultimate development as a politically progressive nation within the European landscape. Whereas other European countries, in particular one thinks of France and England, were advancing politically, the situation in the German Empire was stagnating. Müller attributes this stagnation and the accompanying lack of central political development to Germany's precarious geographical location in the heart of Europe. Surrounded by politically stronger countries, who had already used German soil as their battleground, as in the Thirty Years' War, the German territories were thus more concerned with survival than with political or social progress, reflected by Müller's maxim: "auszulöschen oder ausgelöscht zu werden". This aggressive attitude is reflected in Prussian militarism, which had reached new levels under Frederick II (the Great) during the eighteenth century, and would increase under the Prussian Chancellor from 1871-1890, Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898), known as "der eiserne Kanzler" (the iron chancellor"). Although Bismarck was finally able to unify parts of the German-speaking territories in 1871 and established the Second German Empire, this "Revolution von oben" ("revolution from above"), as it is most commonly referred to in Marxist jargon, negated the efforts of the
peasants and the working class, thus rendering them impotent and without "fangs" throughout the next century.

In 1990, Müller expands on his above analysis on the roots of Germany's and especially the GDR's problem for survival based on Brecht's comment about the peasants' revolt. Returning again briefly to the era of the Thirty Years' War, he explains:


This war, the next major event after the peasants' revolt on the German time continuum, came at a time when the people or in particular the peasants were perhaps ready to try again to assert themselves and improve their social condition. Instead, for three long decades, people from the various German principalities lived in fear for their lives and saw their lands and meager possessions stolen or destroyed before their very eyes. Now their only thought was for their immediate survival, rather than for any type of advances or improvements in their social situation. Totally preoccupied with the struggle for existence, their woes were similar to those in modern times during the post-World War periods, in which the priority of the
German people was the struggle for the means to stay alive: food and shelter. Müller sees this struggle for survival compounded by the suppression of the people by the Prussian dictators, particularly Frederick II in the mid-eighteenth century, and his emphasis on military endeavors to win fame and fortune which resulted in the Seven Years' War and the creation of what Müller calls the "military machine". The Prussian monarch's actions caused further loss of life and, again, left the people fearful for their lives and with no time left to be concerned with their rights and social improvements. They had, in fact, and much to the regret of Müller and others before him, become accustomed to obeying orders and subordinating themselves to their sovereign rulers. The French Revolution of 1789 had come and gone and Germany was still not even a unified entity, despite its official title, "the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation". In 1806, this empire was brought to an end after Napoleon's victory over the Prussian army and occupation of Germany, which caused nationalist sentiments to finally awaken. By 1848, following the Paris Revolt of 1830 and other revolts occurring on the European political scene, Germany had again reached the point where it was ready to take a new stand against internal oppression and unjust conditions of the new industrial era. The Silesian weavers' revolt of 1844 had already set the revolutionary ball in motion. Unfortunately, once again the efforts of these German revolutionaries were combated and defeated. Müller's interpretation of these historical German events reveals that the characteristic trait of the Germans, in spite of their continued efforts and not for lack of trying, remains, as Schmitt writes: "die Unfähigkeit, eine Revolution aus eigener Kraft und eigenem Willen siegreich zu vollenden" (60). The rest of Europe was in turmoil: revolting, changing, evolving; yet political, social, and economic conditions, which, comparably, had not improved for Germany, posed a threat to its immediate and long-term future.

Finally, as Müller explains, in 1918, after the First World War, persons and events were in place to attempt another social revolution: another opportunity presented itself with

---

23 ("the inability to successfully complete a revolution based on their own strength and their own will")
the Communist Party, particularly the Spartacus Group and its leaders, Karl Liebknecht and
Rosa Luxemburg. This time, in the early twentieth century, as with the other missed
opportunities throughout German history since the sixteenth century, the revolutionaries'
efforts were brutally suppressed and the leadership obliterated. Only this time the defeat
would have even more bitter consequences: the German Communist Party or KPD would
become an extension of Moscow with far-reaching repercussions for Germany's future and its
very identity. After Hitler's rise to power and the creation of his own "military machine" and
catastrophic actions resulting in World War II and the agonizing losses of the German armies
at Stalingrad and elsewhere, Germany suffered not only defeat in 1945 but the ultimate loss
of identity in the form of its own division by external forces. Thus the GDR, conceived
through a long and bitter history of German self-destruction and several revolutionary
miscarriages, was finally born. In his post-World War II _Geschichtsdrama, Germania Tod_,
Müller focuses on Germany's past as he explores these historical events and their effect on
German identity and the development of the GDR at that time and in the future. In _Germania 3_,
a post-reunification and post-GDR _Geschichtsdrama_, Müller's emphasis is again on
elements from Germany's past and their effect on the GDR's forty years of existence, and he
also includes the possible repercussions for the future of German identity based on its very
existence.

Germany has often been compared to Shakespeare's _Hamlet_: "Deutschland ist
Hamlet" as demonstrated in the title of Alfred Döblin's novel, _Hamlet oder die lange Nacht
nimmt ein Ende: Roman_ (1956) in which the protagonist, Edward Allison, is maimed and
mutilated on behalf of the fatherland, not unlike the unfortunate soldiers of Frederick II's and
Hitler's armies. Hamlet's famous line: "To be or not to be" as the main character contemplates
suicide, questions the value of life, but at the same time reflects a basic passivity about life
and the individual's existence. Müller was an admirer and translator of Shakespeare's theater,
and author of his own Hamlet drama entitled, _Die Hamletmaschine_, in which the title
character voices the wish to neither die nor to kill: "Ich will nicht mehr sterben. Ich will nicht mehr töten" ("I do not want to die anymore. I do not want to kill anymore"). Müller, as mentioned above, developed his own maxim for Germany, which also relates to human existence, but one which suggests an aggressiveness in the form of a deadly action verb: "auszulöschen oder ausgelöscht zu werden". His preoccupation with the concept of being the subject or the object of history, of being the murderer or the victim, comprises an essential element of both his psyche and his view of life. This philosophy is reflected in the story he liked to tell of a Jewish boy in the Warsaw ghetto during the Second World War. Müller explains:

I very much like a sentence from the papers of a Jewish boy who lived in Warsaw, in the ghetto. The papers were found after the war. The boy was killed; he was 11 or 12 years old. The sentence was: "I want to be a German". [. . .] Now that he was living in danger, living in daily confrontation with death, he wanted to be on the other side. He wanted to be a German. By redistributing death, he was trying to repress the fear of death (Heiner Müller: Germania 57).  

The main point of this story for Müller is that it identifies being German with being a murderer during World War II; a painful aspect of German identity which is prevalent in the majority of Müller's texts, including Germania Tod and Germania 3. Schulz recognizes this characteristic trait in Die Schlacht: "Alle Überlebenden sind selbst Mörder: Leben heißt Töten" (Heiner Müller 122).  German identity was associated with being either a subject or an object throughout history; to kill or to be killed; to be active versus passive. The young boy, by admitting his desire to become a German is, essentially, only interested in his own

---

24 The original version of this text was told in English to Sylvère Lotringer and was later translated into German. The English version is taken from Heiner Müller: Germania 57; it can also be found in Rotwelsch 44. The German text is as follows: "Es gibt da in den Papieren eines jüdischen Jungen aus dem Warschauer Getto einen Satz, den ich sehr mag. Die Papiere hat man nach dem Krieg gefunden. Der Junge wurde getötet; er war 11 oder 12 Jahre alt. Der Satz hieß: "Ich will ein Deutscher sein." [. . .] An dem Punkt, wo er in Gefahr war, wo er in täglicher Konfrontation mit dem Tod lebte, wollte er auf der anderen Seite sein, er wollte ein Deutscher sein. Durch die Umverteilung des Todes versuchte er, die Furcht vor dem Tod zu unterdrücken" (Rotwelsch 82-83).
survival and would, therefore, be willing to switch roles with the aggressor if it would spare his own life. In other words, the human instinct to survive is so strong that this boy, as representative of any potential victim, would willingly assume the role of a murderer in order to save himself. In his essay, "Ich lache über den Neger." Das Lachen des Siegers in Texten Heiner Müllers Stück 'Der Auftrag', Horst Domdey applies this tale to the author's deep hatred of fascism. He writes: "Der Zwölfjährige, so Müllers Deutung, identifiziert sich mit dem Feind, dem faschistischen Riesen, um teilzuhaben an dessen Kraft, den Tod auszuteilen. Müller sieht in dieser Form der Unterdrückung der Todesfurcht qua Identifizierung mit dem großen Feind den ersten Schritt zu dessen Überwindung. Man muß selber Riese sein wollen, um den Faschismus besiegen zu können [. . .]" (229). Müller's interest in this story lies in its potential to defeat fascism, which Domdey aptly describes as a "giant". A possible means of defeating the fascist enemy, therefore, is that one has to be willing to become a giant or monster oneself and thus accept the murderous aspect of death. In other words, the "object" must become a "subject" in order to face death, even his own. Thus by his willingness to become a subject, the boy has overcome his fear of death and in this way has ultimately defeated his enemy.

The following quote demonstrates Müller's perspective about the importance of choosing to be a subject when faced with death. He writes: [. . .] was zählt ist das Beispiel, der Tod bedeutet nichts. Weil wir nicht wissen, was das ist und was danach kommt. Und so ist es halt wirklich für uns nichts. Und wie man stirbt, das ist alles" (Ich bin ein Neger 38). He then tells the moving tale of a Jewish man who sacrifices his life for that of two strangers.

---

25("All of the survivors are murderers. Surviving means killing.")

26("The twelve year old boy, according to Müller's interpretation, identifies himself with the enemy, the fascist giant, in order to have a share of his strength, to hand out death. Müller sees in this form of suppressing the fear of death by way of identification with the great enemy the first step in overcoming the enemy. One must want to become a giant in order to be able to defeat fascism.")

27("What counts is the example, death means nothing. Because we don't know what that is and what comes afterward. And so it's just really nothing to us. And how one dies, that's all that counts.")
in an effort to maintain his status as a subject. 28 The story about the Jewish boy reflects an individual's willingness to become a murderer or in effect murder in order to save his own life. The story of the Jewish man, however, portrays the individual who is not only willing to die for another human being, but actually does perform this selfless act which allows two innocent strangers to live. Each of these stories reflect Müller's motto about life, about killing or being killed. In both cases, the person involved is trying to become a subject and leave the role of object: they both succeed, even though both die. The significance is how one dies: whether as an object or as a subject. Müller's belief that "death means nothing" is a further expression of this idea of conquering the enemy by conquering death. He claimed that it was not so much the fact that one dies or is killed, rather the significant aspect is how one dies i.e., one's state of mind when facing imminent death. Both are victims and objects of Hitler's fascism, yet both become subjects by the manner in which they choose to accept their deaths.

In a similar way, the boy and the man in Müller's stories choose to remain subjects and not be made into objects by the aggressor or enemy. The Jewish man was able to choose his form of death and make himself a subject; even though the Jewish boy could not, he could still free himself in spirit by not accepting his role as an object. These two stories also reveal quite a bit about Müller, who wrote so vividly and graphically and violently about death and murder, yet was so moved, not by the fate, but by the choice of the individual to remain a subject in even the most desperate and hopeless circumstances. His emphasis on the importance of

28"Die schönste Beschreibung eines Todes, die ich gelesen habe, ist die Beschreibung eines Journalisten aus Berlin, ein Jude, der mit einem der ersten Schiffe in die USA fahren durfte; also vielleicht nicht eines der ersten, aber das Schiff wurde torpediert von einem deutschen U-Boot, und es gab Rettungsboote, aber nicht genügend Plätze, und er saß, ich habe den Namen vergessen, eine Geschichte, die mich ungeheuer bewegt hat, er saß in einem Rettungsboot. Er wurde beschrieben als ein kleiner, dicker Jude, Journalist und völlig unauffällig. Und dann stand an der Reling eine Mutter mit Kind, ganz sentimental die Geschichte, und es gab keinen Platz mehr in dem Rettungsboot, und dieser dicke jüdische Journalist ließ sich einfach nach hinten fallen und war im Atlantik, damit diese Mutter mit ihrem Kind einen Platz im Boot hatte. Und sie hatte ihren Platz. Das finde ich eine große Geschichte" (Ich bin ein Neger 38). ("The most beautiful description of a death, which I read, is the description of a journalist from Berlin, a Jew, who was allowed to travel with one of the first ships to the USA; well maybe not one of the first, but the ship was torpedoed by a German submarine, and there were lifeboats, but not enough seats, and he sat, I forgot his name, a story, that touched me greatly, he sat in a lifeboat. He was described as a small, fat Jew, journalist and completely inconspicuous. And on the bulwark stood a mother with her child, a totally sentimental story, and there was no more room in the lifeboat, and this fat Jewish journalist
subject versus object reflects a basic existential element which he displays in his texts through the situations he presents and the subsequent actions of his characters.

The characters, both those living and dead, in Müller's *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3* convey this struggle between being an object or a subject of history. Schröder offers a valid reason for the author's choice of such a portrayal. Referring to *Germania Tod* he writes:

> Sein "Germania"-Stück ist eine produktive und agressive Reaktion auf die Erfahrung, auch innerhalb der DDR noch ein Objekt der deutschen Geschichte geblieben zu sein. Indem er sein Land -- gegen die Parteidoktrin, die den "Arbeiter- und Bauernstaat" als die endgültige Überwindung der deutschen Unheilsgeschichte propagierte -- zugleich als Fortsetzung und Opfer der deutschen Geschichte sah, versuchte er sich selber zu einem "Subjekt" freizuschreiben (Schröder 340).

Whereas the SED leadership was intent on furthering its interpretation of history and the role of the GDR as the answer to Germany's troubled past, Müller was aware of the potential threat still present in this new or other Germany, the "Bauern- und Arbeiterstaat" (farmers' and workers' state") where the peasants and workers are still the "object" being suppressed; while on the other side, the party and its functionaries under the thumb of Moscow, are, in reality, the "subject" who crush any and all efforts to break free from such oppression.

Müller's play is an expression of the rage he felt at the fact that even after the GDR had been established, nothing had really changed for the course of German history. In the first of each of the paired scenes, he presents elements of the German past which demonstrate an aspect of previous national characteristics which he had hoped would be eliminated in the GDR and would no longer be part of the new German identity. Unfortunately, he perceived the same or similar aspects in the GDR, and these he represents in the second of each pair of scenes,
respectively. The sense of helplessness in the face of contemporary historical events and the inability to change their course in order to save the GDR from itself, from its past, and to improve its future, is the foundation for this play.

The GDR, as a product of deutsche Misere, was, at the same time, in danger of becoming its next victim as well: "Denn diese widersprüchliche Doppelperspektive [. . .] negierte die DDR als Produkt der "deutschen Misere", und sie entschuldigte sie als ihr Opfer (Schröder 340). This was the view of the party leadership which saw the GDR as something totally new, outside the course of German history, but excused its shortcomings by taking recourse to its historical founding and the political circumstances in which it found itself. Müller recognized the hypocrisy of this explanation since he knew that this other Germany was a result of the culmination of historical events which led to the possibility of its formation and eventually its actual creation. Simultaneously, it was a potential victim of its own past because those elements were still present in the GDR: willingness to obey authority, in this case the victor, the Soviet Union. Instead of subjugating themselves to a Prussian monarch or a fascist dictator who called the shots and set the tone, the authority figure was now a party leadership that suppressed personal freedom and creativity yet demanded obedience and conformity, while not accepting criticism. In his essay, "Proletarische Öffentlichkeit -- Begriff aufgehobener deutscher Misere und der Literatur in der DDR", Bernhard Greiner refers to the "deutsche Misere" and what he calls the "Revolution" in the SBZ as having come neither from the populace nor the working class, rather from the "Besatzungsmacht" ("occupying power"); thus liberation from Nazi domination came from the conqueror, who, for over a decade, had been declared "zum rassischen, nationalen und ideologischen Feind" ("the racist, national and ideological enemy") (2). Thus, in place of a revolution by the people, there occurred a "Revolution von oben" similar to the predicament

proclaimed the "workers' and peasants' state" as the final victory over Germany's troubled history -- was at the same time the continuation and victim of German history, he tried to write himself into a "subject".
under Bismarck, and the "deutsche Misere", which Greiner describes as "Situationen
tiefgreifender gesellschaftlicher Krisen" (2), continued.\(^{31}\) The most compelling proof of the
continuance of the deutsche Misere was given in June 1953, when, similar to the peasants of
the sixteenth century who dared to oppose those in power but were brutally crushed, the
workers were forced to submit to party rule, which the leadership was only able to obtain and
maintain through force -- from an external source, the Moscow Soviet leadership and army.

Müller was aware of the dangers facing the GDR when he was completing this play in
the early seventies. He explains: "[. . .] Und man kann ein DDR-Bild nicht geben, ohne die
DDR im Kontext der deutschen Geschichte zu sehen, die zum größten Teil auch eine
deutsche Misere ist. Nur aus diesem Kontext der deutschen Misere kriegt man ein richtiges
DDR-Bild im Drama" (GI 32).\(^{32}\) Since it is a product of a country gone wrong, its roots are
well grounded in the German past, which includes, unfortunately, the Prussian legacy and the
more recent Nazi past. Although it would have been in compliance with the party line if
Müller had tried to deny the GDR's affiliation with its German origins, it would have been
hypocritical and would have nullified the very connections and dangers he was interested in
portraying. The picture of the GDR he presents is, therefore, not very flattering, but at the
same time he does offer a glimmer of hope. Generally, however, the tone of the play is
ominous and even verges on the revolutionary at times, as Müller clearly embraces the
Marxist ideology. Nevertheless, the dialogue in the play shows a strong anti-Stalinist tone
and Müller is often critical of the East German government. In relation to the GDR aspect of
this play Schröder confirms: "Daß es ein Stück über die DDR ist, daß es versucht, die
"Misere" der DDR am Ende der Ulbricht-Ära aus der "Misere" der deutschen Geschichte zu

---

\(^{30}\)("Because this contradictory double perspective [. . .] negated the GDR as a product of the "German misery",
and it excused it as its victim [. . .].")

\(^{31}\)("situations of deep-reaching social crises")

\(^{32}\)("And you can't present a picture of the GDR without viewing the GDR in the context of German history,
which consists for the most part also of a German misery. Only in this context of "deutsche Misere" does one
get a correct picture of the GDR in drama.")
Müller designed the construction of this play to illustrate the similarities and parallels between contemporary and past events. He structures his play so that there are six pairs of scenes: the first of each pair presents a significant element from the GDR's Vorgeschichte or "prehistory" (Schröder 329), a term used to refer to the span of time before the establishment of the GDR (Hermand "Braut" 137), followed by a scene occurring in the contemporary GDR of either 1949 or 1953. Müller's use of this unique structure allows him to depict themes from the German past in order to accurately represent the dangers surrounding the GDR. His utilization of a pair of scenes to demonstrate the connection between a specific aspect of the German past and the GDR present allows for an overview of centuries, which would not be possible using a traditional dramatic style. In his book, Heiner Müller, Georg Wieghaus accurately describes Germania Tod as the "deutsche Misere im Zeitraffer" (5). In order to further a better understanding of this comment regarding Müller's play and tenets, a brief definition and explanation of the term, deutsche Misere, follows.

The concept deutsche Misere is best described as: "die politische und soziale Rückständigkeit der Deutschen und Deutschlands seit den Bauernkriegen" (Schröder 4). It refers to Germany's political and social situation throughout the centuries and its inability to become a unified, integrated nation with a stable, centralized government. The origins of the symptoms begin with Hermann and his victory over the Roman legionnaire, Varus, at the Teutoburger Forest in the first century; as a result of which the Germanic tribes remained free from Roman rule and never became a unified entity and were thus destined to fight each other throughout the centuries and into modern times. The Romans built the Limes, the wall stretching five hundred and fifty kilometers from the Rhine River to the Danube River to serve as a boundary between their Empire and the territories of the Germanic tribes. The

33(“That it is a play about the GDR, that it attempts to offer the reasons for and deduce the 'Misere' of the GDR at the end of the Ulbricht-era from the 'Misere' of German history, can already be recognized by its symmetrical construction.”)
Limes, while not a forerunner to the Berlin Wall, can, nevertheless, be viewed as a harbinger of things to come for the Germans: fragmentation and isolation. Although these Germanic tribes eventually developed into "das Römische Reich deutscher Nation" ("the Roman Empire of the German nation"), it consisted of a large number of principalities and kingdoms ruled by princes who held political power over their sovereign territories and on whom the Emperor was dependent. Political fragmentation, therefore, remained a major characteristic of the Empire (Fulbrook 24). As a result of this German phenomenon known as Klein-staaterei ("provincialism"), the development of a unified German nation was hindered and prevented the establishment of a solid, centralized form of government. In turn, any progressive political and social growth was stunted which resulted in the advancement of this concept deutsche Misere.

The "concept" of deutsche Misere has existed for a long time, as demonstrated in the literature of eighteenth and nineteenth century German writers, such as Hölderlin's Hyperion (1797-99), Lenz's Die Soldaten (1776), Büchner's Woyzeck (1878), and Heine's Deutschland. Ein Wintemärchen (1844), who are very critical of German behavior and Germany's social and political conditions. The term itself, however, is generally attributed to Friedrich Engels in the mid-nineteenth century (Schröder 4). One of the most vitriolic expressions of deutsche Misere in German literature can be found in Heine's text. In Sieben Arten an Deutschland
zu leiden, Jost Hermand refers to Heine's criticism of the German situation as: "[. . .] eine der schärfsten Verurteilungen ‚deutscher Zustände‘, die je geschrieben worden sind. [. . .] Als das Zentrum dieser tyrannischen Unterdrückungspolitik wird eindeutig Preußen hingestellt [. . .]" (43). Heine's biting and sarcastic descriptions of various aspects of the German condition reflect a troubled nation. He presents the Prussian element as the root of the country's troubles, which coincides with the views of the GDR and Müller; it is, therefore, no surprise that Heine's book was popular later in the GDR; whereas it was largely ignored and even avoided in the FRG (Hermand 45). Heine's nineteenth century views of and comments about Germany are expressed in cynical and often vulgar terms. His criticisms of German behavior and mentality, a reflection of past as well as contemporary events, are echoed in the writings of Marx and Engels a short time later. Similar to Heine: "[. . .] verwenden sie in auffälliger Ähnlichkeit mit den Heineschen Intentionen meist den Begriff der „deutschen Misère" (47). In modern times, this concept again found a voice in Heinrich Mann's Der Untertan (1918), Brecht's reworking of Lenz's Der Hofmeister (1950), and Müller's Germania Tod (1956/71). Thus the concept of deutsche Misere has become part of the thread woven into the German tapestry of national identity, whether East or West, and Müller was highly interested in evaluating it as part of the German heritage.

**III.3.1 Form and Style**

In Germania Tod, Müller uses the traditional genre of Geschichtsdrama but changes its structure by employing the techniques of Montage and Collage, arranged in a collection of disparate scenes following each other in rapid succession, influenced by film and other modern art forms. This style is characteristic of his work in the seventies (Schulz 129).
on Müller's own words about the "Fragmentcharakter unserer Geschichte" ("fragmented nature of our history") ("Geschichte und Drama" 56) and his description of this style as: "der Versuch, ein Fragment synthetisch herzustellen" ("the attempt to create a fragment synthetically") (Theater-Arbeit 125), the form can be considered a dramatic historical collage modelled on a fragmented German history. His drama itself, however, is not a "fragment", as he confirms in his 1994 interview with Klaus Welzel, "Wir brauchen ein neues Geschichtskonzept". As a unique type of "Geschichtscollage" (Raddatz 73), Germania Tod demonstrates his interest in experimenting with modern forms of drama as opposed to the stifling constrictions demanded by Social Realism. Most importantly, this form serves him well when it comes to emphasizing the influence of specific historical aspects on Germany's fragmentary development and the resulting fragmentation of German identity.

In addition, Müller employs anti-realistic techniques taken from various fields of entertainment such as the circus, cabaret, revue, and even slapstick (Schröder 327) to portray his perspective of German history and its relation to German identity. An important component of his style is his continual use of intertextuality, the technique of inserting lines or phrases from other literary texts into the main text, which affect its meaning and interpretation. One quality these intertextual references have in common is their relationship to the German past and heritage. Whether taken from a Grimm fairy tale, Nazi propaganda, a poem or song by a communist revolutionary, they are all expressions of German identity throughout the centuries. Among the conference lectures collected in Walter Hinck's Drama der Gegenwart: Themen und Aspekte, Lothar Köhn discusses this aspect of Müller's style in his contribution, "Drama aus Zitaten: Text-Montage bei Heiner Müller, Volker Braun und Botho Strauß". Referring to Müller's technique of letting the characters recite quotes from other literary texts, Köhn regards Müller as: "einer der Vorreiter der neuesten intertextuellen

---

37("[. . .] they mostly employ, with noticeable similarity to Heine's intentions, the concept of deutsche Misere.")
Dramatik” (27). He maintains that the central focus is on the meaning of Müller's text and most importantly: "[. . ] daß die Zitate eine Fülle von zusätzlichen Bedeutungen 'konnotieren', sei es im Text im Stück selbst, sei es in den Kontexten, die zum zitierten Text-Fragment gehören, Bedeutungen, denen der Leser eher nachgehen kann als der Zuschauer eines Theaterabends" (34). The result of this technique is that the reader, more so than the audience member who has less time to digest and interpret these various literary references, is afforded a wealth of connotations which are intended to underscore the meaning in Müller's text. The challenge to the reader is to find the corresponding significance hidden within these literary references, which often requires time and patience, accompanied by a vast knowledge of or access to numerous authors and literary works. Further, Köhn writes that such allusions are: "[. . ] nicht mehr auf der Ebene des Dargestellten, des Figurenbewußtseins, sondern der Darstellung, die nur der Leser/Zuschauer entschlüsseln kann" (34).

In other words, the significance of these quotes extends beyond the role of the character depicted in the drama and, instead, is directed at the reader who must make the connection between the work cited and its relationship to the ultimate meaning in Müller's text as the reader perceives it based on his own personal experiences. Within these thirteen scenes of the play, Müller's presentation of diverse and intriguing images of Germany's past, accompanied as they are by his use of intertextuality, offers insights into the author's perspective of German identity using historical persons and events, myths, traditions, and nationalistic tendencies, which he weaves together in a patchwork of his own design based on his personal observations, perceptions, and experiences.

Due to Müller's deliberate handling of the time element in these adjacent scenes, the timeline for this play does not follow a progressive approach: that is, it is not chronological.

---

38 ("one of the forerunners of the newest intertextual dramaturgy")
39 ("[. . ] that the quotations 'connote' an abundance of additional meanings, whether it is in the text in the play itself, in the contexts, which belong to the quoted text-fragment, meanings, which the reader can more readily pursue than the audience member attending the theater in the evening")
Rather, Müller juxtaposes differing time periods in order to compare and contrast German identity from the German past with that of the German present, significantly the GDR. At first glance it might appear that Müller jumps back and forth from one year to another without adhering to a logical sequence, however, there is a definite purpose to his specific and targeted choices. He employs an interesting and unique technique to create his own brand of dramatic art in this play, which Schulz refers to as a number of: "\textit{zwei sich spiegelnde(r) Szenen}" ("mirroring or parallel scenes") (129). This term almost sounds as if Müller took Lukács' concept of \textit{Widerspiegelung} and formed it to suit his own ironic, satiric brand of representation of the truth. Müller uses the technique of creating a pair of scenes under a common title in which the first scene depicts a place and event from Germany's common past, which is then followed by a parallel scene playing in the contemporary GDR. Schulz writes: "\textit{In der Form einer Abhandlung, eines Traktats über dieses Thema Germania/DDR ist die Szenenfolge geordnet. Zu fast jedem Titel gibt es zwei sich spiegelnde Szenen, wobei die zweite immer eine Alltagsszene aus der DDR darstellt}" (129).

Müller's utilization of this style underscores both similarities and differences between earlier eras in Germany with the GDR era and thus offers a sense of continuity from the German past to the GDR's formative years. Schulz continues: "\textit{Die Paarung der Szenen macht also die Differenz und Kontinuität zugleich deutlich} (131). He uses this technique to contrast and draw comparisons between certain episodes from Germany's past with contemporary events in the GDR and to a lesser extent in the FRG. In particular, he presents the FRG as the continuation of Nazi Germany. In his essay, "\textit{Deutschland-Denkmale: umgestürzt. Zu Heiner Müllers Germania Tod in Berlin}", Paul Gerhard Klussmann writes:

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{[. . .] no longer on the level of the one represented, of the character's awareness, rather of the portrayal, which only the reader/audience can decipher}"
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{The sequencing of scenes is arranged in the form of an essay, of a treatise about this topic Germania/GDR. For almost every title there are two scenes which mirror each other, whereby the second always represents a scene taken from the daily life of the GDR.}"
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{The pairing of scenes makes the discrepancy and continuity evident simultaneously.}"
\end{flushleft}
Müller's presentation of the FRG as a continuation of Hitler's fascist Germany coincides with the GDR view which the leadership espoused during the immediate post-war years and well into the Cold War era. Characteristically, this GDR author often expresses this ideological division in the form of two brothers who are politically at odds with each other. As Christian Klein writes in his essay, "Entre hier et aujourd'hui": "L'âpreté des affrontements entre les deux <<frères ennemis>> favorise les analyses schématiques et la bipolarisation. Chacun des deux Etats affirme en effet sa légitimité historique et démocratique en se (re-)présentant comme la bonne Allemagne opposée à la mauvaise" (173). This confrontational attitude was typical for the mood in the GDR in particular during the 1950s as its leadership struggled to maintain legitimacy as a nation as well as define itself in terms of its claim to German identity.

The search for the new German identity began immediately following the fall of the Third Reich, as the general population struggled to come to terms with what had happened and why, overshadowed only by their struggle to survive in the bitter aftermath of defeat. After the separation into the occupation zones and the subsequent official division, this search took on a new meaning and perspective. Even though the people of the GDR regarded themselves as the "Verlierer des Krieges" ("losers of the war") according to Adolf M. Birke in Nation ohne Haus: Deutschland 1945-1961 (408), they also considered the GDR to be "das wahre Deutschland"; the true Germany and, therefore, they looked to the cultural past to

\[\text{Seitenblicke und Anspielungen auf die Bundesrepublik Deutschland sind zumeist in die historischen Rückblenden eingefügt, so daß im Gegensatz zum Neuanfang und zur Eigengeschichte der DDR die Bundesrepublik als Fortsetzung der alten nationalistischen und faschistischen Tradition erscheinen muß (165).}\]

\[\text{Müller's presentation of the FRG as a continuation of Hitler's fascist Germany coincides with the GDR view which the leadership espoused during the immediate post-war years and well into the Cold War era. Characteristically, this GDR author often expresses this ideological division in the form of two brothers who are politically at odds with each other. As Christian Klein writes in his essay, "Entre hier et aujourd'hui": "L'âpreté des affrontements entre les deux <<frères ennemis>> favorise les analyses schématiques et la bipolarisation. Chacun des deux Etats affirme en effet sa légitimité historique et démocratique en se (re-)présentant comme la bonne Allemagne opposée à la mauvaise" (173). This confrontational attitude was typical for the mood in the GDR in particular during the 1950s as its leadership struggled to maintain legitimacy as a nation as well as define itself in terms of its claim to German identity.}\]

\[\text{The search for the new German identity began immediately following the fall of the Third Reich, as the general population struggled to come to terms with what had happened and why, overshadowed only by their struggle to survive in the bitter aftermath of defeat. After the separation into the occupation zones and the subsequent official division, this search took on a new meaning and perspective. Even though the people of the GDR regarded themselves as the "Verlierer des Krieges" ("losers of the war") according to Adolf M. Birke in Nation ohne Haus: Deutschland 1945-1961 (408), they also considered the GDR to be "das wahre Deutschland"; the true Germany and, therefore, they looked to the cultural past to}\]
support this claim. In particular due to its developing status as a "Vasallenstaat der Sowjet-union" ("vassal state of the Soviet Union") (Birke 260), along with its close proximity to the West, the GDR became an opposing force to the FRG and especially to its occupying power, the USA. As Müller and others had feared, Germany was indeed caught in the middle between two world powers and, due to its situation as a defeated nation, was helpless to change the course of these new events. In his essay, "The GDR and the German Question in the 1980s", Günter Minnerup succinctly sums up the post-war situation: "The division of Germany was not an automatic and inevitable outcome of World War Two, but a product of the conflict between the interests of the USA and the Soviet Union in the course of the Cold War" (4). In the aftermath of the war, the western Besatzungszonen ("occupied zones") underwent a period of denazification and democratization which prepared them for integration into the Western system. The Sowjetische Besatzungzone ("Soviet occupied zone") or SBZ during the same period was subject to Soviet influence under the Sowjetische Militäradministration ("Soviet military administration") or SMAD, which did its best to transform the SBZ into a communist-styled nation, thus paving the way for future Soviet domination and, as Henry Krisch writes in, The German Democratic Republic: The Search for Identity, to further the "breakup of the aristocratic-bourgeois order" (8). The communists were interested in changing society by destroying the old social order and creating one that centered on the working class. Even after 1949 and the official establishment of each German state, neither was allowed to act independently of its respective Besatzungsherrschaft ("occupying authority") (Birke 242) and each was thus subjugated to the will of these two superpowers. Both the FRG and the GDR, respectively, tried to justify itself as the one true German nation but with one major difference: the former emerged as the "bürgerliche Nation" ("middle class nation") and the latter as the "sozialistische deutsche Nation" ("socialist German nation") as Patricia Herminghouse writes in, "Whose German Literature? (re-)presenting itself as the good Germany as opposed to the bad one.”)
GDR-Literature, German Literature and the Question of National Identity" (7). Or, taken one step further: the FRG was the "kapitalistische Nation" ("capitalist nation") and the direct opposite of the GDR, the "sozialistische Nation" ("socialist nation") (Emmerich 178). The GDR leadership stressed the idea of Kulturnation: an attempt to retain and emphasize the positive aspects from Germany's past based on its literary and cultural heritage, which excluded any association to recent events under fascist rule.

The FRG did not officially acknowledge the existence of its neighboring German state until the late sixties and its developing policy of Ostpolitik under Chancellor Willy Brandt (1969-1974). Due in large measure to Brandt's efforts, along with those of the new SED party leader Honecker, the door was opened for inter-German relations between the FRG and the GDR. Finally in 1972, after the signing of the Grundlagenvertrag or German Basic Treaty, the first general treaty between the two German states, the government in Bonn recognized the GDR as a fully sovereign state for the first time as Henry Krisch explains in The German Democratic Republic: The Search for Identity (76). This Treaty led to both German nations becoming members of the United Nations in 1973. Until that time, however, the general belief of the post-war years, referred to as the "two Germanys" or "other Germany" theory continued to thrive. Jennifer E. Michaels offers a GDR description of these two German states, the FRG and the GDR, respectively, in her essay, "Confronting the Nazi Past": "the sadistic Nazi Germany of the Antichrist and the good Germany of the culture of Goethe" (3-4). Whereas the FRG represented a continuation of the former fascist nation, the GDR quickly staked its claim as the other or "good" Germany with an emphasis on the continuation of the German cultural heritage. In her essay, "Digging Deep: Elfriede Jelinek and Heiner Müller", Dagmar Jaeger writes that the GDR:

[. . .] promoted the myth of a new and purified beginning with no connection or link to the past after the war. The struggle against fascism was actually essential to East Germany's claim to legitimacy. By freeing itself from the memory of Nazi
Germany, it defined itself as the new Germany versus the old Nazi Germany that had become West Germany (47).

By establishing the GDR as the "new" Germany, the ruling party seemingly offered its citizens an opportunity for a fresh start, particularly concerning German identity. Ironically, this new beginning, which denied any connection to Hitler's Germany and his ruthless dictatorship, soon developed its own tyrannical characteristics under its leadership, which was strongly influenced by the Soviet dictator. Given the party stance that the GDR represented a different Germany which thus had no affiliation to the recent Nazi past: "any discussion of the continuities in thinking and behavior between the Third Reich and the GDR was stifled" (Michaels 7). In this sense, Müller shares the same or similar views as the leaders and party functionaries in the GDR at the time of its founding: the GDR was the new and better state where the revolutionary goals of the Spartacists and the KPD would finally be realized. Although Müller eventually lost hope in the redemptive qualities of the socialist nation, his depiction of the birth of the FRG in Germania Tod, a combination of slapstick and grotesque satire, corresponds to this GDR belief.

Finally, in order to further a better understanding of Müller's Geschichtsdramen in this study, included below is a brief overview of the major political, economic, social, and religious differences between the FRG and the GDR during their early years. Virtually from its inception, the GDR was controlled by the SED, the party which was officially established on 21-22 April 1946 as a result of the forced union between the KPD and the SPD in the Soviet-occupied zone. Walter Ulbricht (1893-1973), who had left Germany for Paris in 1933 as a result of the Nazi takeover and the resulting persecution of Communists, lived in exile in Moscow from 1938 until 1945. Unlike many of his comrades, he survived all the Stalinist purges, and became closely allied to the Soviet Communist Party. He returned to Germany with the Soviet Army and reinstated the KPD in the Soviet-occupied zone through the "Gruppe Ulbricht" as early as 1945. The main political parties in the FRG were the SPD led...
by Kurt Schumacher (1895-1952) and the CDU led by Konrad Adenauer (1876-1967), who was the Federal Chancellor from 1949 until 1963. In spite of the policies of denazification in all of the occupied zones, in the FRG, with its strong anti-communist stance, former Nazis were quickly integrated into society and many could even be found in the Adenauer government as Mary Fulbrook writes in *A Concise History of Germany* (213); while in the GDR they were sent to work primarily in construction.

On the monetary front, which is closely interconnected to the economic and political sectors, in June 1948 in the FRG the Western powers instituted a currency reform: the Deutschmark replaced the Reichsmark. The GDR soon responded with its own currency reform and the blockade of West Berlin. The USA sent help in the form of the Marshall Plan which enabled the city to survive until the Soviets finally ended their blockade in 1949. Thereafter, the FRG enjoyed strong economic support from its western ally, the USA, which helped it to develop into the Wirtschaftswunderland ("economic miracle land") as early as the 1950s. As Fulbrook explains: "In one stroke, the former bastion of Prussian nationalism and Nazi militarism had become a symbol of western freedom and democracy, to be protected at all costs" (210). As a result, the FRG was granted membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO on 5 May 1955, which corresponded with its return to sovereignty. The GDR responded by becoming a member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization or WTO in 1956. In this way, it can be seen that economic policy was having a direct influence on the political and military actions of both nations. Although by the eighties the GDR had eventually developed the best economy among the other eastern nations in the Eastern bloc, it could not compete with the progress of the FRG. After Stalin's death on 5 March 1953, a "New Course" was initiated to improve the economy, but at the expense of the workers. Their dissatisfaction increased until a major strike developed spontaneously beginning on 16 June 1953 and continuing the next day. Thus the economic situation led to serious repercussions for both the political and military arenas. Because none of the western powers intervened in
the strike of 17 June 1953 when the Soviet tanks entered Berlin to take control, it became clear to both sides that there would be no immediate reunification and that the Soviet leaders had nothing to fear from the western military powers. Most importantly, however, it is significant because it also meant the beginning of the end to any hopes of the GDR as the fulfillment of the communist utopian dream. After the strike, Ulbricht became Erster Sekretär ("First Secretary") of the Zentralkomitee ("Central Committee"), thus securing for himself a greater position of power, which he held until 1971.

The major social differences between the two German nations stem from the economic situation of each which, in turn, had its origin in the political arena. The major trading partners of the GDR were, of course, the other East European countries which were also members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance or COMECON. This economic organization, which was established in 1949 and finally disbanded in 1991, served to provide the Soviet Union with trading partners. The GDR, which joined in 1950, enjoyed limited trade with Albania (from 1949 until 1961), Bulgaria, Cuba (from 1972), Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Mongolia (from 1962), Vietnam (from 1978), and Yugoslavia. By the 1980s, the GDR's economy could boast of the highest per capita production of the COMECON countries and had become "the twelfth most important trading nation in the world" (Fulbrook 235). Even though the GDR, with its agricultural policy based on a system of collectivization which had replaced private ownership, was for the most part self-sufficient concerning production of food and consumer goods, the choice of items available to the average consumer was limited. It is a well-known fact that some of the first items East Germans bought during their excursions to West Berlin in November 1989 were bananas and other exotic fruit, which had not been available to them in the GDR. Not only was the banana a coveted consumer product following the fall of the Wall, it came to represent the different lifestyles each German nation had experienced and, as such, demonstrates the differing aspects associated with German identity. In her essay entitled, "The Banana and the Trabant:
Representations of the "Other" in a United Germany", Mary Beth Stein confirms the importance of the banana as a symbol of the West as well as of reunification: "For East Germans, the banana symbolized all that was desirable about the West [..]" (338). The East German automobile, the "Trabant" or "Trabi", however, "became the dominant symbol of the GDR after 1989", as she continues: "The Trabi allowed aggression toward the Other to be displaced onto an inanimate and physically distinguishable symbol of that Other" (340). The physical and ideological separation of forty years left its mark in a simple economic manner and ultimately, on German identity as well. These economic and social differences are what the Germans from both sides of the Wall would now have to conquer. Whereas employment, housing, healthcare, and childcare were available to virtually all GDR citizens, and many households owned a refrigerator, television, washing machine or even a car, privileged persons had more access to luxury goods and fewer travel restrictions than the average citizens. A privileged person can best be described as one who enjoys an elevated status due to his profession, such as a successful athlete or author, a government superior official or employee, or a Stasi informant. One of the most important and most devastating differences between life in the FRG and the GDR was the existence of the Ministerium für Staats sicherheit ("Ministry for State Security") or Staatssicherheitsdienst, known simply as the "Stasi" or secret police. Established in April 1950, the Stasi employed spies, spy tactics, and informants, who were often one's own family members, in an effort to repress its citizens and maintain control. In this sense, the GDR was no better than Nazi Germany and reflects a strong dictatorial aspect. After reunification the Stasi was dissolved and its records became available for public viewing, which resulted in further disappointment and distrust and a visible sign that its legacy lives on to haunt German identity.

Turning now to the comparison of religious aspects between the two nations, the GDR was primarily Protestant with a small Catholic segment; whereas the FRG had a large Catholic segment in addition to its Protestant members. The fact that the GDR was primarily
composed of Protestant citizens and only a small Catholic group can be explained historically, because the concentration of German Catholics was originally found in the western and southern areas of the former German Reich (Krisch 122). The Bund Evangelischer Kirchen ("League of Evangelical Churches in the GDR") in the GDR oversaw the two main Protestant or Evangelical churches: the Evangelische Kirche der Union (EKU) ("Evangelical Church of the Union") and the Vereinigte Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche (VELK) ("Lutheran United Evangelical Lutheran Church") (Krisch 122). As a response to the reproach following reunification that the Church in the GDR had been a tool of the Stasi, Dietrich Mendt wrote a pamphlet entitled, *Stasiverseuchte Kirche? Eine Flugschrift*. In this pamphlet, Mendt claims that there were four alternatives for a Christian in the GDR: 1) to leave the Church and join the Party; 2) to flee to the West; 3) to adapt to the GDR by joining the CDU and the "Society for German-Soviet Friendship" or; 4) to remain in the GDR and accept God's assignment to try and improve the situation there. During those forty years, in spite of all of the difficulties it and its members faced, the Church managed to maintain its presence in this communist, dictatorial society and even held peaceful protests. Especially in 1989 these peaceful Monday demonstrations are partly responsible for helping to further change and to promote the ultimate fall of the Berlin Wall.

**III.4 The End of an Era with the Demise of the GDR and Reunification:**

**Political Events and Literary Consequences**

Although it seemed that the Berlin Wall was toppled overnight, its process of deterioration had actually started much earlier. Since the end of World War II, the Soviet Union's main priority had rested on defense spending, but at the expense of its economic growth. By the 1980s, the effort to compete militarily with its rival superpower, the USA, was thus becoming harder to maintain, despite a period of stagnant growth during the 1970s in the USA and the short-lived decade of détente. This "release from tension" is the name
given to the period of improved relations during the seventies between the United States and the Soviet Union through the actions of President Richard M. Nixon (1913-1994) and the Secretary General of the Soviet Communist Party or KПdSU, Leonid I. Brezhnev (1906-1982). The defense policy of President Ronald Reagan (1911-2004) beginning in the early eighties, however, signalled a return to heightened rivalry. The result was that Germany became trapped in the middle and German soil was once again the battleground, as Pershing-II intermediate-range missiles were placed on West German soil in 1983. The situation improved due in part to the General Secretary of the KПdSU from 1985 until 1991, Mikhail Gorbachev (1931-), who introduced a program of economic, political, and social restructuring, known as perestroika, during the Twenty-Seventh Party Congress in 1986. His new policy became the catalyst for change within Eastern Europe, including the GDR, and shares responsibility for the eventual reunification of the two German states. In the early eighties, Poland had already initiated the process of freeing itself from Soviet hegemony due to the efforts of Lech Walesa (1943-) and the Solidarity movement on behalf of the Polish workers. By the end of the decade, accompanied by the strong support of Pope John Paul II (Karol Jozef Wojtyla) (1920-2005), which coincided with Gorbachev's more liberal attitude of "socialism with a human face", Poland was able to establish a workers' union and a non-communist form of government. The Eastern European political scene was restructuring itself and the former bastion of communist power, the Soviet Union, was learning to adapt as well. Accompanied by an increase in rebellious actions in other Soviet satellite states, the Soviet military machine was neither willing nor equipped to crush the resistance. Thus Russia's four decades of control in Eastern Europe were reaching their end. As a result of these parallel manifestations, on 8 December 1987, the Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev and the American President Reagan signed the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces or INF Treaty at the Washington Summit. The Treaty called for the reduction by withdrawal or destruction of both U.S. and Soviet missiles in Europe and was a major step toward ending the Cold War.
The largest destructive force which was unleashed following these relatively peaceful revolts was the Bosnian War, which began in the summer of 1991 and lasted until the fall of 1995. This new wave of violence and destruction would again drastically alter the landscape of Eastern Europe while also serving as a reminder that peace in Europe is a precious yet fragile condition.

Only a short time before the war in Eastern Europe started, in September 1989, Hungary opened the door for more freedom for the East Germans by waiving visa restrictions and making it possible for them to travel to Austria and then to the FRG. Many East German vacationers simply never returned to the GDR and others found refuge in the embassies in Prague and Warsaw. An exodus of GDR citizens was again occurring, similar to that of the fifties, which ultimately led to the building of the Berlin Wall. At this new point in time, the Wall was beginning to crack and there was not much that the GDR leadership could do to repair it. Demonstrations and church-sponsored non-violent protests took place on East German soil to show the dissatisfaction of the people and their desire for drastic change. Honecker, who was suffering from the onset of cancer, nevertheless conducted an official celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the GDR in October 1989. Shortly thereafter, on 18 October 1989, due to his illness, Honecker resigned from office and Egon Krenz (1937-) assumed the reigns over the rapidly deteriorating communist nation. In 1989, on 9 November -- an infamous historical date known for the Kristallnacht\textsuperscript{45} -- an unguarded comment by a government official, Günter Schabowski, the SED Party Secretary of Berlin, that travel restrictions would be eased immediately, set the wheels of history in motion: German citizens from both sides of the Wall took to the streets and literally started knocking it down piece by piece. A revolution by the people and without violent measures brought the two German nations one step closer to unification. Less than a year after Honecker's anniversary

\textsuperscript{45}On this date in 1938, "the night of broken glass", Jewish-owned homes, stores, and synagogues were brutally destroyed throughout Germany and thousands of Jews were either killed, arrested, or deported at the instigation of the Nazis.
celebration, on 3 October 1990, the FRG and the GDR were officially united: "the first workers' and peasants' state on German soil" had ceased to exist." However, it was not totally erased from the minds and memories of its former citizens.

The inter-German struggle was not over, however, it was only just beginning: this time in the form of the division of Germans into Wessis and Ossis; German identity took center stage, reminiscent of the post-war years, as citizens from both West and East looked once again for an answer to the question of what it means to be "German". This quest also affected German writers, just as it had after World War II, and the ensuing deutsch-deutsche Literaturstreit ("inter-German literature debate") of the nineties brings to mind memories of the Gruppe 47 and the divergence of ideologies at that time: the division primarily between communist and non-communist. In the nineties, however, the differences were more ambiguous given that many East German writers had emigrated to the West and East German writers still living in the GDR, such as Müller, had published in the West. The main concern centered on the role of the writer and intellectual in politics and the writer's responsibility to the truth, which is difficult to fulfill under censorship and dubious if the writer is known to have been privileged. As Stuart Parkes writes in, "Disunity and Unity - the Inter-German Literaturstreit of the Early 1990s", the major criticism focused on: "the attitudes and behaviour of writers and intellectuals, particular those in the GDR" (17). The disclosure that Müller and others had cooperated with the Stasi also contributed to the dialogue and further complicated matters. Reacting to the reproaches from his colleagues and the public, Müller had this to say about his contact with the Stasi: "Man hat über Kulturpolitik gesprochen. Das kann man mir zum Vorwurf machen. Aber warum sollte ich nicht versuchen, Einfluß zu nehmen, wenn ich dazu die Möglichkeit hatte? Ich habe darin nie ein moralisches Problem gesehen" (KoS 484). His attitude suggests that his contact with the East German secret police was a matter of routine which had no damaging effects on the literary and cultural
scene of that time. On the contrary, he paints a picture of himself as a concerned intellectual and author, who tried to use this forced perfunctory contact as a means of ameliorating the cultural policy of the GDR government. Whatever the case may be, the truth is that Müller, despite his earlier professional problems with the cultural ministry and party functionaries, became a privileged author. Allowed to travel beyond the Berlin Wall, he was thus able to pursue his literary and career interests over an extended period during which the majority of GDR citizens was forced to comply with strict regulations and prohibitions. From its inception, the East-West conflict presented him with the subject matter for his texts and, later, also offered him the opportunity and the freedom to benefit professionally and economically on both sides of the Wall, a situation he willingly accepted.

Müller's view on the role of the economy in shaping German identity reflect this East-West dichotomy prevalent in the Cold War years. In his 1982 interview with Sylvère Lotringer entitled, "Ich glaube an Konflikt. Sonst glaube ich an nichts", Müller says the following about the constitution of German identity in the FRG: "Die Mehrzahl der westdeutschen Bevölkerung findet ihre Identität im Standard der Deutschen Mark. Im Westen gibt es keine andere nationale Identität." With this comment he is criticizing the West German emphasis on money based, of course, on its capitalist system, and their mercenary attitudes. In regards to the East Germans he says: "Die eigentliche Gefahr für uns ist, daß die Westmark auch unser Standard wird". Müller apparently feared, not without reason as history has proven, that the defining factor of German identity in the GDR would become the West German form of currency at that time: the Deutschmark. The GDR populace would thus become as interested in acquiring goods as that of the FRG; in other words, would become a capitalistic Konsumgesellschaft ("society of consumers"), which, in

---

46("We talked about cultural policy. One can use that as a reproach against me. But why should I not have tried to use my influence, when I had the opportunity? I never saw a moral dilemma in that.")
47("The majority of West Germans find their identity in the standard of the German Mark. In the West there is no other national identity.")
48("The actual danger for us is that the Western Mark will become our standard as well.")
his Marxist view, would not be a positive development. Shortly after reunification, in an interview with Robert Weichinger in June of 1990 entitled, "Waren Sie privilegiert, Heiner Müller?", Müller expressed his disappointment that the Germans from the GDR were not improving their situation, rather were simply going: "Von einer Knechtschaft in die andere, von Stalin zur Deutschen Bank (GI3 87)." He recognized the important role that the economy has played throughout history because of its influence on the social and political elements. The peasants of the sixteenth century were revolting due to social dissatisfaction as a result of economic inequality which in turn affected their quality of life. The Silesian weavers from the mid-nineteenth century were protesting their social misery brought about by economic injustices. The factory owners, who were primarily interested in earning more profits, thus were only too willing to exploit their defenseless workers. As Müller rightly anticipated, the economic factor and the buying power of the West German form of currency was a major impetus in the desire for reunification; the East German currency was traded one to one against the West German Mark in July of 1990. Thus the economy still shapes German history even in modern times and, therefore, continues to influence German identity.

Although his words imply one thing, his actions say another: Müller was not totally immune to the allure of money. As he says in an interview in September 1991: "[...] Und das Geld. Geld nehme ich immer. Geld verschafft Freiheit" (GI3 130). His attempt to explain his position as a writer in the GDR is, ironically, based on the fundament of capitalism. The ability to excel as a writer or an artist throughout the ages has been dependent on the writer's basic existence: the age-old adage: "die Kunst geht nach Brot" ("art depends on bread") has not lost any of its relevance in the twentieth century. Following the less restrictive policies under Honecker, which made it possible for East German writers to publish their texts in the FRG, as discussed above, Müller willfully and knowingly benefitted from the capitalist

49 ("From one bondage into another, from Stalin to the German Bank.")
50 ("And the money. I always take the money. Money provides freedom.")
system he claimed to disdain. Asked if he was a privileged author, Müller avoids tackling the real issue and responds: "Ich denke schon. Es ist ja schon ein Privileg, daß man leben kann von dem, was man gern macht" (GI3 84). Yes, he was a privileged author who learned to manipulate publishers, interviewers, the audience, and readers on both sides of the Wall. Yet despite his characteristics and behavior, which some view as shortcomings, Müller is the creator of a body of work which deserves continued analysis, interpretation, and performance. As snapshots of another era in German history, his Geschichtsdrämen belong in the same category as those of Büchner and Brecht. Müller once said of Brecht and his works: "Brecht gebrauchen, ohne ihn zu kritisieren, ist Verrat" ("Keuner +/- Fatzer" 21); given Müller's stance, the same treatment can and must be applied to him and his texts.

III.5 Origins of Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann

With his comment: "Der Tod der "Germania" war befristet" (339), Schröder is, of course, referring to the reunification of the FRG and the GDR in 1990 based on the title of Müller's first play, Germania Tod in Berlin. More than four decades had passed since her official "death in Berlin" in 1945, yet "Germania" had finally risen from the ashes of both the fascist and communist flames of history. Therefore, it is not surprising that Müller was preparing to write another "Germania" play: not as a continuation, rather as a sequel designed to explore Germany's new situation and the newest facets of German identity. Germania 3 had its world premiere at the Bochum Schauspielhaus on 24 May 1996, directed by Leander Haußmann; it was also performed shortly thereafter on 19 June 1996 at the Berliner Ensemble, directed by Martin Wuttke. According to Holger Teschke, who worked with him

---

51 ("I think so. It is already a privilege to be able to make a living doing something one likes to do.")
52 ("To use Brecht without criticizing him is treason.")
53 ("The death of "Germania" was limited.")
54 As Müller explains in his interview with Peter von Becker, "Die Wahrheit leise und unerträglich" ("the truth softly and unbearable"), he had originally agreed to have the premiere of Germania 3 in the theater in Bochum with Leander Haußmann as director, because: "Es schien mir günstiger, denn der Erwartungsdruck ist ungeheuer hoch" ("It seemed better, because the pressure from expectations is incredibly strong"). But there was an ever-increasing opposition from his colleagues at the Berliner Ensemble, who believed it should have its premiere
at the Berliner Ensemble, Müller had originally planned to write this play by the year 2000 in seven parts, starting with Stalingrad and up to the fall of the Berlin Wall ("Heiner Müller zum Beispiel" 132). In an interview with Alexander Weigel in April 1991 entitled, "Was wird aus dem größeren Deutschland?" ("What will become of the larger Germany?") Müller laments:


This description coincides with characters and events found in Germania 3, which makes it highly plausible that he was referring to his final play. Another element to support this claim is the fact that he had not written a drama for seven years, as he states in his interview with Becker early in 1995: "Daß ich sieben Jahre kein Stück geschrieben habe, hat mich krank gemacht" (27).  

Such a timeline coincides with the completion and publication of his five-part cyclical play, Wolokolamsker Chaussee, which he wrote consecutively from 1984-1987. In his autobiography, he also refers to an already conceived text, which he was in the process of developing:

Mich interessiert, was Deutschland betrifft, der Zweite Weltkrieg. Jetzt ist es möglich, Hitler und Stalin in Beziehung zu setzen, auch im Theater. Die beiden können jetzt miteinander reden, ihre Arbeit ist getan. [. . .] Der Plan, das zu machen, ist fünf, sechs Jahre alt. Es gibt Notizen und Entwürfe (257).  

there. Thus Müller was in an uncomfortable situation and uncertain as to where the actual premiere would finally take place (23).

55("I don't have any time now for my desk. In my head I'm working on five plays. I don't know how long my head can put up with that. The first play that I want to write will be a play about the second world war in Russia, which will cover the time period from Stalingrad to the fall of the Wall. The protagonists are the victims, the shadows in the background are Hitler and Stalin.")

56("That I haven't written any play in seven years has made me sick.")

57("Regarding Germany, I am interested in the Second World War. Now it is possible to relate Hitler and Stalin to each other, also on the stage. The two can now talk to each other; their work is done. [. . .] The concept to do this is five or six years old. There are notes and outlines.")
Considering that his autobiography was published in 1992, it becomes clear that he took up his work on the drama in which Hitler and Stalin appear in the late eighties. In fact, his conception for such a play goes back even further, as he also explains in his interview with Becker: "Die Pläne, die Entwürfe für Stücke reichen in der Regel sehr weit zurück. Das Stück, das ich inzwischen fast fertig habe, beruht auf einem Plan, der ist schon zehn, fünfzehn Jahre alt" (10). According to his own calculations then, he has almost completed this play, which is still without a title at this point, as Becker points out (23), some fifteen years after its initial conception, similar to the developmental process for Germania Tod. Indeed, in his interview with Welzel, Müller reveals that he had originally considered placing the "Ulbricht/Thälmann" scene, which is the first scene of Germania 3, "Nächtliche Heerschau", as either the parallel scene to "Die Heilige Familie" or as the final scene in Germania Tod (201-202). His remarks in this interview confirm that his thought processes were already anticipating the end of the GDR and preparing the way for another "Germania" play. Although Müller shied away from the idea of categorizing his texts, he, nevertheless, had a tendency to write certain texts as a set or series based on certain themes. The most conspicuous of these being, for example, his planned "Doppelstück", Die Schlacht and Traktor, and his five-part Wolokolamsker Chaussee cycle. It can be reasonably and accurately stated, therefore, that the author conceived Germania Tod and Germania 3 as "Germania" plays which I am categorizing as "German identity" plays.

Nevertheless, some critics remain sceptical concerning the origins and completion of Müller's final play. Kalb, for example, who had interviewed Müller personally for his book, quotes Teschke as saying that Germania 3 is not actually a completed play, rather consisted of "a compilation of core material intended for numerous future plays" which Müller quickly put together in 1995 after learning that he was terminally ill (234). According to Roland Clauß, however, and based on information he received from Stephan Suschke, the assistant

58("The plans, the outlines for plays as a rule go way back. The play that I have almost completed in the
director at the Berliner Ensemble who guided the publication of this play, it is a fully completed text which Müller worked on from December 1994 until December 1995 (42), and the author himself oversaw the correction process (49-50). In the interview with von Becker, Müller admits that: "Es gibt noch ein paar Stellen, die ich sonst nicht zu Ende schreiben kann. Wo ich weiß, da fehlt noch etwas, aber was genau, das krieg ich nicht raus ohne Kontakt mit der Bühne" (23). Whether he was able to complete the play to his satisfaction during the last eleven months of his life at rehearsals is not definitively known, but in any case and most unfortunately, he did not have the pleasure of seeing its premiere which he had planned to stage early in 1996 at the Berliner Ensemble. Without any concrete statement by Müller himself, which is no longer possible, and provided no further correspondence or information regarding this particular aspect surfaces, it must by necessity remain a matter of speculation. His death in December 1995 made any such alterations or adjustments, however, a moot point and, therefore, Germania 3 must be interpreted and analyzed, not as it may have developed, but rather as it exists now and for all time.

As mentioned above, as late as January 1995 Müller's final play was still without an official title. The title he finally chose for this Geschichtsdrama must be divided into two parts in order to analyze it accurately. The first part, "Germania 3" is based on the supposition, which I discussed in Chapter One, that both a "Germania 1" and a "Germania 2" exist. In that discussion I assert that the play Germania Tod represents Germania 1; the GDR stands for Germania 2; and Germany after reunification in 1990 is depicted as Germania 3. In 1992, Müller responds to a query by Welzel if the topic of "Germania" has been exhausted or not. By stating: "Das Thema ,,Germania" ist nicht beendet; auf keinen Fall. Das fängt ja gerade wieder an. Aber nicht innerhalb dieses Textes, da würde ich nichts ändern" (202) it meantime, is based on a plan that is ten, fifteen years old."

59("There are still a few spots, which I otherwise cannot finish writing. Where I know that something is missing, but not exactly what, I cannot figure that out without contact with the stage.")

60("The topic "Germania" is not finished; not at all. It has only just begun again. But not within this text, I would not change anything in that.")
is clear he thus considers his first "Germania" play to be complete. However, he is considering a new play about the topic: "[...] Ich möchte nur gerne was Neues schreiben, was in dem Zusammenhang mal machen, mal den Kontext dazu, also mal "Germania II" -- wie immer das aussieht. [...] Nicht Erweiterung, es ist das nächste dann (214)." Müller's use of the term "Germania" signifies that he was referring to a play with the topic of "Germania" i.e., German identity and what has been happening within Germany since the completion of his first Germania play. The designation using the Roman number "II" refers only to the fact that his interest lies in the creation of a second "Germania" play, but it does not indicate the number which will appear in the title.

Müller most likely borrowed the second part of the title from the name of a 1931 war novel about German soldiers during World War I by Paul Coelestin Ettighoffer (1896-1975) and specifically the chapter entitled, "Gespenster am Toten Mann". The term "Totenten Mann" is taken from the hill at Verdun in northeastern France bearing the name, "Homme Mort" ("Dead Man"). Given Müller's characteristic trait of borrowing subject matter or

---

61("[...] I would just like to write something new, to make something in this context, thus something like "Germania II" -- whatever that would look like. [...] Not a continuation, it is the next one then.")

62Both Schmitt and Eke point to Ettighoffer's novel as the source for the title of Müller's Geschichtsdrama (Schmitt 181; Eke 249). There is no known concrete proof, however, such as a source from one of his numerous interviews, a letter, or his autobiography. Schmitt comments that a connection to this novel would have "wenig Sinn" ("little sense") since Müller's play does not include any elements relating to this hill at Verdun or to World War I (182). However, considering that WWI set events in motion which led to much turmoil within Germany, and Müller's interest in portraying the interconnection of historical events and their subsequent effects on the future course of Germany, it is conceivable that Müller chose this title. In addition, Müller visited Verdun in October 1995 in preparation for the performance there of Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann as part of the Festspiele ("festival performance"). In his memorial speech at Müller's funeral, Alexander Kluge mentions that Müller was "uninvited" by Verdun's mayor after his less than complimentary comments relating to "Totenkitsch" ("cheapening of the dead"). (Kluge's speech is printed as: "Es ist ein Irrtum, daß die Toten tot sind" ("It's a mistake, that the dead are dead") in: Ich Wer ist das / Im Regen aus Vogelkot Im Kalkfell für Heiner Müller Arbeitsbuch (Berlin: Theater der Zeit, 1996) 145-147.

63Paul Coelestin Ettighoffer, Gespenster am Toten Mann (Cologne: Gilde, 1931). In the chapter mentioned, found on pages 126-131, the deputy officer Segmüller, who is going insane due to the strains of battle, has a foreboding of imminent death. In his hallucination he sees the souls of just fallen soldiers fighting each other in the air: "Einjährige seid ihr, na, da müßt ihr es doch wissen, daß die Seelen der toten Soldaten noch lange nach den Schlachten in der Luft schwieben und sich dort bekämpfen [...] Nun, soeben habe ich die hier Gefallenen gesehen. Sie haben sich mit Handgranaten, mit Gewehren und mit Spaten bekämpft, dort, in der Luft, über dem Toten Mann. Nun weiß ich, daß mein Ende gekommen ist. Ich muß sterben, Kameraden. Es wird ein großes Sterben geben in unserem Regiment [...] Ja, es wird ein großes Sterben geben; da, da (...) seht ihr nicht, da sind sie wieder. Jetzt sind es Franzosen ... Sie kommen auf uns zu ... Alarm! Alaaarm! Gespenster! Gäspsänstar! Gäspsänstar am Toten Mann! Alarm! Alaaarm!" (129-130). ("You are high school students, well, you really should know it, that the souls of the dead soldiers hover in the air long after the battles and continue
themes from other literary works to inspire him for his own literary creations, it is consistent with his style that he would have based the title on this scene from Ettighoffer's World War I Kriegsroman. An interesting yet ironic fact about Ettighoffer which has not been mentioned in the secondary literature is that the author, in addition to fighting during World War I, later became a dedicated Nazi and even volunteered for service during the Second World War. The Nazis reprinted his works, which centered on World War I and a soldier's strong sense of nationalism, and used them for propaganda purposes about the myth of the German soldier: a myth Müller was interested in debunking. In addition, the fact that Müller visited Verdun in October 1995, a mere two months before his death, strengthens the supposition that he knew of this hill and decided to use it for the title of his play. By doing so, he draws a connection to events from World War I and most importantly, to its aftermath which include the Treaty of Versailles, the murder of the German communist icon, Rosa Luxemburg, the rise of Hitler, who is responsible for World War II and in particular Stalingrad, the eventual division of Germany, and ultimately the creation of the GDR.

III.5.1 Form and Style

Germania 3 is composed of a series of nine separate scenes which take place in different settings and at various historical times, but all within the twentieth century after World War II and some even after reunification. The majority of the scenes are made up of either brief dialogues or long monologues for which Müller employs both iambic pentameter and prose. Similar to his style in Germania Tod, the author employs the technique of intertextuality throughout the play to reflect various elements relating to the German past.

fighting each other there [... ] Now, I have just seen those who have fallen here. They were fighting each other with hand grenades, with pistols and with spades, there, in the air, above the Dead Man. Now I know that my end has come. I must die, comrades. There will be many dying from our regiment. [... ] Yes, many are going to die; there, there, don't you see, there they are again. Now it is the French ... They are coming straight toward us, ... Alarm! Alaaarm! Ghosts! Ghosts! Ghosts at Dead Man! Alarm! Alaaarm!"

Segmüller is speaking to the soldiers who are known as "one-years": high school students who only had to serve for one year during peace-time and who, therefore, do not have as much as experience, which is similar to Müller's positioning of younger and older soldiers in Germania Tod and Germania 3. The line, "Ich muß sterben, Kameraden" does make one think of Müller standing there alone at the hill in Verdun with the realization that he is dying of cancer just two
More so than in his first "German identity play", however, he relies heavily on inserting long passages from nine well-known literary texts by German authors, including two of his own, and even provides a list of sources for the reader. At the end of the play the sources for the quotes are listed, of which there are nine total including, in order of their appearance: Heinrich von Kleist's Prinz Friedrich von Homburg (1821), Friedrich Hölderlin's Empedokles (1797-1799), Friedrich Hebbel's Die Nibelungen (1861), Bertolt Brecht's Leben des Galilei (1943) and Coriolan (1952/53), Franz Kafka's Das Stadtwappen (1920/31), Müller's Philoktet (1958/64) and Macbeth (1971) and Franz Grillparzer's Die Ahnfrau (1817). Müller's use of these secondary literary sources is an important component of the play and, therefore, of my analysis and interpretation relating to German history and identity. Kalb justifiably refers to the drama as one of Müller's "most densely allusive writings" (233-234).

In the appendix at the end of the play, compiled by Suschke, additional evidence for the West-East dichotomy is found. There are twenty-one entries from the GDR and nineteen entries from the FRG encyclopedia, respectively: Lexikon A-Z in zwei Bänden, Enzyklopädie Volkseigener Verlag, Leipzig, 1957 and Das Bertelsmann Lexikon in vier Bänden, C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1955 (85-116). Presented side by side in two separate columns, their main purpose is not only to explain the varying elements with which the reader may not be familiar, rather they also function as a means to compare and contrast the differing definitions of persons, institutions, and other aspects of German existence as presented by the East and West at the height of the Cold War in the mid-fifties. The need to compare experiences is an aspect which reflects German identity after the reunification: a combination of citizens from both the GDR and the FRG who have grown up and have been indoctrinated by different ideologies: "Ossi versus Wessi." This appendix is extremely important for the overall context of German identity associated with this play because it shows the discrepancies now present in the reunified Germany which are based on the East-
versus-West dichotomy, and vice-versa. The respective entries for "Deutschland" reflect the differing political and cultural perspectives of the GDR and the FRG. In the GDR entry, for example, it is noted that the country was divided by "foreign imperialists" in 1945 and since then two separate and very different nation states have existed (97-98); whereas in the FRG entry there is no mention of the forced separation, rather the emphasis is on the precarious geographical location which has led to positive and negative cultural developments. Also worth noting are the respective entries for the "GDR" and the "FRG": these discrepancies are a further indication of the internal division of which Müller writes and which could lead to future violence. The gap between East and West, i.e., Ossi and Wessi, respectively, thus reflects a cultural deficiency with major implications for the future of German identity.

III.6 Summary

The division of Germany was not an automatic consequence of its World War II defeat in 1945, rather it was more a result of the power struggle between the USA and the UdSSR for world supremacy (Minnerup 4). Based on a capitalist economy, the USA feared the threat of communism which would close important markets and weaken its power base; whereas the USSR, with its dictatorial regime, was interested in acquiring more power and in spreading communism. The state of German identity in the 1980s was still dominated by the fissure between East and West, the continuing Cold War as demonstrated by the Berlin Wall, and the different economic systems, even after the fall of the Wall on 9 November 1989 and official reunification on 3 October 1990. Writers from both sides of the Wall had to deal with this new configuration and the important issue of German identity. In her essay entitled, "Whose problem is it, anyway?" Frauke Meyer-Gosau explores the role of literature after reunification. She writes:

> Seen from a historical point of view, the German literature of transition in general offered a medium for a shattered mentality to find out what it still or already was

and more personal significance.
able to think and formulate about itself under the condition of disturbing change. Literature served in that respect as a means of self-exploration and self-expression -- no question whose problem this was in Germany after 1989 (and no matter whether anybody except the author him- or herself would make any use of this offer) (228).

German writers after 1990 were faced with a similar yet reversed situation to that after 1949, namely: reverting from two German literatures to a single German literature. The ultimate question still remained the same, however: what does it mean to be German? The answer to this question is problematic because it seems to depend upon which side of the Wall one comes from and, therefore, on one's corresponding political ideology. These ideological East-West differences and their effect on German development play a major role in both of Müller's Geschichtsdramen. For him, as for the majority of Marxists, the FRG represents the facet of German identity in which fascism was able to continue while cooperation with Western, particularly American, capitalism bolstered the FRG economy and made it into an imperialist economic power. In the GDR, on the other hand, the leadership became more dependent on the Soviet Union politically and economically. Thus the determination of German identity and the economic stability of both German states have not only been based on the recent past, but also, as a matter of logic, became contingent on the relationship of each to its most powerful ally, who were major and powerful rivals on the world scene. As a result, both the FRG and the GDR viewed their neighbor and "brother" to the East or the West, respectively, as a potential threat, a situation which lasted until the thawing of relations during the seventies. By the time of the fall of the Berlin Wall and official reunification, the question of German identity had acquired a new set of factors and, therefore, required a new perspective given the altered national borders and overall dynamic constellation within Europe.

Müller's obsession with German history, combined with his search for German identity, are reflected in Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann.
Whereas the former is Müller's expression of German history and the various facets of German identity associated with it, in the latter he concentrates on the brief existence of the GDR, its history, and the ultimate effects of its demise on German identity. Now it is time to take a closer look at what Müller found during his search and what each of these two texts reveals about German identity. In the next chapter, I analyze and interpret the themes and characters in Germania Tod in Berlin in connection with their significance to German identity based on historical and intertextual aspects from Müller's perspective.
IV. Analysis of *Germania Tod in Berlin*

IV.1 Major Themes and Characters Reflecting German Identity

Motto:
"ES LEBE DIE
DEUTSCHE DEMOKRATISCHE REPUBLIK
DER ERSTE ARBEITERUNDBAUERNSTAAT
AUF DEUTSchem BODEN"¹

The above motto signifies the GDR's attempt to conceive itself and to be considered the "first workers' and peasants' state on German soil", an attainable goal for the peasants in the sixteenth century and the workers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. A lofty communist objective which inspired hope in many, including Müller, but which would prove to remain out of reach in a nation that was out of touch with its proletarian members of society. Since the playwright was an avowed Marxist, his choice of characters and themes in *Germania Tod in Berlin* reflects primarily negative aspects of past German behavior and events. He used the Geschichtsdrama to examine Germany's history in an effort to reach a better understanding of past German identity and, in order to accurately reflect on and discover its current identity. Spanning the spectrum of time not randomly, but according to a specific design, Müller's historical odyssey takes us back as far as the first century to Germany's famous and beloved forefather, Arminius. Certain characters represent well-known figures from Germany's recent historical past, such as Hitler and Goebbels; other characters, for instance Hilse, are based on German literature, and still others have their basis in German mythology, such as the Nibelungs. Some of the themes relating to German identity in this play emphasize elements of German history and identity which can be traced

¹("Long live the German Democratic Republic: the first workers' and peasants' state on German soil") This quote is taken from *Germania Tod in Berlin*, "Die Straße 2" (38). All German quotes from the play are taken from: Heiner Müller, *Germania Tod in Berlin*, Texte 5. (Berlin: Rotbuch 176, 1977) 35-78. The page number follows the respective German quote in parentheses. Unless otherwise indicated, all English translations of the German original are my own. Although there is a published English version: Heiner Müller, "Germania Death in Berlin," *Explosion of a Memory: Writings*, ed. and trans. Carl Weber (New York: PAJ Publications, 1989) 39-
back to previous Geschichtsdramen, which were already presented in Chapter Two: Goethe's Götz, Schiller's Wallenstein, Kleist's Die Hermannsschlacht and Der Prinz von Homburg, Büchner's Dantons Tod, Hauptmann's Die Weber and Florian Geyer, and Brecht's Mutter Courage. Müller's characters from the proletariat and the lower levels of society, such as prostitutes and drunks, represent types rather than specific named individuals; that is, their depiction is based exclusively on their role in society. Hilse is the conspicuous exception to this general rule.

Müller's eclectic mixture of various social and political types reflects a common German historical, political, and literary heritage while simultaneously illuminating the German people's search for a new collective identity. Using specific constellations based on themes relating to German identity, I will discuss, analyze, and explain the significance of the historical, allegorical, and mythical characters based on: 1) historical facts; 2) purpose within the play itself and; 3) Müller's time period. In regard to the literary analyses, Müller employs the method of intertextuality throughout this play by inserting quotes or excerpts from other literary works, German folk songs, fairy tales, and other sources. These texts have primarily either social, political, or military connotations which reflect on various facets of German identity relevant to his search: each will be discussed in conjunction with the appropriate characters and scenes. Müller's use of intertextuality provides a main component in his presentation of and search for German identity and as such is a significant aspect of this Geschichtsdrama. As Heinz-Dieter Weber asserts: "Der Sinn des Stücks ist ausschließlich konstituiert über seine Intertextualität" (48).\(^2\) Historical characters, intertextual references, and his overall style are the principal components of Müller's search for German identity and are, therefore, the focus of my analysis.

\(^88\), I have chosen to use my own translations due to various discrepancies between Müller's original German version and Weber's English translation which would affect my interpretation.

\(^2\)("The meaning of the play is established exclusively through its intertextuality.")
IV.1.1 The Germans and Their Rulers

a) Hitler and the Myths of the Third Reich

I first turn to the figures: Adolf Hitler was born not in Germany, but in Braunau-am-Inn, Austria, an area considered the borderlands, where people are usually unsure about their national identity and have to fight for it, often becoming fanatical in the process. Following the end of the First World War, there were six million Germans in Austria who were denied national reunification through the peace treaty of 1919, according to A.J.P. Taylor in *The Origins of the Second World War* (135). Even before then, during the days of Bismarck, Austria had been defeated by Prussia and was excluded from the German unification process, a matter of contention for some, such as Hitler. Hitler, as Taylor remarks: "had been a German nationalist in Austria long before he became the leader of nationalism in Germany" (82). He even volunteered for military service in Munich, fought in the German Army during World War I and was awarded two medals for bravery. After a brief unsuccessful attempt to establish himself as an artist, he found his calling in politics. While serving a prison sentence in 1924 for taking part in the unsuccessful uprising against the Weimar Republic, he wrote the infamous *Mein Kampf* ("My Struggle"). Declared Chancellor by President Paul von Hindenburg in 1933, he would soon become the most powerful and dangerous man in the history of Gemany and Europe since Napoleon. During the historic night from 30 June to 1 July 1934, the infamous *Nacht der langen Messer* ("night of the long knives"), Hitler consolidated his power over the party by having the leaders of the *Sturmabteilung* (SA) ("Storm Troopers") murdered by Himmler's and Goebbel's men. Hitler had to choose between the *Reichswehr* ("German armed forces 1919-1933") and the SA, which demanded incorporation into the *Reichswehr* along with more power, which the generals refused. Hitler knew that he could not rule without the support of the military and sacrificed the SA: he thus consolidated his power over the NSDAP by brazenly taking the law into his own hands and
killing his opponents. According to Ernst Schürer in his essay, "Revolution from the Right: Bertolt Brecht's American Gangster Play The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui", in the American press, Hitler was compared to the gangsters of the "Prohibition Era" like Al Capone who disposed of their rivals in a similar manner, as during the famous St. Valentine's Day Massacre in Chicago in 1929. In his play, Brecht compares Capone, "who had become a folk hero and almost a mythical figure to the people by the end of the 1930's" (Schürer 29) with Hitler, whom he did not want to turn into a myth, rather: "his intention was to destroy the aura of greatness surrounding dictators, statesmen, politicians, who were often no more than political criminals" (Schürer 37). In contrast to Müller's depiction of events, Hitler's former friend and ally, Ernst Röhm, was actually shot and killed on 1 July 1934 by the SS-Oberführer ("superior commander"), Theodor Eicke, after refusing to commit suicide (Berthold 44). While Hitler's comment that he used his pistol to shoot Röhm himself while Goebbels and Himmler held him is historically untrue, it exemplifies Hitler's control of that situation and the subordinate role the other men played in this power struggle. Most likely it also represents an intertextual reference to Brecht's play, Arturo Ui in which such a scene does occur. Müller's reference to Hitler's relationship to Röhm as his "first marriage" implies that his second marriage is to Josef Goebbels, the Reichsminister für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda (Minister of the Reich for Enlightenment of the People and Propaganda"), usually referred to as the Nazi propaganda minister. By including allusions to marriage or relationships with other men, in particular Röhm, a known homosexual, Müller insinuates that Hitler had homosexual tendencies. In Hitlers Geheimnis: Das Doppelleben eines Diktators the German historian Lothar Machtan claims that Hitler was a homosexual who lived in fear of being "outed" and, therefore, successfully suppressed his tendencies and destroyed any and all proof from his earlier years. Pertaining to written clues or documentation Machtan writes: "Wenn es sie gegeben hat, dann sind sie von Hitler und seinen Leuten
mit Sicherheit vernichtet worden" (29). In Hitler and Stalin, Parallel Lives the distinguished English historian and expert on both dictators, Alan Bullock, avoids any mention of homosexuality, writing only that: "Without any conclusive evidence to go on, there is a strong presumption that Hitler was incapable of normal sexual relations, whether for physical or psychological reasons, or both" (421). Thus the supposition of Hitler's sexual preferences and inclinations remains merely that, but Müller's portrayal of a perverted and grotesque man is consistent with the rumors and conjectures which still abound over half a century later.

In the first scene of his play, Schweyk im Zweiten Weltkrieg, Brecht satirizes Hitler and his Russian offensive in Stalingrad: he describes Hitler, Göring, and Himmler as "überlebensgroß" ("larger than life") but Goebbels he describes as "überlebensklein" ("smaller than life") (Gesammelte Werke Vol. 2 1915). In reference to the ideal of the blond and tall Aryan male as extolled by the Nazi, Goebbels was satirically called a "Schrumpfgermane" or "shrivelled German". Given that a strong rivalry existed among the top leaders, especially Göring and Goebbels, this namecalling was possibly even encouraged. Müller presents Goebbels with a Klumpfuß ("clubfoot"); he is a type of "she-devil" or, as Schmitt refers to him, a "weiblicher Teufel" (103). He was indeed a man of small stature and Müller's depiction of him with a clubfoot is based on fact: due to a bout with polio as a child Goebbels had developed a crippled foot. After completing his academic studies in German literature and even writing a novel he, like Hitler, also found his fulfillment in politics. Propaganda was the most powerful tool during the Nazi regime and Goebbels wielded it with a masterly hand until 1945. While Hitler was known at that time as abstemious sexually --

---

3 ("If they existed, then they were definitively destroyed by Hitler and his people.")
4 Goebbels did in fact have a club-foot. In German folklore the devil has a "Klumpfuß" and leaves a smell of Schwefel ("sulphur"). In Heinrich von Kleist's Der zerbrochene Krug the licentious judge Adam has a "Klumpfuß." In one of the scenes, the character Brigitte believes that he is the devil because of his "Klumpfuß" and his smell. Schulz uses the term "Gottvater" for Hitler's relationship to Goebbels' child (133); and Schmitt refers to Hitler as "der Vater" but also as "ein negativer Gottvater" (103).
5 He wrote and published an expressionist novel entitled, Michael: ein Deutsches Schicksal in Tagebuchblättern (1926).
few people knew that he had a mistress aptly named Eva Braun -- Goebbels, in spite of being a married man with several children and despite his small stature, was famous for his affairs, especially with actresses whom he was able to court with impunity because of his control over the German film industry. It is reported that Hitler got so disgusted with him that he issued a stern warning, either to desist or be dismissed. Müller obviously had fun turning this oversexed male into an oversexed female, and Hitler into a timid man with strict sexual mores who is scandalized by his mother's sexual licentiousness.

b) Germania

I continue my analysis with the character of "Germania", based on an allegorical figure which has existed for centuries in German lore and literature, and her relationship to this infamous dictator. She represents the German national mood in any given specific era: at times positively and at other times negatively. Müller takes this traditional figure with her long and enduring history dating back to the sixteenth century and the Reformation and Humanism, and uses her to present his own interpretation of Germany based on his experiences during and after the Hitler years: the period including most of the twentieth century. In his essay, "Heiner Müller and the German Question", Axel Schalk writes: "The author has cynically turned on its head the oldest of all German myths, of the blonde Germania -- she who watched over the Rhine" (70). Müller's choice of image for "Germania" in this play reflects his disillusion with and disdain for the system which enabled Hitler to seize power and the events which developed afterwards. Regardless of how "Germania" has been represented throughout the centuries, whether in a positive or a negative manner, she

---

6 A detailed list can be found in Jost Hermand's essay, "Braut, Mutter oder Hure? Heiner Müllers Germania und ihre Vorgeschichte", Sieben Arten an Deutschland zu leiden. (Königstein: Athenäum, 1979) 127-141. The essay has been published again in: Jost Hermand and Helen Fehervary, Mit den Toten Reden: Fragen an Heiner Müller. (Cologne: Böhlau, 1999) 53-69. He writes: Doch die Vielgestaltigste unter all diesen Figuren ist sicher die Germania, da sie die Deutschen, das Volk mit den meisten Hoffnungen und Niederlagen, Umbrüchen, Stagnationen, Demütigungen und Überhebungen zu allegorisieren hatte ("Braut" Sieben Arten 128). ("However, the most polymorphic of all these figures is certainly that of Germania, since she had to allegorize the Germans, the people with the most hopes and defeats, upheavals, stagnations, humiliations, and arrogance.")
has always constituted an allegory of national identity, even -- or perhaps especially -- following 1945. Although she was doomed to destruction by the actions of Hitler and the Nazis and was to a certain extent their victim, she is not totally pure and innocent and Müller does not neglect to express this aspect.

"Germania" makes her first and only appearance in *Germania Tod* in scene seven entitled, "Die Heilige Familie" ("The Holy Family"), which is situated symmetrically in the middle of the play with six scenes previous and six following. Because this scene is the centerpiece of the play -- its importance is further underlined by the play's title -- the significance of the figure is evident: "Germania" i.e., the German people and ultimately German identity, are the main topic of this play. In this sense, Müller's use of the grotesque reaches almost comical proportions: if the subject matter were not so horrific, it could be considered comical or even slapstick. In explaining Müller's images, Schalk clarifies that they: "aim, by means of the comic, to strip historical significance of its demonic features" (71). During the Nazi regime, Hitler and his highest ranking officers were responsible for such dialobical acts that Müller chose to represent him and his cohorts as ridiculous figures in order to emasculate them and the memories associated with them. Müller's portrayal of Hitler can best be compared to Charlie Chaplin's efforts in his film from 1940, "The Great Dictator", in which he parodies the German dictator in an attempt to disarm him using humorous means. Taking place in Berlin in April 1945 in the *Führerbunker* ("Führer's bunker"), it occurs at a significant juncture in Germany's modern history because the Soviet Rote Armee ("Red Army") entered Berlin on 2 April 1945 and on the last day of the month Hitler committed suicide in his bunker. Müller's grotesque satire is shocking, but since it obviously has no relationship to reality, the audience is induced or rather forced to search for symbolic interpretation based on the figures, the text, and the requisites: allegorical figures assist greatly in this task.
In Müller's *Geschichtsdrama*, Goebbels is depicted with "gigantic breasts" and pregnant with Hitler's child while Germania, the mother of Hitler, serves as midwife for the impending birth. She is described as "riesig" ("enormous") but not as "überlebensgroß" which, like Brecht before him, Müller uses to describe other characters, such as the Baker and the Man Who Carries Signs from scene one and the Nibelungs in scene five. The German terms "überlebensgroß" and "riesig", "larger-than-life" and "enormous" respectively, signify a distinguishable difference with implicit connotations: "Germania" is depicted in a measure beyond the normal scope and even "larger-than-life". This distinction signifies her i.e., Germany's, important position and stature in the European political landscape, and by his use of the term "riesig" Müller thus presents an exaggerated image of Germany's sense of its own importance. He also portrays a complicated relationship between Hitler and Germania: although she is his mother, she touches his genitals. Her interest may be a reflection of her need to find out if he has the sexual prowess necessary to father a new Germany. Naturally she has slept with him, all on the symbolic level, as the biographical and symbolic interpretations overlap. She is his mother because Hitler, although originally an Austrian citizen, was a product of extreme German nationalism. He only acquired German citizenship on 22 February 1932 in order to be able to run for political office (Bullock 268). He loves her more than his father, who was, after all, Austrian ("Ödipuskomplex"). Hitler sleeps with her in order to father a new Germany after the defeat and humiliation experienced at Versailles. His embarrassment from her action prompts her to laughingly refer to his "Ödipuskomplex" (60) which leaves little room for doubt that in addition to their mother-son relationship he is also, as Fehervary phrases it: "her son-lover Hitler" ("History and Aesthetics" 89). Germania's insult to Hitler later in the scene: "Mit dir war nie viel los im Bett" (62) ("You were never very good in bed") refers to the popular conception during that time of Hitler as a sexual prude. Bullock mentions the studies concerning Hitler which concentrate on: "his relationship
with an over-protective mother and a domineering father, a common enough pattern in the German-speaking world at the turn of the century and one which Freud saw as the origin of an Oedipus complex" (10). The term "Oedipus complex" was named by Sigmund Freud and rejected by the Nazis, who banned his works and included them in their book-burning frenzy on 10 May 1933. Hitler's reaction to Germania's remark about this complex: "Das ist eine jüdische Schweinerei" (60) ("That is a Jewish obscenity") prompts her to scold him for his "Judengeschichten" ("Jewish stories"). These have led to her being scorned and snubbed and the unwilling recipient of "finger-pointing": "Es gibt Leute, die zeigen mit Fingern auf mich. Heute noch. Manche grüßen nicht einmal" (60-61) ("There are some who point a finger at me. Even today. Some don't even greet me"). German identity in 1956 and 1971 was strongly associated with and condemned by other nations for its Nazi and fascist past and its crimes, especially the aggression against other countries and the Holocaust, as is still the case.

Although she reprimands him for his actions against the Jews, her attitude leaves doubt that she is truly sorry about his persecution of the Jews. Rather, she seems more upset that her reputation has been sullied and that she no longer enjoys popular social status. Matias Mieth also refers to the idea that: "Germania -- Deutschland -- will international wieder salonfähig werden" (61) in Die Masken des Erinnerns: Zur Ästhetisierung von Geschichte und Vorgeschichte der DDR bei Heiner Müller. Her attitude thus reflects a lack of remorse for recent events in Germany.

Hitler's breakfast, which consists of a German soldier and gasoline, points to the two resources which Hitler and his armies used most wastefully at this point in the war to hold out against the onslaught of the enemies: they are being consumed at a fast rate. In Heiner

7 ("Germania -- Germany -- wants to become internationally fit for society again.") The idea of others pointing an accusing finger at Germania is found in verse five of Brecht's poem, "O Deutschland, bleiche Mutter!" 

---

7 Bertolt Brecht, Gesammelte Werke in acht Bänden, vol. 4 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1967) 487-488. ("Oh Germany, pallid mother!") Why do oppressors everywhere glorify you, but
Müller, Reinhard Tschapke explains that: "Der moderne Krieg säuft Benzin in Mengen -- und also schüttet auch Hitler kräftig das Zeug in sich hinein" (34). In addition, his "Mama" Germania is actually supporting him even at this late date, as her solicitous motherly remarks demonstrate: "Trinkst du dein Benzin? Iß deine Männer? Brav" (60) ("Are you drinking your gasoline? Eating your men? Good boy"). The reference to eating his men refers back to Goebbels' line to Hitler: "Das deutsche Volk liebt Sie als Vegetarier" (59) ("The German people loves you as a vegetarian"), which has its basis in fact although it is attributed to being part of Nazi propaganda. Bullock writes that after the suicide of his favorite niece, Geli Raubal, the daughter of his half-sister, Angela Raubal, Hitler: "refused to touch meat or alcohol for the rest of his life" (419-420) and describes him as "an aggressive vegetarian and teetotaler" (423). Therefore, the allusions to the technical ("Benzin") and human ("Männer") resources for war, as expressed in Hitler's diet, point to his criminal waste and destruction of both at this late stage in the war, when all was lost and there was no hope of victory. They also point to Hitler's professed desire to take Germany down with him if he lost the war since the German people had not proven themselves worthy of him and his grand vision.

Meanwhile, Germania applies makeup to Goebbels so that he looks like a prostitute before the arrival of the Three Kings, who represent the three Western Allies: England, France, and the United States, respectively. The idea of Goebbels wearing makeup is based on historical fact, as he was seen wearing makeup on at least one occasion: Stauffenberg disgustedly claimed to have seen Goebbels wearing makeup at a staff meeting (Baigent 19). By applying makeup to his face, Germania wants to put the best face on things and conceal Goebbels' true identity which represents the fascist Nazi past; thus she is trying to fool the Western Allies into believing that there is no more danger and nothing left to fear. She

/* The oppressed accuse you? / The exploited / Point their fingers at you, but / The exploiters praise the system / Which was devised in your house! [. . .]*/

8 ("Modern war guzzles great amounts of gasoline -- and so Hitler also fills himself up vigorously with the stuff."))
silences Goebbels when he tries to recite one of his most infamous speeches: "Wollt ihr den totalen Krieg?" ("Do you want total war?") which he gave on 18 February 1943 at the Sportpalast ("sport palace") in Berlin shortly after it was clear that defeat at Stalingrad was imminent. Back to the play: after Hitler had already reprimanded Goebbels for screaming, which he perceives as a sign of weakness and not worthy of the Aryan race: "Eine deutsche Mutter schreit nicht" (61) ("A German mother doesn't scream"), he attempts to prevent Germania from making Goebbels look disreputable: "Eine deutsche Mutter --" (61) ("A German mother -- "). She interrupts him with her response: "Ich muß mit der Zeit gehn, wenn ich wieder ins Geschäft kommen will" (61) ("I have to go with the times if I want to get back into business") which reflects a strong parallel to Brecht's character, Mother Courage, and her commercial interests and business sense. In the same way that she exploits the Thirty Years' War to forge a living at the expense of her own family and respectability, Germania is willing to "turn a trick" in order to cover up the recent fascist German past and get back into business as quickly as possible. For that reason she interrupts Goebbels when he attempts to recite his post-Stalingrad speech, in which he refers to "den totalen Krieg" ("the total war").

Her choice of business partners, however, does not reflect sound business judgement, as each has its own sordid past. Matzkowski views the gifts from the Kings to the "newborn" which consist of "canons, a set of torture tools, and black dolls" as representative of the colonial past and slavery shared by all three countries (56). However, their interpretation need not be limited to the colonial past, but can be extended to include their wars of conquest as well as their treatment of social, political, and ideological enemies, given that "canons" imply war and "torture tools" denote the suppression and victimization of one's enemies. Their presentation of the gifts as "historisches Spielzeug" ("historical toys") for the newborn and the "Kleinigkeit für Ihre Küche" ("a little something for your kitchen") (62) demonstrates
their own disregard for life and the ease with which they kill those who are weaker than themselves. As "brutale Unterdrücker der Bevölkerung der Dritten Welt" ("brutal oppressors of the Third World population") (Schmitt 106), they are no better than the fascists. Müller is probably referring here to the rearmament of the FRG and its membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO, which occurred in the mid-fifties. On 23 October 1954 the treaty was signed in Paris and on 5 May 1955 it took effect, making the FRG a sovereign state, yet even more closely aligned with its Western Allies. In the Marxist interpretation of history, fascism was an outgrowth of capitalism and the Western Allies are, in their eyes, just as guilty as the Nazis. Müller's choice of "gifts", therefore, expresses this Marxist outlook, similar to his predecessor Brecht, who also espoused this idea in his plays.

The musings of this "holy family" are suddenly interrupted by Goebbels' labor pains which precede the birth of a deformed creature, a "Contergan" wolf. The name "Contergan", taken from the West German company which manufactured it during the sixties and seventies, has come to represent the greatest scandal concerning medicine in German history. The sedative "Thalidomid" ("Thalidomide") was marketed as having no side effects, but in fact it caused deformities in newborns after women had taken it during the early stages of pregnancy. In her book from 1999, Der Contergan-Fall: eine unvermeidliche Arzneimittelkatastrophe. Zur Geschichte des Arzneistoffs Thalidomid, Beate Kirk presents the history and events surrounding this lethal substance. Müller's use of this particular name serves to underscore the disdain and scorn with which the communist GDR viewed its capitalist "brother". Although Müller does not specifically refer to or use the term "FRG" in the dialogue, the inference is obvious: Contergan refers to a West German company and its

---

9 Thematically similar is Müller's revolutionary play, Der Auftrag ("The Mission") with its subtitle, "Erinnerung an eine Revolution" ("remembrance of a revolution"), written in 1979, in which he symbolically presents the dilemma of the Third World's struggle for freedom from the yoke of its Western oppressors.

10 In an ironic twist, Thalidomide is currently the focus of intensive research and tests in Germany, specifically Leipzig, for its medical benefits as a possible solution in the fight against cancer, leprosy, and AIDS. In medical
defective and highly dangerous product, and the references to "PERSIL" and the family-sized pack of "SUNIL", two additional West German products, imply a connection to marketing and capitalism, elements found in the FRG. The offspring of Goebbels, a she-devil, and Hitler, a type of monster who dines on his soldiers and imbibes gasoline, thus results in a deformed wolf: the FRG. Critics have generally reached the same conclusion: Schulz uses parentheses to claim that the wolf represents the FRG, but does not offer any solid reasoning (133); in a footnote, Schmitt mentions the Contergan scandal of the sixties (106); Klussmann refers to "das Contergan-Motiv" as presenting a "Zusammenhang zwischen Hitler-Deutschland und der Bundesrepublik" (410); Raddatz stresses the association between "die deutsche Geschichte, der deutsche Faschismus und die Entstehung der Bundesrepublik" (90); and Mieth sees in Müller's representation of the FRG an "Auseinandersetzung mit dem Alptraum der Wiedergeburt des deutschen Faschismus" which did not discard "das verbrecherische Wesen der Vergangenheit", rather has only hidden it "hinter einer neuen Fassade" (63). In Müller's opinion, through its close alliance with the Western powers and the restructuring of its military, the FRG was in the position of possibly repeating the mistakes of the past which led to fascism. Again, as she did with Goebbels, Germania tries to conceal the true identity of the wolf by taking laundry powder from her "Hebammentasche" ("midwifery bag") or "bag of tricks" and pouring it onto the wolf: "Der Wolf steht im Schafspelz" (63) ("The wolf stands in sheep's clothing"). The dangerous wolf, with its historic lineage of fascism, assumes the appearance of an innocent sheep in order to trick the allies into believing it has been

circles and the media, many are already referring to the "Contergan-Comeback", provided that the risk of any possible detrimental side effects can be fully eliminated.

11 ("Contergan-theme"; "connection between Hitler-Germany and the Federal Republic")
12 ("German history, German fascism and the formation of the Federal Republic")
13 ("discussion about the nightmare of the rebirth of German fascism"; "the criminal substance of the past"; "behind a new facade")
rendered harmless.\textsuperscript{14} Thus in a sense, the FRG is the newest colony of the allied nations, born of two perverted monsters, and as such, poses a threat to the GDR through its rearmament and membership in the NATO; a fear which was shared by many people in the West, including the FRG.

In a nation which had previously celebrated das Dritte Reich ("the Third Empire") and had anticipated its ultimate victory over England, the Soviet Union, and the United States, the role of Germany's former enemies, including France, regarding the question of German identity developed increased significance after the formation of the FRG and the GDR. Germany had become a conquered and humbled country separated into four zones, until it was finally divided into two separate nations which were, as Hermand writes, ideologically and politically at odds with each other ("Braut" 132). The role of "Germania" in this scene demonstrates how the actions of the Hitler regime during the Second World War have affected Germany's image: now that Germany has been vanquished, German identity must be reinvented or redefined. Müller was aware that the key to this redefinition, however, lies in the past: in the bones of the dead which must be exposed in order to become powerless. Thus his obsession with Germany's history serves as the first step toward redefining German identity for the present and the future. His representation of significant elements from the German past helped to form Germany's i.e., "Germania's" image and led to her ultimate demise in Berlin. Müller's concept of "to annihilate" or "to be annihilated" plays a significant part in the German legacy and, therefore, for German identity: a great nation that had been a "subject" of history as a conquering force has become an "object" of history given its own division by the new conquerors. Germany's i.e., the FRG's rearmament and subsequent inclusion in the NATO not only represent a threat to world peace, but also to German identity.

\textsuperscript{14}Matzkowski makes a connection between the laundry detergents, SUNIL and PERSIL, and the document given to those Germans who were considered to be "entnazifiziert" ("denazified") which was called a "Persilschein" since they had now "come clean" (58).
which is again being deformed by western capitalism, just as it is being deformed by Stalinist Communism in the East. Because Germany is, in essence, a colony of the victorious powers, its identity is being forcefully molded into the image of these powers and not according to its own nature.

Müller includes a brief reference in this scene to the other contemporary European dictator, Stalin, when Goebbels informs Hitler that his former hairdresser has been ordered to serve Stalin and that the new hairdresser cannot prove his Aryan blood: "der Friseur kann den Ariernachweis nicht erbringen" (59) ("the hairdresser cannot furnish proof of an Aryan background"). Müller's reference demonstrates yet another facet of German identity associated with Hitler: his misguided racist belief in Aryan superiority. Schmitt supposes that the reference to Stalin here is intended to show the "Verwandtschaftsverhältnis" ("kinsmanship") between two brutal dictators (104) but that is not the sole purpose for this reference. Rather, Hitler's reaction also serves to demonstrate the rivalry between these two dictators and his fear of being beaten by his competition from the East. Neither man is to be trusted, as Hitler proved when he broke the 1939 non-aggression pact with Stalin; and Stalin allegedly attempted to have Hitler assassinated (Berthold 97). Goebbels' use of the term "Geheimnisträger" ("top secret agent") actually reflects an anachronism since this term was used by the GDR authorities to isolate persons with special knowledge from contacting or even coming into contact with people from the West, even their own relatives, by prohibiting them from travelling there. This term precedes Goebbels' line about the hairdresser being sent to serve Stalin and is followed immediately by Hitler's verbal tirade about traitors. Hitler's desire to maim and destroy the traitors further reflects the unbalanced and disturbed personality of a

15 This line brings to mind Edgar Hilsenrath's (1926-) satirical novel, Der Nazi und der Friseur, which was not published, however, until 1977, after Müller had completed Germania Tod in 1971. It is the fictional tale of an SS-man, Max Schulz, who assumes the identity of one of his Jewish victims, Itzig Finkelstein, and becomes a successful hairdresser in Israel after the war. Schulz does not know the identity of his father and, therefore, it remains uncertain whether or not he can claim an Aryan heritage.
man with a pathological disposition who suffers from paranoia. He has fallen victim to his own propaganda about the Dolchstoßlegende ("stab in the back legend"), the myth that the German army was not defeated in World War I but stabbed in the back by traitors, i.e., socialists, communists, and Jews. Bullock recognizes this characteristic trait in Hitler and explains that the most common symptom of this illness, exhibited by both Hitler and Stalin, is: "[. . .] the combination of delusions of grandeur with the conviction that one is the victim of persecution and conspiracy, producing an excessive suspiciousness and distrust of others, and an eagerness to strike at enemies before they can injure oneself" (403). Hitler demonstrates fear and distrust of his own propaganda minister when he accuses him of being a traitor after Goebbels timidly reprimands him for his use of an unacceptable, vulgar word (59). Hitler's childish temper tantrum, as he throws himself on the floor and kicks, reflects his inability to accept even the slightest criticism. Goebbels's plea: "Gnade, mein Führer" (59) ("Mercy, my leader") and ensuing act of humiliation following Hitler's order to lick his boots, further serves to demonstrate Hitler's ultimate power and tyranny over even his closest associates.

The paranoia Hitler demonstrates in this scene, however, is by no means without justification, to which the many plans to assassinate him testify. In Die 42 Attentate auf Adolf Hitler, Will Berthold lists various plans and attempts between 1921 and 1945 by a variety of groups and individuals (250-251) to take the life of "das Monster" (8). Peter Hoffmann presents a minimum of forty-three attempts during the same time period in his book, Die Sicherheit des Diktators (251-252). Although the exact number will probably never be determined, it remains a fact that Hitler could not count on the loyalty and support of all Germans and was only able to maintain his position by force and violence; in the same manner by which he originally attained power. Through an eerie string of luck and timely coincidences, all of the efforts at assassination were destined to fail. The most famous
assassination attempt was carried out by General Claus von Stauffenberg on 20 July 1944 but, according to Berthold, the fuse for the bomb was: "bereits im Juli 1934 scharf gemacht" (47) ("already ignited in July 1934"). Through his actions during the "night of the long knives" Hitler demonstrated his brutality, lack of loyalty, and sheer disregard for the law and created many new enemies. Danton's words in Büchner's play, which are in fact attributed to one of Danton’s historical contemporaries, "Ich weiß wohl -- die Revolution ist wie Saturn, sie frißt ihre eignen Kinder" (I,5) are echoed by Ernst Röhm in his prison cell in Munich-Stadelheim when he tells his fellow National Socialist Hans Frank, the Bavarian Justizminister ("Minister of Justice"): "Alle Revolutionen fressen ihre eigenen Kinder (Berthold 43) ("All revolutions devour their own children"). Although an exact number is not known, it is estimated that between two and three thousand supposed accomplices were executed for the failed Stauffenberg assassination attempt (Baigent 88).17

There is an irony comparable to Kleist's Homburg and his ideas about the nobility of a Prussian officer and a sublime death to be found in the final letters and words of other conspirators, some of whom came from noble Prussian families. Homburg was finally willing to die for his disobedience to his leader on the basis that it was part of his duty; the twentieth century conspirators, who were disloyal to the Führer and had even tried to assassinate him, willingly accepted their execution during the last year of the war on behalf of the future of

16 ("I know -- the revolution is like Saturn, she devours her own children.")

17 Some of the accused directed their final words in the courtroom to the president of the Nazi court, the Volksgerichtshof ("people's court"), Dr. Roland Freisler. Their words offer an eerie parallel to the fate of Robespierre and his associates who would soon follow Danton and his loyal comrades, as Hitler and his Nazi criminals would soon be joining Stauffenberg and his conspirators in death; except that the method of execution was hanging and not the guillotine. In what could best be described as a Kleistian twist of fate, Freisler did indeed join these men in death very soon during one of his Schandprozesse ("dishonorable trials"), when he was hit by a falling beam during an allied air attack when a bomb hit the building (Zimmermann 320). For example, Erich Fellgiebel, General of the Nachrichtentruppen ("news agency division"), said: "Dann beelen Sie sich mit dem Aufhängen, Herr Präsident, sonst hängen Sie eher als wir" (Zeller 463). ("Then hurry up with the hanging, Mr. President, or you will be hanging before us.") The lawyer and civilist Dr. Josef Wirmer's response to President Freisler's comment that Wirmer would soon be in hell was: "Es wird mir ein Vergnügen sein, wenn Sie bald nachkommern, Herr Präsident" (Zeller 464). ("It will be my pleasure, Mr. President, knowing you will soon follow.")
their country, of "Germania". These men, who died to save their country by eliminating its leader who had become a dictator, tyrant, and murderer, are the true heroes of the Second World War because they risked and lost everything in their attempt to rescue their beloved "Germania" from a madman, and in this way tried to salvage the remnants of Germany's reputation for the future. If Stauffenberg's attempt had been successful, the war might have ended sooner and millions of lives might have been saved. It is estimated that the last nine months of the Second World War cost more lives, particularly in the Nazi concentration camps, in the fields of battle, and from allied bombings among German civilians, than the previous four years and eleven months (Baigent 93). This senseless slaughter during the final phase of Hitler's war might have been averted.

By using the term "Germania" and not "Deutschland" in the title of his play, Müller makes a deliberate statement about his perception of German history and of German identity, namely: that the origins of Germany's division can be found at a time far before their ultimate separation in 1949. The fact that Hitler's character appears in the same scene along with that of Germania suggests a profound significance for German identity, namely: that Hitler is responsible for the death of "Germania". But the German people are at least partly responsible for Hitler's rise to power, so in effect they share some of the responsibility for what has happened to "Germania" i.e., Germany, and for the rebuilding not only of their country, but of its identity as well. By including the lines: "Ich werde mich jetzt an mein Volk wenden. Mein Volk" (60) ("I am going to address my folk now. My folk"), Müller

18For example, Fritz-Dietlof Graf von der Schulenburg, who was from an old and wealthy Prussian aristocratic family, wrote: "Wir haben diese Tat auf uns genommen, um Deutschland vor einem namenlosen Elend zu bewahren" (Zeller 167). ("We took this deed upon ourselves, in order to protect Germany from unspeakable misery.") Julius Leber had these final words for his friends: "Für eine so gute und gerechte Sache ist der Einsatz des eigenen Lebens der angemessene Preis" (Zimmermann 255). ("The risk of one's own life is the appropriate price to pay for such a good and just purpose.") Peter Graf Yorck von Wartenburg wrote to his mother: "Es waren lediglich meine vaterländischen Gefühle, die Sorge um mein Deutschland, wie es in den letzten zwei Jahrtausenden gewachsen ist, das Bemühen um seine innere und äußere Entwicklung, die mein Handeln bestimmten (Zimmermann 270). ("It were purely my feelings for the fatherland, my concern about my Germany, how it has grown in the last two thousand years, the care for its inner and outer development, which
emphasizes Hitler's dictatorial tendencies while at the same implying the subservience of the German people. His words mimic the speech, "An mein Volk" by the Prussian King Frederick William III on 17 March 1813 to the Prussian and German populace declaring the beginning of the Befreiungskriege ("wars of liberation") (1813-1814) against Napoleon. With this reference Müller again presents a strong connection to Hitler and the historical lineage of Prussian kings and their autocratic rule which he emulated. Hitler, who awakens at midnight to consume his grotesque breakfast, does not appear to be human and can be considered a monster: similar to the vampire-like Frederick II in scene eight and the Nibelung giants of scene five. Müller's portrayal of Hitler as waking up at midnight is based on fact: Bullock describes him as "a night bird" who "did not go to bed until the early hours of the morning" (423).

As a progressive culmination of events from Germany's past, Hitler can be considered "ein Produkt Deutschlands" ("a product of Germany"), as Schmitt claims, but he was not created by the "Deformationen des deutschen Nationalcharakters" ("deformations of the German national character") as Schmitt further contends is the case (105). Rather, he was able to use and abuse the German "Nationalcharakter"for his own political and military purposes; he took advantage of the Germans' propensity and willingness to blindly obey orders and their absolute subservience to authority figures. He is a product of skillful political propaganda which incessantly told the people that Adolf Hitler was the great man who had come to save Germany; a Frederick the Great and Bismarck rolled into one, who would restore Germania to her former glory after the humiliation of Versailles. The terror, which he used against his political enemies, was necessary, again in the name of "law and order" as he told his followers, to restore the economy so that the six million unemployed could get work to support their families and have a good life in a "Volk" in which everybody would be a
determined my action.") To his wife he wrote: "Auch für meinen Teil sterbe ich den Tod fürs Vaterland" (Zimmermann 271). ("As for me, I will also die for the fatherland.")
valued and equal member. Everybody except his detractors and political enemies, the
socialists and communists and especially the Jews, who were responsible for all the evils in
the world and had to be expelled or reformed. The Germans fell for this "siren song" and
elected Hitler, who had assured them that he would rule in a democratic manner, and that he
would redress the wrongs perpetrated against Germany, but through peaceful means. Once in
power, he was quick to seize the opportunities created by the Reichstagsbrand ("German
Parliament Fire") on 27 February 1933 and by the catastrophic economic conditions to
assume dictatorial powers and destroy the opposition. Hitler's hidden agenda and
misrepresentation of his goals are reflected in Goebbels' quote from the fairy tale Rumpel-
stilzchen: "ACH WIE GUT, DASS NIEMAND WEISS / DASS ICH RUMPELSTILZCHEN
HEISS " (63) ("Oh how good, that nobody knows, that my name is Rumpelstiltskin") as he
dances a "Veitstanz". This type of dance refers to the martyr St. Vitus, the patron saint of
those suffering from the diseases epilepsy and "Veitstanz". He was and remains an

19During Roman times, St. Vitus refused to give up his Christian belief and was, therefore, imprisoned and
tortured. Because he is believed to have healed the Emperor's son from epilepsy, St. Vitus became the patron
saint of those suffering from the diseases epilepsy and "Veitstanz" (Siemes 210), otherwise known under the
name "Chorea Huntington". Referred to as the "dancing mania" during the Middles Ages, this disease affected
many people in Europe and, particularly in 1374, in Germany. It was even believed that this disease could be
brought on by the bite of an infectious spider. Even in modern times, as Gerhard F. Strasser explains in his
essay, "Sankt Vitus oder der Heilige Veit, der Veitstanz und >>die von der Tarantel Gebissenen<<", this
expression is still used as an explanation: "[... ] für peinlich erscheinende Gefühlssprünge, die auf pseudo-
physiologische Art ergründet werden sollen [... ]" (565). ("[... ] for embarrassing occurrences of emotional
outbursts, which should be examined thoroughly in a pseudo-physiological manner [... ]") Further, Strasser
explains the historical facts surrounding St. Vitus' martyrdom: "Der Heilige, an dessen Existenz aus katholischer
Sicht nicht zu zweifeln ist, obschon gesichtliche Zeugnisse fehlen, stammt aus Sizilien und mag dort zu
Beginn der Verfolgung unter Kaiser Diokletian (etwas 304/305) den Martertod erlitten haben. Das älteste
Zeugnis seines Kults findet sich in Gallien um 600; um diese Zeit entstand auch in Lukanien die legendarische
Passio S. Viti. Ihr zufolge war Vitus der Sohn einer reichen heidnischen sizilianischen Familie und floh im Alter
von sieben Jahren mit seinem Erzieher Modestus und der Amme Crescentia nach Lukanien, weil ihn sein Vater
durch die Glaubensabfall zwingen wollte. Als Christen erkannt, wurden die drei vor das Gericht Diokletians in Rom
geschleppt. Obwohl Vitus dort den Sohn des Kaisers von Besessenheit geheilt und andere wunder gewirkt hatte,
waren die drei gefoltert und in einen Kessel mit siedendem Öl geworfen. Von den Martern hinweg seien sie
durch einen Engel nach Lukanien zurückgebracht worden, wo sie jedoch bald verstarben (559-560). Herrscher,
Switzerland: Fachverlag für Wissenschaft und Studium, 1996) 557-565. ("The saint, whose existence is not to
be doubted from the Catholic viewpoint, although historical proof is missing, came from Sicily and may have
suffered a martyr's death there at the start of the persecution under Emperor Diokletian (approximately 304/305).
The oldest proof of his cult is located in Gallien around 600; at this time the legendary Passio S. Viti also
developed in Lukanien. According to this, Vitus was the son of a rich, pagan Sicilian family and fled to
Lukanien at the age of seven with his tutor Modestus and the nurse Crescentia, because his father wanted to
force him to apostasy. Recognized as Christians, the three were taken to the court of Diokletian in Rome. Even
important religious figure to the North-Rhine-Westphalian city of Mönchen-gladbach (Siemes 210), which is, coincidentally, the "twin city" of Rheydt, Goebbels home-town in the Rhineland. The physical reactions associated with these diseases are sometimes compared to a type of dance and this fact, along with the proximity of St. Vitus to the Nazi propaganda minister's hometown, may explain why Müller chose to use this term in association with him. Goebbels, who resembles the devil due to his club-foot, is represented as an agent of the devil, like this fairy tale character who is associated with the devil, and who dances around the fire singing his rhyme. The fact that Rumpelstiltskin is a "little man" could also be a subtle insult directed at Goebbels, the man referred to scathingly as the "little doctor". The identity aspect of this fairy tale, that his name i.e., his identity, is not known, indicates here the disguised fascism which, in Müller's portrayal, Goebbels, Hitler, and Germania are desperately trying to conceal from the rest of the world. Contrary to the fairy tale character who reveals his own secret and thus loses the riddle, given the corresponding to the GDR view that the FRG is the continuation of fascism, the fascists are thus able to transfer their "secret" to the FRG. Schmitt's reference to: "der nur scheinbar friedliebend-human gewordenen BRD" (106) substantiates the view that Müller portrays the FRG as the inheritor of Nazi fascism. Finally, in the German version by the Grimm brothers, the character tears himself in two at the end of the tale before he disappears into the earth: "[. . .] dann packte es in seiner Wut den linken Fuß mit beiden Händen und riß sich selbst mitten entzwei" (Grimm 5). Thus Müller's use of this fairy tale character in association with the fascists also alludes to the self-destruction of Germany through its defeat and then division after twelve years of Nazi terror.

though Vitus cured the Emperor's son of demoniacal possession and performed other wonders, the three were tortured and thrown into a pot with boiling oil. Away from the torment, they were brought back to Lukanien by an angel, where they, however, soon died.

20("the FRG which only seemingly had become peace-loving and humane")

21("[. . .] then due to his anger he grabbed his left foot with both hands and ripped himself apart right down the middle into two pieces.")
Fairy tales are traditionally known and cherished for their depiction of an element of truth hidden between the lines of the text. The element of truth present in fairy tales is voiced by Viëtor: "In Märchen aber sei bisher mehr Wahrheit als in gelehrten Chroniken" (364). Müller, whose own mother was very fond of telling him fairy tales when he was young (Tschapke Heiner Müller 8), demonstrates his recognition of the hidden truths to be found in them and shows exceptional insight in applying this particular fairy tale to the German situation and the legacy of this dictator. There is one more association relating to Müller's use of this fairy tale in Germania Tod which bears significance for German identity.

According to Jack Zipes in Fairy Tale as Myth, Myth as Fairy Tale, the central message in the Rumpelstiltskin fairy tale revolves around female productivity (71). The author, who has translated the Grimms' fairy tales into English and has written several books about the genre, describes the relationship between spinning and reproducing as essential elements of German life in the pre-industrialization periods. During the nineteenth century, the former was in danger of becoming extinct, which is exactly what happened, as industry, run by men, usurped this important role of women in society. Thus the only significant role in society that remained for the female population was to reproduce, as demonstrated in this fairy tale.

Applying this to Germania Tod and in particular to the role of "Germania", it could be argued that her symbolic role in this capacity, to reproduce for the future of Germany, has been destroyed by the actions of Hitler and the Nazis. Additionally, the role of German women as procreators of the German nation, of bearing future German citizens and especially soldiers,

\[\text{22} \text{("But up until now there has been more truth in the fairy tale than in scholarly chronicles.")}
\]

\[\text{23} \text{Müller also uses this fairy tale to satirize another German dictator, the Prussian monarch, Frederick II, in the title of a scene in Leben Gundlings: "ACH WIE GUT DASS NIEMAND WEISS DASS ICH RUMPELSTILZCHEN: HEISS oder DIE SCHULE DER NATION ein patriotisches Puppenspiel" (18) ("OH, HOW GOOD, THAT NO ONE KNOWS, / THAT MY NAME IS RUMPELSTILZCHEN or THE SCHOOL OF THE NATION a patriotic puppet show") (18-19). The hidden truth in that scene relates to Frederick and the dangerous wars which he forced upon his people but which he disguised as opportunities to earn and receive glory for the soldiers and officers. Frederick grades his soldiers based on the degree of their wounds for his cause. In a frightening parallel, Hitler and the Nazis presented their twentieth century war as a chance for the soldiers to earn honor and glory for themselves and their fatherland as well; the fate of "Germania", however, is less important to them.} \]
has been abused by Hitler in his continuous battles with the result that female productivity has been utterly exhausted and the future of the German race is equally in danger. Therefore, the only birth Müller portrays in this play is the perverted one of the FRG to monstrous parents.

After Germania has served her purpose of aiding in the birth, her skills are no longer required and she is subsequently tortured by Hitler, who then orders his men to kill her at the end of this scene. This act refers to Hitler's order shortly before the war ended to destroy everything in Germany since the Germans had not lived up to his expectations and thus the nation, in his distorted opinion, was not worthy of survival. It is through the death of "Germania" -- she who calls herself Hitler's mother and who aided Hitler, Goebbels, and the Nazis and who represents the former German nation -- that the opportunity for a new beginning has simultaneously been created, or as Hermand calls it, "Platz für Neues" ("room for something new") ("Braut" 140). Müller saw this opportunity in the form of the GDR: "Germania's" death is the chance for a new era in the course of German history: an escape from the deutsche Misere which has overshadowed much of the past and has in part led to the rise of Hitler. Andreas Keller writes in Drama und Dramaturgie that indeed this "death in Berlin" breaks the cycle of this ancient German dilemma and ushers in "eine neue Epoche in der deutschen Geschichte" (207). With Germania's death, the path has been cleared for an ultimate rebirth as something newer and better; something which has never been experienced before in Germany's history. The birth which occurs in this scene, however, the deformed parents.

24 Hermand's entire quote is: "Doch eins steht wohl fest: Nach 1945 gibt es für Müller keine Germania mehr. Die ist endgültig im Führerbunker in tausend Fetzen zerschossen worden. Das wirkt einerseits sehr pessimistisch, da mit diesem Vorgang das Ende der deutschen Nation besiegt wurde. Doch andererseits ist gerade durch diesen 'Tod in Berlin' der Kreislauf des ewig Deutschen an einer Stelle durchbrochen und damit Platz für Neues geschaffen worden" ("Braut" 140). ("Yet one thing remains certain: after 1945 there is no Germania anymore for Müller. She has finally been shot into a thousand pieces in the leader's bunker. That sounds very pessimistic on one hand, since with this event the end of the German nation has been sealed. Yet on the other hand, through this "death in Berlin", the cycle of the immortal German has been broken in one spot and thus space for something new has been created.")

25 ("a new epoch in German history")
child of Hitler and Goebbels, is not the rebirth Müller had in mind, as his allegorical description of the FRG makes clear: a "Thalidomide Wolf", a grotesque, deformed offspring, born of perverse parents cannot be the anticipated savior of a fallen and divided Germany. Rather, in accordance with the GDR's views at that time, the distinction of being the positive and new Germany belongs to the GDR.

Turning now to the title, its significance is twofold: firstly, it refers to a polemic work from 1845 by Marx and Engels entitled, \textit{Die heilige Familie oder Kritik der kritischen Kritik. Gegen Bruno Bauer und Konsorten} in which they present their criticism of contemporary viewpoints concerning philosophy, religion, and politics, including but not limited to those of Bruno Bauer, a former associate and close friend of Marx.\textsuperscript{26} Particularly offensive to Marx and Engels, and the main point of their criticism, relates to Bauer's aristocratic tendencies and his "Angriff gegen die Masse" ("attack against the masses") as Wolfgang Mönke explains in \textit{Die heilige Familie. Zur ersten Gemeinschaftsarbeit von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels} (127). The bourgeoisie at that time, which was still recovering from the Silesian weavers' uprising of 1844, was now faced with a new assault against the world order, or as Mönke refers to it: "Wie damals die Verfechter der Feudalgesellschaft, so spürten jetzt die der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft die Axt an der Wurzel der durch Religion und Philosophie geheiligten Ordnung [. . .]" (134).\textsuperscript{27} Marx, Engels, and their fellow socialists were in the process of discovering and developing a new system, designed to enhance society and elevate

\textsuperscript{26} Bauer (1809-1882) was a philosopher, historian, and theologian, who combined religious and political analyses with the ideas of Hegel. Marx and Engels devote chapter six in particular to denouncing Bauer's hypotheses concerning the role of philosophy and religion in the historical development of politics (113-228). Wolfgang Mönke offers essential background information relating to the origins of this text, and he reproduces in print an impressive collection of the major reactions to Marx and Engels' work in his book also entitled, \textit{Die heilige Familie}. The choice of title for Marx and Engels' book was agreed upon at the suggestion of their publisher, Dr. Zacharias Löwenthal (1810-1884), because it was more sensational than merely, \textit{Die kritische Kritik}, and is a reference to the three Bauer brothers: Bruno, Edgar, and Egbert, authors of \textit{die Allgemeine Literarische-Zeitung} (Mönke 130-131). In their publication, which only lasted from 1843 until 1844, the three brothers offer their superior and arrogant views and criticism of religion, history, philosophy, and society. Consequently, it was "ein Dorn im Auge" (a thorn in the side") of many contemporary professors and literary historians as well as fellow intellectuals (Mönke 136).
the proletariat but at the expense of the lower and upper middle classes. The fact that *Die heilige Familie* represents "das erste Werk, mit dem Marx und Engels ihre neue materialistische und kommunistische Anschauung -- wenn auch fragmentarisch und noch unausgereift -- der Öffentlichkeit vorlegten" (Mönke 134) most likely reflects the reason Müller chose it as the title of this scene, in which the FRG is born, the representative of the former fascist regime and the antithesis of the GDR, the newest communist hope.

Secondly, the scene is a parody of the Christian "Holy Family": Mary, Joseph, and Jesus (Matzkowski 54-55), which has been replaced by a "Teufelsfamilie" ("devil's family") (Schmitt 103). This distorted and grotesque constellation focuses on the Nazi era with its rampant fascism, inherited by the newborn, who represents the FRG as a continuation of Nazi Germany. The birth in this scene is, therefore, not the type of "rebirth" for Germany which had been envisioned by the communists and anti-fascist forces. Rather, the birth of the FRG can be seen to represent the birth of a "negative" Germany; whereas Müller proposes the GDR as the positive and new Germany. Envisioned as a place where fascism no longer exists and the communist utopia would be able to flourish, it was conceived as a state ruled by workers and farmers: "Der antifaschistische Arbeiter- und Bauernstaat", as the GDR proudly labelled itself, although it was ruled not by its members, but by the Party, or rather the Central Committee of the Party, which received its instructions from Moscow. It was the utopian version of a communist state or Räterepublik that was Müller's original hope in the early years; but even by 1956, especially following the failed strike in 1953, and certainly by 1971, this hope was gradually fading and being replaced by disillusionment. Even after the Russian dictator's death, the GDR remained too dependent on Russia and could not free itself to save its future.

---

27("As in earlier times the advocates of the feudal society, so now those of the middle class society felt the axe at the root of the system sanctioned by religion and philosophy [ . . .]")
Hitler's imitation of the typical Napoleon pose during this scene draws an additional parallel between Hitler and another dictator, the former French emperor. Both men claimed that the purpose of their course of action was to win fame for their respective country, when they were mainly interested in their personal glory, and both men were ultimately defeated in Russia. Significantly, the German national character has been influenced by Napoleon through his victory and occupation of Germany from 1806-1813. Napoleon's subjugation of Germany engendered strong patriotic emotions which had first been awakened by the victories of Frederick the Great, and had been inspired by the French revolution and the victories of the liberated people of France against foreign aggressors. Although the "Terror" and Napoleon's assumption of dictatorial power had sullied this vision of a free people in a united fatherland, it remained an ideal which was worth many sacrifices. It is owing to this chapter in German history and the loss of their empire, Das Heilige Römische Reich deutscher Nation (1806), that the Germans started to develop a sense of national pride and the desire to become one free nation and work together to liberate their land from foreign oppression. In Deutsche Geschichte 1800-1866, Thomas Nipperdey credits Napoleon with having influenced the course of modern German history through his politics and the nationalism he unwittingly fostered in Germany: he describes the years 1806 through 1813 with being: "die Geburtsjahre der nationalen Bewegung" (303).29 The simple sentence: "Am Anfang war Napoleon" ("In the beginning was Napoleon") (Nipperdey 11) reflects the great influence this French dictator had on Germany, not only in the first half of the nineteenth century, but well into the twentieth century. This sense of nationalism or patriotism would later be exaggerated, perverted, and taken to dangerous extremes during the Third Reich.

28("the first text, in which Marx and Engels presented their new materialistic and communistic perspective -- even though fragmentary and not fully developed -- to the public")
29("the birth years of the national movement")
c) The Myth of Stalingrad: Dictators and Nibelungs

The sense of nationalism reached new extremes during the period of the Third Reich, exemplified by the brutal battle for Stalingrad. Stalingrad is considered the turning point of the war and the most bitter defeat suffered by Hitler's military forces during the Second World War. In scene five, "Hommage à Stalin 1" ("Tribute to Stalin 1"), which takes place in Stalingrad in the Kessel ("pocket") where the German Sixth Army fought against the Soviet Red Army in the fall and winter of 1942/43, Müller juxtaposes the four dictators: Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, and Stalin against the four Nibelungs: Gunther, Volker, Hagen, and Gernot. The author combines the Nibelung characters with historical facts to demonstrate that the characteristics of obedience and duty have been perverted for military reasons and have thus caused great harm and devastation throughout German history. As the scene opens, three German soldiers are standing in a representation of the Kessel at Stalingrad, barely surviving; in fact, they have turned to cannibalism in order to avoid starvation. Soldiers 1, 2, and 3 tease the fourth "Young Soldier" who, having just arrived, is ignorant of the ways of war. They are more experienced and have subsequently developed a nonchalant approach to

---

30 The term "Kessel" is associated with the German defeat at Stalingrad. It stems from the verb, "einkesseln" meaning "to surround", which is what happened to the Sixth German Army in Stalingrad by the Soviet Red Army.

31 Further proof of this characteristic to blindly obey orders without question is experienced in the twentieth century during the reign of the Nazis and World War II. As mentioned above, scene three in Leben Gundlings, "ACH WIE GUT DASS NIEMAND WEISS DASS ICH RUMPELSTILZCHEN: HEISS oder DIE SCHULE DER NATION ein patriotisches Puppenspiel" has similarities with this scene and with scene three: soldiers in the snow are marching (goose-stepping) into the fire for their King, Frederick II: "Feuerwand, davor Schneetreiben. Durch den Schnee marschieren Soldaten (Puppen) in Wehrmachtsuniform im Stechschritt ins Feuer" (18). Frederick II is observing his soldiers and giving them grades: "5 (ungenügend) für Unversehrtheit oder leichte Verwundungen, bessere Noten (4-2) für jede schwere Blessur bzw. Verlust von Gliedmaßen,1 (ausgezeichnet für die Toten)" (18) ("Prussian Games": A wall of fire, in front a snowstorm. Through the snow, soldiers (puppets) in German Wehrmacht uniforms are goose-stepping into the fire. Downstage right at the footlights, a blackboard on which Frederick II is writing grades for the soldiers who hobble crawl or are carried back from the battle: F (Fail) for those who have no wound or only light ones, better grades (C,B) for every serious wound or loss of limbs, A (Outstanding) for the dead") (Weber Hamletmachine 66). Teraoka also sees a connection between Prussia and Nazi Germany and the blind obedience to the military and performing one's duty. About scene three from Leben Gundlings she writes: "The goose-stepping and the uniforms of the "Wehrmacht" (the official name of the German armed forces from 1935-1945) establish a direct historical continuity between Prussia and national-socialist Germany" (57). This theme of obedience to authority, particularly the military takes on a contemporary dimension in this scene with the background of Stalingrad and World War II. The soldiers' willingness to die for their cause is reflected in the grades they receive, and death is associated, ironically, with the best grade.
the ravages of war: death, destruction, and cannibalism. The Young Soldier is optimistic at first about finding a place where the battle is not raging, but they quickly disillusion him by tearing off his arm and starting to eat it (48). Raddatz relates the significance of Müller's repeated use of the constellation, three against one, not only to the number of stormtroopers who came and took his father away that fateful night in 1933, but also and more importantly, to the "zentrale religiöse Struktur der indoeuropäischen Kultur" to which he refers as the "indoeuropäische Archetypus, der sich auch in Grimms Märchen finden läßt" (87-88).

Raddatz uses the example of a hero who stands alone facing three major tasks, but this archetype can also be interpreted as referring to the basic constellation of good versus evil which represents a significant aspect found in "modern" fairy tales which have their origins in Indo-European cultures dating back thousands of years. In Müller's text, the evil refers to barbarism and fascism which are personified by three characters, and the good is represented by the young and innocent newcomer, who has been forced into a dangerous situation. In this scene, the Nazi soldiers are the antagonists, later the Nibelungs, and in scene ten, the lone communist faces three belligerent prisoners. This scene's graphic images of barbarism reflect a realistic element of Stalingrad and of war, an unpleasant subject, indeed a taboo, which is not often discussed openly.

The appearance of Napoleon and Caesar suggests that this

---

33 ("central religious structure of the Indo-European culture"); "Indo-European archetype, which is also found in Grimms' fairy tales"
34 The cannibalism theme, which is strongly represented in *Germania Tod in Berlin*, has its origins in *Die Schlacht*. Hermand comments on the aspect of cannibalism in Müller's play, *Die Schlacht*, in his essay, "Deutsche fressen Deutsche. Heiner Müllers *Die Schlacht* an der Ostberliner Volksbühne", *Mit den Toten reden. Fragen an Heiner Müller*, Jost Hermand and Helen Fehervary, eds. (Cologne: Böhlau, 1999) 39-51. Because his comments are about "Germans eating Germans", I believe they can be applied to this play and in particular this scene as well. He refers to the scene, "Ich hatt einen Kameraden" in *Die Schlacht* and the act of cannibalism. Hermand is offended that Müller chose to portray this aspect of war in his play and would have preferred that Müller show the soldiers in a different light: they should have carried their fallen comrade 200 kilometers in the name of fascism. Hermand believes that would have been a more realistic depiction of fascism. I believe Hermand has missed the point entirely, as to why Müller chose to depict a scene of cannibalism. Namely: he was attempting to show the destruction of Germans by Germans during the war in general and by the Nazis in particular. Hermand also expresses dismay or even anger that Müller focuses on various types of murder in the play, but only in regard to Germans killing Germans and does not mention the other victims of fascism. Again, in this instance, I believe he does not appreciate the "German danger" Müller is interested in portraying here.
scene takes place in the afterlife, in a type of purgatory or hell in which war never ends. The name Stalingrad in the title reflects Stalin's presence and although Hitler is not mentioned by name, he is certainly present in spirit since he is responsible for the battle at Stalingrad. Hitler was quite often compared or directly linked to Caesar by anti-fascist writers, among them Bertolt Brecht and Georg Kaiser. Hitler's megalomania was called "Cäsarenwahn" ("Caesar mania"), while his physical poses, as mentioned above, were reminiscent of those by Napoleon. Historically, all four men were dictators and all four were responsible for the deaths of multitudes. Müller's use of the word, "hommage", is an ironic and sardonic tribute to the former Russian leader, to which the inclusion of various examples of death and destruction testify. The historical connection is clear, namely: Napoleon took his army to Russia and suffered a bitter defeat and, most significant in this context for Müller, Napoleon is to blame for the death of his own soldiers. As their leader, he carries sole responsibility for leading them to disaster. The description of Napoleon as "dick" ("fat") signifies the great number of men who died under his autocratic reign. Dragging a dead soldier behind him, Soldier 1 comments: "Das geht in Ordnung. Es sind seine Leichen. Ohne ihn wären sie nicht hier" (48) ("That's alright. They're his corpses. They wouldn't be here without him"). The implication that Napoleon has a right to his soldiers' corpses underscores his guilt and responsibility for their deaths. Caesar's appearance evokes satirical and deprecating comments from the soldiers, as Soldier 1 says: "Er lebt vom Fechten. Seine Leichen hat er auf Sperrkonto. Die Schlachtfelder liegen zu tief" (48) ("He lives from panhandling. His corpses are tied up in a frozen account: his battlefields are too far below"). His battles are deeply imbedded in history; they happened so long ago that nobody remembers them. Caesar,

Schmitt shares Hermand's opinion about Müller's depiction of fascist atrocities: "Sein Faschismusbild ist insofern nicht komplett" (81), but he also misses the point that Müller's main interest here lies in the depiction of German identity. The atrocities committed by the Nazis in World War II are widely known and condemned; Müller is trying to show yet another and related facet of these atrocities which directly affect Germans. Hermand and Schmitt want to show the Germans only as perpetrators, while Müller portrays them as perpetrators and victims, a view not politically correct in German left circles, especially before 2000.
the original Emperor i.e., Kaiser or dictator, lives on only by having his name associated with modern dictators and their wars. A parallel exists between Caesar, who was actually betrayed and assassinated in 44 B.C. and Hitler, against whom attempts were made but none successfully. Thomas Aquinas' belief that the murder of a tyrant is a justifiable act and acceptable homicide certainly would have been applicable to all four of these dictators given the deaths of so many soldiers for which they are responsible, but especially to Hitler because of his crimes against humanity. The soldiers' actions during wartime ensure that the respective dictator will not be forgotten, rather, will live on in history, even though time has long since forgotten the soldiers themselves, who died in his name. Müller's depiction of the four dictators not only shows that they are not the "great men" who symbolize their respective nation, but that they act for selfish reasons. It is the ignorance of the people who fall victim to the propaganda which makes them believe in the great leader, whether "Kaiser", "Emperor", "Führer", or "Dictator": Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, or Stalin.35

With the arrival of the four Nibelungs: Gunther, Hagen, Volker, and Gernot in the Kessel, the theme of soldiers who fight senseless battles for all eternity takes on mythic proportions. Gunther is King of the Burgundians; his brothers are Gernot, Giselher and his sister is Kriemhild. Siegfried, lord of the Nibelungs, is married to Kriemhild; with his help Gunther wins and marries Brunhild. Siegfried helps the Burgundians and fights side by side

35A similar presentation is found in Brecht's Hörspiel ("radio drama"), das Verhör des Lukullus (1940), in which the Schattenreich ("kingdom of shadow") represents a parallel to Müller's Totenreich. Lukullus, a commander of the Roman Army, has died and entered this kingdom, where he will be judged by the common people, in particular those who suffered due to his actions: not only those who were once bakers and teachers and mothers of soldiers, for example, but also those who were forced into slavery by him. In the course of the trial, Brecht stresses through the Totenrichter ("judge of the dead") that the afterworld does not notice names and deeds: they are without significance in this realm: there are other criteria for judging a man. Müller presents Caesar and Napoleon, whose names are known to the earthly world, as responsible for the death of countless soldiers, whose names are unknown. Whereas in his representation of this afterworld, in which an apocalyptic day of judgement takes place, Brecht shows that men who were great during their lifetimes, or thought they were: emperors and kings, for example, are actually unimportant and of no value. Rather, as a result of their orders and utter disregard for the value of human life and the lives of their many subjects, myriads of other lives were destroyed and so these once great men or supposed great men deserve to be sent into oblivion. Lukullus is accused of sending eighty thousand men to the kingdom of shadow for a cherry tree: "Ein Kirschbaum! Die Eroberung / Hätte er machen können mit / Nur einem Mann! Aber 80,000 / Schickte er hier herunter!" (1476) ("A cherry tree! This conquest / he could have made with / only a single man! But 80,000 he sent down here!").
with them against their enemies. Hagen is a kinsman and vassal of the Burgundians who, incited by Brunhild, murders Siegfried but remains loyal to his lord, Gunther. Volker, often referred to as "The Fiddler" and "The Minstrel" because of his skill with the violin (Hatto 404), is a vassal of the Burgundian kings and Hagen's loyal comrade. Hagen was only able to kill the good and powerful Siegfried by deceit, by tricking Kriemhild. Because of his treachery and murder of her husband, Hagen and Kriemhild are bitter enemies and she plots to have her revenge on behalf of Siegfried. The author's description of them as "überlebensgroß" (49) signifies their mythical stature and the exaggerated importance they have assumed in modern German history.

Müller's portrayal reflects a highly critical assessment of their role since his main goal in this play is the deconstruction of German myths which have led to the rise and fall of a specific type of nationalist-fascist German identity. He accomplishes this goal by satirizing the figures and by exposing the emptiness behind these various myths. Therefore, Schmitt's contention that Müller's designation of them as "überlebensgroß" symbolizes their importance in German history (93) is correct since their mythical stature raises them above reality. In the play, however, Müller "cuts them down to size" so to speak, by portraying them as warmongers, whose desire to fight supersedes all other human needs and interests, an attitude which has influenced modern Germany and helped cause its destruction. Gunther's disdain is obvious as he walks about and observes the German soldiers who are crawling around and dying in the Kessel. His words add insult to injury: "Simulanten. Drückeberger. Defätisten. Feiges Pack" (49) ("Maligners. Slackers. Defeatsists. Cowardly mongrels"). Gunther tells them to get their swords because: "Die Hunnen kommen wieder. GOTT MIT UNS" (49) ("The Huns are returning. May God be with us"). The Huns, who invaded Europe from the East, are associated here with the Russians. The motto: "Gott mit uns" was engraved on the Koppelschlösser ("buckles") of the soldiers of the Wehrmacht ("German armed forces")
(Berthold 53), since even the fascist invoked the help of the Christian God, realizing that the majority of the Gemans were practicing Lutherans or Catholics and that their identity was strongly influenced by the Christian faith. This motto reminds Mieth of "die jahrhundertelang geübte christliche Verbrämung von aus durchaus profanen Gründen geführten Kriegen" (48). He is referring to the Kreuzzüge ("crusades") or holy wars of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries which were called for by the Papacy in order to free the Holy Land from the Muslims, as well as to religious and nationalistic wars over the centuries. By having a Nibelung utter this phrase, Müller is demonstrating the lack of meaning associated with the term while simultaneously reinforcing how equally ridiculous it is for a Nazi soldier to use the term. Hitler, who was raised in the Catholic faith and even sang in the choir as a child, imitated the elaborate ceremonies of the church and created his own spectacular military ceremonies. His choice of the Swastika, a symbol of good luck and prosperity for thousands of years by many various groups and religions, reflects his interest in and recognition of the power of symbolism, which he wanted to develop for his own cult following. Often described as a "twisted" or "broken" cross, the Nazi swastika has come to represent pure evil and still evokes fear and terror. Recognizing the powerful position of the Roman Catholic Church throughout history and its potential as a threat to his endeavors and mindful of the Kulturkampf ("culture struggle") which Bismarck had waged for many years against the German Catholics with little success, one of Hitler's first diplomatic successes was his Reichsconcordat in July 1933 with Rome. With this agreement, the Vatican, through Pope Pius XII, recognized Hitler's regime and promised not to interfere in his politics, and with it Hitler hoped to win and won to a large degree the support of the German Catholics and the Catholic clergy. His efforts to create a German i.e., Nazi-dominated Lutheran Church, were countered in 1934 by the establishment of the Bekennende Kirche ("Confessional Church") whose main

36 ("the centuries old Christian practice of waging wars for thoroughly secular reasons")
leaders, the Berlin Pastors Martin Niemöller (1892-1984) and Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945), were joined by approximately a hundred other Protestant pastors. The movement was finally extinguished when Hitler declared that all pastors had to swear an oath of allegiance to him in 1938 and Niemöller, Bonhoeffer and hundreds of others were sent to concentration camps.

Returning to the text, Siegfried, who has already been murdered, is thus not present in this scene and Hagen, Gunther and Volker hypocritically claim they are fighting to avenge his death: "Rache für Siegfried" (49) ("Revenge for Siegfried"). They are justifying their aggression by lying and trying to pin their leader's murder onto the enemy, the Huns, which can be construed as a "Propagandatrick" (Mieth 48) at which the Nazi regime excelled. Only Gernot naively speaks the truth: "Aber ich habe doch selbst gesehen. Ich meine, das weiß doch jeder, daß du ihn [. . .]" (49) ("But I've seen it with my own two eyes. I mean, everybody knows you did [. . .]"), which forces the creation of a new lie. Gunther again distorts the truth and explains that Siegfried was, in actuality, a traitor and, therefore, had to die: "Er war ein Verräter" (49) ("He was a traitor"), which harkens back to Germany's defeat in the First World War and the accusations invented to find a scapegoat in the form of the Dolchstoßlegende. This legend, mentioned earlier, which developed as a result of Germany's defeat in 1918, claims that Germany lost the war because of traitors in the homeland, figuratively said to have back-stabbed the soldiers who were heroically fighting in the frontlines. The myth was propagated by the defeated government leaders who were more interested in their own international causes and profits than in the glory and victory of Germany. In Hitler's war and particularly at the pocket in Stalingrad where this scene takes place, the Nazi leadership deserted its men in their hour of need, which represents the ultimate betrayal.

The focus shifts to generational differences when Gunther preaches: "Man soll der Jugend ihre Illusionen lassen, solange es irgend geht. Jetzt weißt du es (49) ("Youth should
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be allowed to cherish illusions, as long as it's absolutely possible. Now you know"). Volker's
line, "Das ist die Jugend von heute. Sie hat keine Ideale mehr" (50) ("That is today's youth for
you. No ideals anymore"), also implies a generational conflict between the younger and the
three older Nibelungs. Again, Müller employs his customary "three against one" constellation
in which Gernot embodies the hopes and illusions of the younger generation; whereas
Gunther, Volker, and Hagen demonstrate the Nibelung virtues of "performance of duty" and
"courage". Thus the three older Nibelung characters represent the German characteristics of
blind obedience to duty; whereas Gernot represents the youthful voice of change. He
questions the validity of fighting a senseless war and is the first to be killed by the others
who, in essence, brand him a traitor as well. Gernot says: "Ich weiß immer noch nicht, warum
wir uns hier mit den Hunnen herumschlagen [. . .] Aber wir brauchen doch nur aufzuhören,
und es gibt keinen Kessel mehr" (50) ("I still don't know why we keep fighting with the Huns
here [. . .] But we only need to stop and there won't be a pocket anymore"). These sentences
by Gernot reflect a tragic element of war: soldiers will fight, though they themselves do not
know why and do not understand the cause, if only their leaders offer them a legitimate
reason. But when all hope for a victory seems lost, the logical response, according to Gernot
at least, would be to simply stop fighting. The other Nibelungs are shocked because, as a
reflection of the situation in Stalingrad, by order of Hitler, surrender was not an option.
In her essay, "Hommage à Siegfried: Heiner Müllers, Germania Tod in Berlin und das
Nibelungenlied", Birgit Kawohl refers to Müller's use of Stalingrad as a metaphor for all
futile historical wars (21). But in its immediate relation to twentieth century German identity
it represents something much more significant, namely: the antagonism between Nazi
Germany and Soviet Russia. From the European perspective, Stalingrad symbolizes the
rivalry between two European dictators of the twentieth century: Hitler and Stalin, fascism
versus communism. It is rather ironic that both Hitler and Stalin resurrected aspects of


German and Russian identity in their gigantic struggle against each other which, according to their respective ideology, they wanted to eradicate in their ideological struggle to create a "new man". Hitler appealed to the religious feeling with the previously mentioned "Gott mit uns" and saw the war as a fight against atheistic bolshevism, picturing himself in the role of the white knight or "Retter des Abendlandes" ("savior of the occident"), riding out to save the Christian values of the occident from the Huns, who were intent on destruction, rape, and pillage. Stalin, on the other hand, forgot all about the international brotherhood of communism and appealed to his compatriots to join him in the great war for the fatherland, to save "Mother Russia" from the German invaders, who were again raping her to continue their conquest which had started centuries ago and had only recently reached a climax in World War I. In the play, the Huns stand for the Russians and the Kessel represents Attila's (Etzel's) hall where the Nibelungs are slaughtered as Kriemhild's revenge for Siegfried's death. Although Siegfried is not physically present in Germania Tod, his presence in this scene is unmistakable since the conflict revolves around him, his murder, and his murderer. Similarly, even though Hitler is not physically present in this scene, he carries the sole responsibility for the battle at Stalingrad and the resultant catastrophe; therefore, his presence in this scene and in this historical context cannot be denied. Stalin is mentioned in the title of the scene because Stalingrad is symbolic of the struggle between these two ruthless dictators with their utter disregard for the lives of their men. Thus there is a historical connection between the previous dictators and Hitler to be found in the fact that all of them were willing to sacrifice the lives of their soldiers for their own selfish political and military purposes and for their own greatness. Schmitt writes:

Für egoistische Machtinteressen haben sie skrupellos das Leben vieler Soldaten geopfert. Sie sind in diesem Sinne Vorläufer Hitlers, der in Stalingrad mit seinem

---

37 Although Kriemhild and Siegfried do not have a direct role in this drama, in Germania 3 each has a significant role with important aspects for German identity which will be presented and discussed in Chapter Five.
Ausbruchs- und Kapitulationsverbot den Tod unzähliger Menschen verschuldete. Es ergibt sich eine erschreckende historische Kontinuität (93).³⁸

Because Hitler's men were neither allowed to fight their way out of the encirclement nor to capitulate, they were doomed to fight until their deaths. However, Schmitt fails to recognize the fact that Hitler carries the responsibility for beginning World War II, and especially the Russian Campaign with his desire for territorial expansion. Also, he is guilty of the deaths of countless individuals through his concentration camps and racial extermination, whether the battle for Stalingrad had taken place or not. The Kessel is one element of death among many in Hitler's twelve-year resumé: many more Russians would have died if the Germans had been able to continue their resistance in the battle of Stalingrad, and if the Germans had been able to defeat the Soviets there, millions more would have died in a prolonged war or, after a victory, by persecution. Thus Schmitt's view about the battle at Stalingrad is short-sighted in that he holds a specific order by Hitler responsible for the defeat and death of the soldiers of the Sixth German army. From the ninety thousand who surrendered at the end, only six thousand returned home after the war. But even if the outcome of the battle for Stalingrad had been in favor of the Germany army, the individual soldier would have continued to fight until killed or would have died in a prisoner of war camp, since there is hardly a chance that the Nazis would have won the war in the long run. The real tragedy of Stalingrad is that Hitler sent thousands of German men there to fight his battles and then deserted them. As Müller writes: "[. . .] Für Hitler gab es keine Weltzeit, nur Lebenszeit [. . .]" (GI3 202)³⁹ despite the recurring references to das tausendjährige Reich ("the thousand year empire") by the Nazi leadership, an analogy to das Heilige Römische Reich deutscher Nation which lasted from 800 - 1806. Without including specific names, Brecht wrote that some leaders of the Hitler

³⁸("For selfish power interests and without scruple, they sacrificed the lives of many soldiers. In this sense, they are the predecessors of Hitler, who in Stalingrad, with his order prohibiting a breakout or capitulation, caused the death of countless persons. There is a terrifying historical continuity.")
regime believed the Reich would last ten thousand or even thirty thousand years but he himself remarks sarcastically that it is doubtful: "[. . .] ob das Regime den nächsten Winter überdauert" (Gesammelte Werke, vol. 8 783). Hitler's attempt to win Stalingrad was based on his egotistical desire to defeat his Soviet rival, Stalin. Not only was he interested in the glorification of the Aryan race, he was also intent on his personal glorification during his own lifetime and despite all of the propaganda to the contrary, Hitler did not consider the outcome for "his" Volk: loss of life and destruction of German identity.

The comparison between the battle for Stalingrad and the battle of the Nibelungs was originally voiced by Hermann Göring. In his radio address on 30 January 1943 to commemorate the ten year anniversary of Hitler's Machtergreifung ("seizure of power"), Göring had to refer to the current situation in Stalingrad but without incriminating the Führer and his decade of rule. Entitled, Appell an die Wehrmacht ("call to the armed forces"), Göring spoke in the Ehrensaal des Reichsluftfahrtministeriums ("hall of honor of the Imperial Aviation Ministerium") to selected representatives of the Wehrmacht. In an attempt to downplay the catastrophic situation and the great losses already suffered there, he turns to mythical elements as a means of propaganda. He includes a comparison to the Nibelung battle in Attila's hall in an attempt to energize the Wehrmacht and the German people. The following excerpt includes this pertinent section:

Allerdings ist nunmehro die Härte des Kampfes ins Gigantische gewachsen. Und dabei muß bedacht werden, daß Deutschland ja an allen Fronten kämpft oder die Wache hält: vom Nordkap bis zur Biskaya, hinunter bis in die Wüsten Afrikas und bis in den fernen Osten an der Wolga kämpft, blutet, aber siegt auch Deutschland.

39("For Hitler there was no world time, only a lifetime.")
40("[. . .] if the regime will be able to outlast the next winter")
41The entire speech was printed in the Nazi newspaper or Kampfblatt, Völkischer Beobachter, No. 33 on 3 February 1943, pages 3-4. I am quoting from: Joachim Heinzle and Anneliese Waldschmidt, eds. Die Nibelungen, Suhrkamp Taschenbuch 2110. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991) 170-187.

Germany was fighting battles in various regions of the world and the military forces were spread thinly at this point in time, but Stalingrad, a strategically situated city on the Volga river, represented a major and significant goal for Hitler, and he wanted it occupied at all costs. The logical question arises: why recall at that critical moment a mythical event, a Natonepos ("national epic"), which ends in bitter defeat and utter downfall? The answer lies in the fact that the importance of Das Nibelungenlied had been recognized as early as the

42 ("Certainly the severity of the battle has grown to colossal proportions at this stage. And at the same time it must be considered that Germany is fighting on all fronts or is keeping watch from the North Cape to Biscay, down south to the deserts of Africa and in the far East, on the Wolga Germany is fighting, bleeding but winning. And among all of these giant battles there stands out now an enormous, monumental structure, Stalingrad, the battle for Stalingrad. One day it will be the greatest heroic battle which has ever taken place in our history. What our infantrymen, engineers, gunners, anti-aircraft artillermen, and whoever else is in this city now, from a general to the last man, who is fighting against huge superior forces for every block, for every stone, for every hole, for every trench, who keeps fighting, tired, exhausted -- we know a powerful, heroic song of an incomparable battle that is called "The Battle of the Nibelungs." They also stood in a blazing hall of fire and quenched their thirst with their own blood but fought and fought until the end. Such a battle is raging there
late eighteenth century by the Schlegel brothers. As Bernhard R. Martin writes in, *Nibelungen-Metamorphosen: Die Geschichte eines Mythos*, it had already been declared the "national German epic" in the early nineteenth century by Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen (13). The tradition to call upon the Nibelungs in times of trouble was thus established. Martin writes that: "Der Untergang der Nibelungen wird zu einer Schablone der absoluten Herausforderung für das 'Germanisch-Deutsche,' vor der der Mensch seine Größe beweisen kann" (17). Martin has touched upon the central chord evoked by this *Nationalepos*, the underlying reason as to why this particular myth has endured throughout German history: due to the many defeats suffered by Germany, its leaders have had to develop coping strategies for the population. More importantly, it was used in an attempt by the respective government as a survival technique, which, however, has not always proven successful. During the First World War and especially after Germany's defeat, comparisons were made to characters in the *Nibelungenlied* in order to boost morale among the German population. Along with the infamous *Dolchstoßlegende*, Hindenburg incorporated the Nibelung myth to exemplify this legend: thus Siegfried represents the warfront effort and Hagen the homeland traitors. This legend is again reflected here, this time in Hitler's lines as he compares himself to Siegfried: "Ich bin von Verrätern umgeben. Mein Rücken ist eine einzige Narbe. Dolchstoß um Dolchstoß" (60) ("I am surrounded by traitors. My back is a single scar. Stab after stab").

In his speech, Göring followed this tradition of incorporating comparisons to the *Nibelungenlied* into his description of the current military situation. The situation for Göring was critical since his airforce had failed to supply the troops in Stalingrad with the necessary food, arms, ammunition, and other supplies, in spite of his assurances to Hitler that it could do so, and because he knew that Generalfeldmarschall Friedrich Paulus had already

---

43("The downfall of the Nibelungs becomes a model for the total challenge of the 'Germanic-German' by which the individual can prove his greatness.")

44("The downfall of the Nibelungs becomes a model for the total challenge of the 'Germanic-German' by which the individual can prove his greatness.")
capitulated in Stalingrad. Göring's main interest at this point was in promoting the belief among the German people that the German army would achieve the *Endsiege* ("final victory"), even though it had suffered a great defeat at the hands of the Soviet forces. He encourages the people of the nation to endure and sacrifice willingly on behalf of the fatherland, as the members of the Sixth Army were doing. In order to limit the negative repercussions and publicity for himself, Hitler, and the Third Reich, he restricts the comparison between the Nibelungs and the Sixth Army to: "das heroische Durchhalten der 6. Armee trotz aussichtsloser Lage als Vorbild der Opferbereitschaft" (Krüger 160).\(^{44}\) His emphasis is on the sacrifice and endurance of these soldiers which should serve as an example for the rest of the German nation. He attempts to convince his listeners to look at the military debacle in the light of a mythological vision which will endure for "a thousand years" in the same way as the Nibelung myth. In *Die Schlacht von Stalingrad: Metamorphosen eines deutschen Mythos*, Michael Kumpfmüller explains Göring's attempted transformation: "Was vorher militärische Verfügungsgewalt gewesen ist, soll nunmehr eine Art mythologische Verfügungsgewalt sein, deren Macht nicht in Quadratkilometern, sondern in Jahrtausenden gemessen wird" (48).\(^{45}\) In Göring's propagandistic view, the battle is thus no longer merely a matter of geography, and the present military situation has assumed a timeless, eternal dimension, which turns defeat into victory. Instead of admitting a catastrophic military defeat, he has endowed it with mythological characteristics which will endure forever. To admit defeat would shatter the myth of the invincibility of the German army which had been victorious up to this time. Such an admission would perhaps prove too devastating for the Third Reich to overcome. Therefore, the first myth was bolstered by a second to keep the morale at the front and in the homeland high in spite of the truth, which was too terrible to contemplate. In February of

\(^{44}\) ("the heroic resistance of the Sixth Army despite the hopeless situation as a model of willingness to sacrifice")

\(^{45}\) ("What had been military power before, shall now be some sort of mythological power whose might is measured not in square kilometers, but in millenia.")
1943, Paulus surrendered in the name of ninety-one thousand men of whom it is estimated as few as five thousand (Baigent 240) or perhaps six thousand (Kurowski 392) would ever return to their fatherland; the rest falling victim to hunger, cold, and illness. Stalingrad became synonymous with the death of an entire army, as Kurowski writes: "Stalingrad, das war jenes Wort, das jeder Soldat der Ostfront nur mit tiefem Grauen im Herzen aussprechen konnte" (394). Müller's Nibelungs incorporate this mentality of non-capitulation, a product of exquisite Nazi propaganda, which used the myth of the Nibelungs to justify the ultimate defeat of their own soldiers. As Kawohl writes: "So wie sich die Nibelungen am Ende selbst zerfleischen, so läßt die deutsche Führung ihre Soldaten bewußt in den Tod gehen (28). Müller's satire of the Nibelung myth also criticizes Nazi rule and the resultant destruction of German identity. Because of Stalingrad and the horrors which occurred there, the German myth was exposed and no longer believable. Stalin's forces and the situation in the Kessel forced the Germans to realize that: "der deutsche Heldenmythos ein für allemal ein Ende gefunden hat" (Klussmann "Deutschland-Denkmale" 169). Soldiers are men, they are human and not superheroes or mythical gods, contrary to Nazi propaganda: they are susceptible to losing limbs and to dying when pierced by bullets or confronted with the frozen winter in Stalingrad. Thus while the alternatives of either "Sieg oder Vernichtung" ("conquest or annihilation") (Kawohl 28) reflect the premise at Stalingrad, they also correlate with Müller's own experiences and interpretations of German history which he views as detrimental to German identity.

Raddatz recognizes three topics in this scene which pose an additional threat to German identity and menace its very existence: "Verrat", "Gewalt" and "innere Zerrissenheit"

---

46 ("Stalingrad, that was that word, that each soldier of the Eastern Front could utter only with deep despair in his heart.")
47 ("Just as the Nibelungs tear themselves to pieces at the end, so too the German leadership lets its soldiers deliberately go to their deaths.")
48 ("the myth about German heroes was put to rest once and for all")
("betrayal", "violence", "inner strife"); whereby Müller makes no distinction between the external danger which is represented by the Huns, and the internal danger, represented by the Nibelungs and the fellow soldiers (Dämonen 47). In other words, the Nibelungs are prepared to fight their mutual enemy, the Huns, but at the same time, they are also ready to fight and kill a member of their own group, Gernot. Müller continues to pit brother against brother as Gunther and Hagen kill Volker and then finally each other: the ultimate betrayal. Violence and betrayal, according to Raddatz, thus lead to inner strife: "[. . .] denn gespalten, zerrissen wird eine Einheit, sei es die deutsche Nation, die deutsche Arbeiterklasse, eine Familie, ein Brüderpaar, irgendein sonstiges Kollektiv oder ein Individuum" (Dämonen 48). Throughout this play Müller demonstrates again and again the repercussions of the Germans' overall inability to cooperate in order to reach a common goal for the benefit of the German nation, which has resulted in continued division and strife at all levels of society and which will ultimately end in the destruction of the German body. The formation of a "Monster aus Schrott und Menschenmaterial" (51) ("monster made of scrap metal and human debris") at the end of this scene shows that the virtual self-destruction never ends, which could have horrible implications for the future of Germany. Furthermore, Müller's representation of the battle at Stalingrad symbolizes the ultimate destruction of Germans by Germans and an end to the maxim: dulce et decorum est pro patria mori, which was promulgated earlier under the Prussian Kings and, as discussed below, specifically, Frederick the Great.

49("[. . .] because a united whole will be divided, torn apart, whether it is the German nation, the German working class, a family, a pair of brothers, or some other kind of collective or an individual.")

50Brecht also expresses a similar idea that soldiers are expected to fight without fear and to concentrate only on killing the enemy in his drama, Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches ("The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich") in the "Mahnwort" ("exhortation"): "Lern dem Tod ins Auge blicken / Ist das Mahnwort unsrer Zeit. / Wird man dich ins Feld einst schicken / Bist du gegen jede Furcht gefeit. / Und dann schieße, steche, schlage! / Das erfordert unser [. . .] Sieg. / Sei ein Deutscher [. . .] ohne Klage [. . .] ohne Klage / Dafür stirb [. . .] dafür stirb und dafür gib" (Gesammelte Werke, vol. 2 1175-1176). ("Learn to look death in the eye / That is the exhortation of our time. / If they then send you into battle / You are immune to any fear. / And then shoot, stab, strike! / That is what our victory requires. / Be a German [. . .] without complaint [. . .] without complaint / Die for it. [. . .] die for it and give for it.")
d) The Prussian Heritage: Frederick II

I continue my analysis of the Germans and their rulers with the kingdom of Prussia, which played such a significant role in the development of German militarism. During the eighteenth century it established itself as a strong military power and became an influential European force. The Hohenzollern Dynasty begins with Frederick I, Elector of Brandenburg (1415-1440), but it was the Great Elector, Frederick William (1640-1688) -- whom we met in Kleist's drama Prinz Friedrich von Homburg -- who established the Prussian army and the basis for absolutist rule. The Elector, Frederick III, reigned from 1688-1713, becoming King Frederick I in 1701. His son, Frederick William I (1713-1740), known as the Soldatenkönig ("soldier king"), improved the army, increased its size, and provided the soldiers with better living conditions. Frederick II, commonly referred to as Frederick the Great, who reigned from 1740-1786, further strengthened the Prussian army and turned the Hohenzollern Dynasty into a major power and force rivalling the Habsburg Dynasty of Austria. Der Sieben-jährige Krieg ("The Seven Years' War) (1756-1763) left a legacy of one hundred eighty thousand killed Prussian soldiers and much death and destruction to the civilian population, particularly in the regions of Prussia and Silesia (Holmsten 133). In spite of his arrogant and at times faulty foreign policy, when the war finally ended, even though Prussia had to withdraw from the territory of Saxony, it had amazingly managed -- with the help of England and much luck -- to survive the armies of Austria, France, Russia, and Sweden and was able to retain the Silesian territory it had previously taken from Austria. Frederick, referred to in his later years as "der alte Fritz", was later emulated by Hitler, who hoped that in the end he would prevail in World War II in spite of his many defeats, just like his famous predecessor. After World War II, the victorious allies abolished the name of Prussia as a geographical and political unit, and in the immediate post-war period, Frederick and his Prussian legacy were condemned and cast into oblivion both in the FRG and the GDR; Prussia and Frederick are
recurring topics in Müller's texts, as evidenced not only in his Geschichtsdrama, Leben Gundlings, but in Germania Tod as well.

In the third scene, "Brandenburgisches Konzert 1" ("Brandenburg Concert 1"), Müller shows us two clowns in a Manege or "circus ring" who represent the famous king and the miller based on Die Legende vom Müller von Sanssouci ("The Legend of the Miller of Sanssouci"). The origins of this legend can be found in historical facts which have been manipulated, altered, and embellished. The legend, therefore, does not correspond with the historical truth: Frederick's summer palace, Sanssouci, built between 1745 and 1747, was blocking the wind and thus hindering the miller's business, which made it difficult if not impossible for the miller Johann Wilhelm Grävenitz (1703-1774) to pay the annual rent to Frederick. Grävenitz sent a written petition to the king on 4 July 1746 which Frederick forwarded to the appropriate department, the Kriegs- und Domänenkammer ("War and Crownland Chamber") for verification. It ruled in favor of the miller and, in addition, Frederick paid for the mill to be moved to a more favorable location (Otto 13-14). The legend, which was first published in 1787 in a French biography, Vie de Frédéric, by an anonymous author reads as follows: One day Frederick II was so bothered by "das ewige Geklapper" ("the constant clatter") (Otto 12-13) of the windmill, which belonged to the miller Grävenitz, that Frederick offered to buy the mill so that the miller could use the money to erect a new mill in a different location. Grävenitz refused this offer to which the King supposedly responded: "Weiβ Er denn nicht, dass ich Ihm kraft meiner königlichen Macht die Mühle einfach wenehmen kann, ohne auch nur einen Groschen dafür zu bezahlen?" to which Grävenitz supposedly answered with: "Gewiss, das könnten Euer Majestät wohl tun, wenn es -- mit Verlaub gesagt -- nicht das Kammergericht in Berlin gäbe!" (Otto 13).\footnote{("Doesn't he know that, due to my sovereign power, I could simply take his mill away without paying even one dime for it?") ("Certainly, His Majesty could do that, if -- by your leave -- it were not for the (Prussian) supreme court in Berlin!")}
message inherent in the legend is that "im friderizianischen Preußen" law and order rule and a fair king reign: "Preußen: ein wahrlich aufgeklärter Staat, in dem jedermann, ob Müller oder König, vor dem Gesetz gleich ist!" (Otto 13). This "Enlightenment" idea of equal rights for everyone in Prussia is the legacy for which Frederick wanted to be known and admired, but the historical reality of his legacy is a different one. The anecdote is known to have been printed "im preußischen und faschistischen Deutschland in zahlreichen Lesebüchern" (Mieth 44-45) and in this way functioned as a subtle form of propaganda for both the Prussian and Nazi dictators. In his essay, "Traum und Verstümmelung: Heiner Müllers Preußen" ("Dream and Mutilation: Heiner Müller's Prussia"), Hermann Korte asserts that Müller's use of Prussian history and material is not designed to offer a realistic image of this past period, of the former monarch, or to show historical truth: "also, nicht um Aufklärung über Preußen". Rather for Müller: "ist der historische Stoff ein funktionaler Materialfundus für die Bühne" in order to denunciate history and thus further his aim of coming to terms with history (76).

Accordingly, Müller paints his own picture of this supposedly "enlightened" Prussian monarch.

Based on the original anecdote, the GDR playwright Peter Hacks wrote a Hörspiel entitled, Der Müller von Sanssouci (1958), which Müller used as the model for this scene. Even though, as Mieth maintains: "Hacks Travestie behält das Handlungsgerüst der überlieferten Fabel bei" (45), the author modifies the characters so that the impetus stems from Frederick himself as a propaganda trick; not only to deceive his subjects into believing that he is a just ruler who willingly subjects himself to the laws of the land, but in particular to detract the Prussian Volk from his war plans. In the third annotation to his play, Hacks

---

52 ("in Frederick the Great's Prussia") ("Prussia: a truly enlightened state, in which everyone, whether miller or king, is equal before the law!")
53 ("in Prussian and Fascist Germany in numerous reading books")
54 ("therefore, not about clarification concerning Prussia", "the historical subject matter functions as a source of material for the stage")
attributes the central idea in his play, the "Müllerstoff", to Brecht: "Friedrichs Idee, an Hand einer Müllerkomödie die Rechtsstaatlichkeit Preußens zu beweisen, stammt natürlich nicht von Friedrich. Sie stammt von Brecht" (27). The problem Hacks' modified monarchical character encounters, however, is that, in contrast to the original miller, Hack's character is so fearful of his monarch, whom he believes to be omnipotent, that the king's plan is almost ruined by his subject's obsequiousness. Mieth's view corroborates their transformation: "Aus dem standhaften Müller wurde bei Hacks ein devoter Untertan, aus dem gerechtigkeitsliebenden Friedrich II. die Karikatur eines Herrschers" (45). During the course of the play, the Miller wavers between unfailing devotion to his monarch, "Ich liebe den König" (49) ("I love the king"), and utter terror, so much so that he falls helplessly to the floor, "Er plumpst hin" (49) ("He falls with a thud"). He does his best to obey his monarch, albeit fearfully, until the latter finally has to beat him into saying the line, which he does so only hesitatingly: "Es gibt noch Richter . . . in Berlin" (61) ("There are still judges . . . in Berlin"). Hacks' Miller, whose name coincidently suggests his character traits, "Brutus Fürchtegott Bleich" (54) ("Brutus Fear-God Pale"), never displays the resoluteness found in the original anecdote's character; nor is this quality present in Müller's representation. Instead, he builds his character upon that of Hacks, reaching the absurd, as will be shown in the following analysis. At the end of Hacks' play, Frederick ultimately succeeds in eliminating the unwanted noise by a clever ruse involving semantics: although he had promised the Miller that he could retain his worker, Nickel, he is nevertheless drafted into the Prussian army, according to the law, as the district magistrate or Landrat Tornow confirms: "Akkurat nach dem Gesetz (63) ("Properly according to the law"). Frederick's final words to the Miller: "Ja, Müller, dann kann

55 ("Hack's travesty retains the plot structure of the traditional fable.")
56 ("Frederick's idea, to prove Prussia's state system of justice by means of a miller-comedy, does not originate with Frederick, of course. It comes from Brecht.")
57 ("In Hack's play, out of the resolute miller becomes a devoted subject, out of the justice-loving Frederick II the caricature of a ruler.")
ich Ihnen nicht helfen. Der König von Preußen ist unter dem Gesetz" (63) ("Yes, Miller, then I cannot help you. The King of Prussia is subject to the law") demonstrate that the Miller has thus been "reingelegt" or duped by his monarch because he loses Nickel, without whose help he cannot work the mill. Hacks' version, contrary to the original anecdote, depicts a monarch who is devious and manipulative even though he adheres to the Prussian law, and a miller who, though cowardly, is deceived into willingly trusting his king, but is ultimately betrayed by him. His trust is abused and in fact, used against the miller to further the king's own goals and desires. Indeed, this anecdote, originally used to prove Frederick II's enlightened and fair actions and demonstrate his assurance that all are equal under Prussian law, is parodied by Hacks to depict the opposite. The anecdote is further perverted by Müller to demonstrate his view that Frederick was a dictator, who used the enlightenment ideals to cover his autocratic tendencies and selfish actions.

In Müller's presentation, Clown 1 stands for Frederick II but also represents the old nobility, the "Feudaladel"; whereas Clown 2 plays the Miller from Potsdam, who represents the German bourgeoisie, "das Bürgertum" (Schulz 130; 'Emmerich 121; Raddatz 76; Schmitz 87). It is significant that Clown 1 determines which role each shall play: he declares himself the King of Prussia and assigns the role of the Miller to Clown 2. His orders will be obeyed, which is in keeping with the attitude and personality of the Prussian monarch. Although their dialogue and actions are correspondingly silly, vulgar, and bizarre, behind every vulgarity and every joke, there is a definite seriousness. Müller positions the two Clowns against each other in a verbal contest that accurately depicts the King as commanding and the Miller as subservient: Clown 1: "Ich bin der König von Preußen"; Clown 2: "Ich will auch König von Preußen sein"; Clown 1: "Du bist der Müller von Potsdam" (41) ("I am the King of Prussia; I want to be King of Prussia, too; You are the miller of Potsdam"). Simultaneously, the Clowns proceed to step out of character continually throughout the scene. The first half of this scene
is devoted to each Clown stating his identity: who he is, what he does, and why. The word "ich" is used a total of only twenty-eight times by Clown 2, but forty-eight times by Clown 1, which is more than in any other single scene by any of the other characters in the play. These numbers serve to illustrate the sense of importance felt and expressed by Clown 1, representing Frederick II, who emits a stronger sense of identity than Clown 2, representing the Miller, but symbolic of the German man and his identity. Their perception of each other signifies an identification of self based in part on their relation to the other, which is exemplified in their dialogue.

Midway in the scene a lion appears, which has been referred to as representing the: "kämpferische[s] Proletariat" ("fighting or revolutionary proletariat") (Schulz 130); "Proletariat und Bauernschaft" ("proletariat and peasantry") (Raddatz Dämonen 76); "mit einer Revolution drohenden Arbeiterklasse" ("working class which threatens with a revolution") (Schmitt 87); "traditional symbol of the fighting proletariat" (Kalb 155) and; "Arbeiterklasse (bzw. Arbeiterbewegung)" ("working class or workers' movement") (Emmerich "Der Alp der Geschichte" 121). In a historical sense, the lion is an allegorical representation of first of all, the peasants oppressed by the aristocracy, the clergy, and the bourgeoisie and later, the working class oppressed by the same upper classes. Historically, the peasants' revolt of the sixteenth century is the forerunner of the proletarian efforts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Raddatz also refers to the lion as representing both the proletariat and the "Bauernschaft" ("peasantry") (76), although Mieth sees "keine textlichen Belege" ("no textual evidence") for the latter (44). Taking into consideration Müller's views (as Brecht's before him) concerning the peasants' revolt and the lack of a successful revolution throughout the course of German history (excluding Bismarck's "revolution from above"), it becomes clear that in Marxist eyes the peasantry is the precursor of the proletarian class. After the two characters fall on and "break" the lion, they also fall out of character:
Clown 1 suddenly starts to use the form "wir" ("we") instead of his habitual "ich" ("I"): "Jetzt haben wir den Löwen kaputt gemacht" (43) ("Now we have destroyed the lion"). Before this point, he had only referred to himself in the first person form and particularly as: "Ich bin der erste Diener meines Staates" (41-42) ("I am the first servant of my state"). At first each tries to blame the other for the damage, but they finally conspire together, because both the nobility and the bourgeoisie, Clown 1 and Clown 2, respectively, are fearful of the revolutionary proletariat, represented by the lion. The proletarian struggle is in danger of being destroyed by these two groups who fear for their own existence in the face of a strong proletariat. The negative effects of the Prussian legacy have thus had a long-lasting influence on the development of Germany, and this legacy represents an underlying threat within the GDR. Unfortunately, however, this lion turns out to be only a toothless "Papiertiger" ("paper tiger") (Mieth 44; Schmitt 87), as evidenced by its continuous inability to enact a successful revolution. The allegorical lion proves too weak to stand up against both the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. Andreas Keller confirms that the fighting proletariat: "in der Konfrontation mit den anderen Klassen zu schwach ist, um wirkungsvoll eingreifen zu können, und dessen Einheit unter dem Druck der Verhältnisse zerbricht" (Keller 214-215). Rather than being able to enact a revolution or at the least an improvement in society, the proletarian movement is divided under the strain of strong resistance by the other factions of society. Continuing along this line of reasoning, the lion, which has been broken into two separate pieces, represents the proletarian movement which can also be described as having been "broken apart" due to internal workers' disunity as well as the external pressure from the other social classes: the result was the establishment of two distinct factions: the SPD and the KPD.

58 ("I am the first servant of my nation."), which was the motto of Frederick II. It was contrasted to the motto of the autocratic French King, Louis XIV (1643-1715): "L'Etat c'est moi!" ("I am the state!") It is ironic that Frederick also spoke and wrote French, not German. He expressed his motto as: "Un prince est le premier serviteur et le premier magistrat de l'Etat." ("A prince is the first servant and the first magistrate of the state.") 59 ("is too weak in the confrontation with the other classes, to be able to effectively intervene, and whose unity shatters under the pressure of the (historical) situation")
Müller's depiction in this scene thus corresponds with the image he has set out to portray beginning in the first scene. The lion i.e., the proletariat, is unable to enact an offensive measure and so is defeated and ultimately divided, in the same way that the German workers' movement was divided after World War I.

When the two Clowns step out of their roles as Frederick and the Miller, respectively, Müller is using the theatrical technique: "Spiel im Spiel" ("performance within the performance"), which is designed to emphasize the allegorical qualities of the scene as compared to the actual historical facts (Keller 213). The scene develops an additional destructive quality through his use of the "Binnenspiel" ("internal performance") and "Rahmenspiel" ("framed performance"); thus the original anecdote is not only destroyed, but perverted to produce the opposite effect (Keller 213). Rather than presenting a just and fair monarch as was the intent of the original anecdote, and in addition to portraying a manipulative and cunning monarch, as Hacks does, Müller's purpose is to debunk the message of the anecdote and Frederick's noble legacy, which he accomplishes by using this particular theatrical technique. The author's intention in this case corresponds to the general views of Frederick in the early years of the GDR.

The unfavorable attitude towards Prussia also played a major role in the cultural policy of the early years of the GDR, where Frederick II and Prussia were viewed negatively. Following this cultural tendency, Müller saw Prussia and its "enlightened monarch" in a negative light and indeed, his depiction could best be described as a portrayal of Frederick's own brand of "enlightened despotism" (Kalb 51). This negative attitude is also reflected in Leben Gundlings, in which Müller graphically depicts how the son, Frederick II, is forcibly transformed into a copy of his brutal father, Frederick William, in order to survive his father's vicious treatment. By killing his son's friend Katte, his father has killed a part of his son, as
Frederick's words confirm: "Sire, das war ich". Katte's death simultaneously symbolizes the death of Frederick's inner and former self. As Bruno Hitz explains in, Der Streit der Dramaturgien: Zum deutschsprachigen Drama nach Brecht: "Friedrich verwandelt sich zur Bewahrung seines selbst in einen andern, vom Gefolterten in einen Folterer. [. . .] Durch die Identifikation mit dem Aggressor, dem eigenen Vater, wird Friedrich zu einem noch blutigern Zuchtmeister, als es jener war (58). By using this specific example from German i.e., Prussian history, Müller shows that this brutal aspect of German identity has a long tradition and even affected the future monarch as a child. Later in his lifetime, Frederick's nickname "der alte Fritz" helped further the illusion that he was ruling in the interests of his subjects. However, his reliance on militarization and repression for pursuing his policies blocked the advancement of the bourgeois capitalist order (Dorpalen 162). The King's claim that the mill must be moved away from his palace because of the noise which disturbs him while he is trying to perform his self-perceived noble tasks for his country is treated with humorous disdain by Müller. His Miller denigrates these supposed noble tasks, such as flute-playing, and turns this royal pastime into a perverse and vulgar sexual act. Through sexual innuendoes and obscene, vulgar comments and puns, Frederick is made to appear ridiculous rather than as an educated and enlightened monarch (Keller 213). In this manner, the author satirizes the actions of the "enlightened monarch" who speaks French and is very "aufgeklärt" ("enlightened"), but in fact Müller is also satirizing the ideals of the Enlightenment period. 

---

60 Referring to Leben Gundlings and specifically this line Müller says: "Der erste Satz, der mir einfiel, als ich in Bulgarien angefangen habe, das zu schreiben, war: >>Sire, das war ich.<< Das ist der Kernsatz". (KoS 269). ("The first sentence, that occurred to me, as I started writing it in Bulgary, was: >>Sir, that was I.<<")

61 ("In order to maintain himself, Frederick transforms himself into another, from the tortured into the one torturing. [. . .] By identification with the agressor, with his own father, Frederick beomes an even more bloody disciplinarian, than was that one.")

62 In Leben Gundlings, Müller's main focus is on discrediting the Enlightenment values, which he portrays with sarcasm and disrespect. Teraoka writes: "Through the experiences of the academic (Gundling), the statesman and monarch (Frederick), and the authors (Lessing and Kleist), the main tenets of the Enlightenment are examined and retold in the form of “Greuelmärchen”: reason as the essence of man and the world; the ineluctable progress of mankind towards a perfect, rational end; and the crucial function of education,
The Prussian monarch is not the only cause for the deutsche Misere, however, and for the GDR's contemporary troubles: Müller also blames the Germans themselves for their subservience to their leaders and their lack of action i.e., revolution. The Miller demonstrates the Germans' inability to overcome the whims of the leader and their own apathy. Although the Miller, as represented by Clown 2, repeats the phrase, "Ich bin ein deutscher Mann" (45) ("I am a German man"), this recognition of his identity does not empower him to stand up and fight for his equal rights. As representative "des deutschen Untertanen", the author demonstrates how the Miller "jedes Rückgrat verliert und sich in das willfährige Werkzeug der Macht verwandelt" as Norbert Otto Eke maintains in Heiner Müller (174). In a line originally found in Hacks' text when Frederick asks who he is, the Miller answers:

"(schüchtern) Ich bin der Müller" ("timidly; I am the Miller"); Frederick continues: "Er ist ein aufrechter Mann?" (You are an honest man?) to which the Miller responds, "(unbestimmt) Ich bin ein deutscher Mann" (45) ("indecisively; I am a German man"). The German word "aufrecht" can mean "upright" or "honest" and Hacks uses uses the term to create a pun and comic effect by having the Miller unable to stand upright, rather he falls down during two confrontations with Frederick. Müller borrows Hacks' imagery not only to create a comic effect in his scene but in order to add further insult to this disparaging image of German identity. Hacks' use of the adjectives "schüchtern" and "unbestimmt" additionally serve to underscore the German man's lack of resoluteness and courage when dealing with an authoritarian figure. The Miller in Hacks' version states his inability to stand "upright" or show some backbone when he says: "Nein, nein. Es ist einmal nicht in mir drin " (61) ("No, no. It is simply not in me"). This idea is inverted in Müller's scene when Clown 2 claims that this weakness is due to inherent natural causes: "Es kommt einfach über mich. Ich kann

---

Erziehung, in this process" (Teraoka 52). By telling them as "Greuelmärchen" ("atrocities stories"), Müller intimates that they are anathema to him: "Sie sind ihm ein Greuel." 63 ("of the German subject") ("loses any backbone and transforms himself into the subservient compliant instrument of power")
nichts dagegen tun. Es haut mir die Beine weg. Es kommt von innen. Es ist eine Naturgewalt" (45) ("It simply overwhelms me. I can't do anything about it. It's pulling my feet from under me. It's coming from within me. It is a force of Nature"). Müller's sardonic expression of German identity here reflects centuries of passivity by German peasants which is mirrored in more modern times by German workers. Thus the characteristics he associates here with German identity are: weakness, apathy, subservience, and blind obedience to authority. The total submission of the German bourgeoisie: "ist nicht das Resultat eines blutigen Niederschlags der Revolution, sondern gegen den Willen des Betroffenen entfalten die internalisierten Muster des Gehorsams ihre Macht" (Raddatz 76).64 Despite the desire of the bourgeoisie to break free from its subservience, it is unable to take appropriate action because of its long history of weakness and submission to authority. The Clowns' continuing internal game can be seen as a: "verschlüsselte Darstellung der deutschen Misere", as Keller postulates, with the main significance being that: "Das Bürgertum kann in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Feudalabsolutismus nicht bestehen. Es versucht zunächst als gleichberechtigter Partner mit der Aristokratie zu verhandeln, verliert aber sein Selbstvertrauen und ordnet sich der Autorität unter [. . .]" (212).65 Despite its efforts to reach equal footing with the nobility, in the end the bourgeoisie remains subordinate to it and must abide by the nobility's rules. In the course of German history, religion, especially Protestantism, has played a significant role in preserving the existing power structure. It always preached subservience to authority, even to illegitimate authority not sanctioned by God. Müller apparently does not treat this important factor in the formation of the German character. It would, however, be worth a separate inquiry.

64 ("is not the result of a bloody suppression of the revolution, rather, against the will of the person affected, the internalized patterns of obedience display their power")

65 ("coded representation of the German misery"; "The bourgeoisie cannot win in the altercation with feudal absolutism. At first it tries to negotiate with the aristocracy as an equal partner, but it loses its self-confidence and subjugates itself to authority.")
In a final and absurd action to complete this imagery of utter and complete subordination, Clown 2 proceeds to lick, then eat the king's rod, thus symbolically internalizing the very instrument of his oppression (Mieth 43; Schmitt 88). The line in this scene: "Den Stock essend, richtet er sich an ihm auf, bis er stocksteif dasteht" (46) ("Eating the rod, he supports himself on it, until he stands upright and stiff") is a pun on the word from Hacks' text, "aufrecht". Additionally, it strongly parallels the idea of deutsche Misere found in Heine's Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen, generally attributed to Caput III in which he refers to the Prussian soldiers and their new uniforms. By having Clown 2, who represents the German Miller, perform this action, Müller demonstrates this aspect of deutsche Misere: the willingness to obey orders without question, one of the attributes that has caused much death, yet has also prevented a successful German revolution. In the future it will thus not be necessary to force them to obey orders, rather, as Schmitt also claims, they will obey of their own accord (89). Rather than taking the reins into their own hands, as the peasants attempted in the sixteenth century, subsequent generations of Germans have continually let their leaders decide for them and, in effect, have made the negative choice to subjugate themselves.

Raddatz maintains that: "Die mißglückte Emanzipation des deutschen Bürgertums, die aus Angst vor dem Proletariat und Bauernschaft (Löwe) mit dem Adel paktiert, führt zu einer masochistischen Unterwerfung unter die Werte des preußischen Adels, zu Militarismus und

---

66 Heine's text: "Sie stelzen noch immer so steif herum, / So kerzengrade geschniegelt, / Als hätten sie verschluckt den Stock, / Womit man sie einst geprügelt. // Ja, ganz verschwand die Fuchtel nie, / Sie tragen sie jetzt im Innern; / Das trauliche Du wird immer noch / An das alte Er erinnern." Heinrich Heine, Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen. Heinrich Heine Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe der Werke, Band 4, Manfred Windfuhr, ed. (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe Verlag, 1985) 95-96. ("They still strut around so stiffly, / So straight as a decorated candle, / As if they had swallowed the stick, / With which they had once been beaten. // Yes, the rod never entirely disappeared, / They carry it internally; / The intimate You will always / Remind them of the old He.") Heine is referring to the old-fashioned form of "Er" which was used during Frederick's time by the monarch to his subjects but which was later replaced by the more familiar term "Du". The term automatically implies a sense of subordination which, in Heine's opinion, has become internalized i.e., has developed into not only a Prussian characteristic, but a German one as well, based on his use of "Deutschland" in the title. Hacks also uses this terminology in Der Müller von Sanssouci when the monarch Frederick speaks to his subject the Miller. Müller uses this imagery in the scene, "Brandenburg Concert 1" to imply that Prussia is at the root cause of this modern German characteristic, subservience to authority, as well as to criticize the German man for his timidity when facing his ruler or leader.
The bourgeoisie's inability to stand alone, due to its fear of the strong proletariat, as Müller demonstrates in scene one during the November Revolution, has resulted in its collusion with the nobility to which it now must pay homage by its subservience. World War I took place against the explicit will of the proletariat; while the bourgeoisie was able to take advantage of and even benefit from the ensuing catastrophic economic conditions.

At the end of this scene, with a movement resembling the Nazi goose-step, Clown 2 marches into war for his king as did the soldiers for Frederick II in the Seven Years' War and later for Hitler. The references to the Russians, British, and French in the lines: "JEDER SCHUSS EIN RUSS JEDER TRITT EIN BRIT JEDER STOSS EIN FRANZOS" (45) ("EACH SHOT A RUSS EACH KICK A BRIT EACH THRUST A FROG") refer to Germany's enemies in the First and Second World Wars, demonstrating a very real historical continuity. Germany's unfortunate tendency to engage in war with its equally aggressive neighbors has its roots with Frederick II; it owes its modern militarism and expansionism to Prussia. Müller's inclusion of "Propagandaparolen von 1914" ("propaganda slogans from 1914") in "Brandenburg Concerto I" as Eke contends, offers a continuity extending back to Prussian militarism which leads into the Wilhelminian period and continues into Hitler's war (175). Mieth views the scene's end as indicative of recurring "historisch unheilvolle Kontinuitäten" ("historical disastrous continuities") relating in particular to Frederick II's and Hitler's expansionist plans (43). As Keller correctly surmises, the scene functions: "[. . .] als satirisch-parodistische Destruktion des überlieferten Geschichtsbildes von der historischen Größe der friderizianischen Aufklärung und von der Modernität und Rechtlichkeit des

---

67 "The unsuccessful emancipation of the German bourgeoisie, which, due to fear of the proletariat and peasantry (lion), comes to terms with the aristocracy, leads to a masochistic subjugation under the standards of the Prussian nobility, to militarism and enthusiasm for war."

68 This phrase refers to an inscription chalked on a railroad waggon taking German troops to the front at the beginning of World War I. It signifies the brutality engendered in any war (the latest example the treatment of the prisoners in Iraq) and found on both sides in any, especially religious or civil, war.
monarchistischen Verfassungsstaats [. . .]" (215). In other words, the Prussian system Frederick put in place is, in Müller's opinion, not worthy of legitimization and he instead chooses to expose its and Frederick's weaknesses, as did Hacks in his text. The bourgeoisie's continued willingness to follow orders and not question established authority figures throughout the historical continuum is depicted in this scene, along with the Prussian monarch's desire to control and manipulate his "folk", who are subjugated to his every whim despite any propaganda claiming the opposite. Keller's summary of the three main components of this scene support my evaluation: "Der autoritäre Zug des preußischen Königstums wird bloßgestellt, die Anpassungswilligkeit des Bürgertums entlarvt und die Ohnmacht der unteren Schichten demonstriert" (Keller 215). Although Frederick II wanted to be known as the "enlightened monarch", a ruler whose policies promoted the well-being of the Prussian citizens, Müller systematically chisels away at the stony fundament of this faulty perception of the Prussian legacy and exposes the historical, despotic truth. Frederick II was condemned in the GDR during its formative years and it was not until later that his image and reputation again enjoyed a more elevated status. Müller's primary interest, however, at the time he wrote this scene, is in warning his contemporaries that the Prussian heritage, that is, the unquestioning attitude towards authority and the people's obedience, which had already delivered devastating results during the Nazi regime, could still threaten the development and, therefore, the future of the GDR. This "Knechtseligkeit des Bürgertums", as Keller writes, carries over into "die Epoche der Weltkriege [fort] und wirkt bis in den Sozialismus hinein [. . .]" (213), signifies that this recurring trait could still represent a danger to the GDR and thus threaten the ultimate success of the desired Socialist state.

---

69 ("as a satirical-parodistical destruction of the traditional historical image of the historical greatness of Frederick the Great's enlightenment and of the modernity of the monarchical constitutional state based on law")
70 ("The authoritarian characteristic of the Prussian monarchy is exposed, the bourgeoisie's willingness to conform is unmasked and the weakness of the lower classes is demonstrated.")
71 ("bourgeoisie's blissful subjugation"; "the eras of the world wars and influences even Socialism")
e) Frederick's Legacy and the Proletariat

In the fourth scene, "Brandenburgisches Konzert 2" ("Brandenburg Concert 2") indicates, Müller draws an additional connection between Frederick II and the GDR proletariat. After the "Normerhöhungen" ("norm increases") have been enacted but before the ultimate strike on 17 June 1953, Frederick II, as a vampire, confronts the Bricklayer at his palace Sanssouci in Potsdam. Norm or standard increases in production of ten percent were enacted in May 1953; on 11 June 1953 the "New Course" was forced on the SED by Moscow, but without concessions on the "work-norms" (GDR Monitor 2 118). The Bricklayer is reminiscent of the character Balke from Müller's Der Lohndrücker (1956) ("The Scab"), in which the author explores the theme of norm increases. The "Held der Arbeit" ("Hero of Labor") \(^72\) in this early play has unwittingly caused an increase in the work quota at the expense of the other workers who subsequently receive less pay while having to produce more. As Kalb describes it, this highly productive worker is: "literally one who depresses wages by working too hard and devaluing the labor of others" (61).\(^73\) In this scene, the Bricklayer is being honored for his speed in removing a statue of Frederick II from its previous place of honor in Berlin to a less public spot in Potsdam, reflecting the former monarch's unfavorable status in the GDR. Müller refers to the bricklayer as the "Maurer von der Stalinallee" (46) (formerly "Unter den Linden" and now again) which is a reference to the district in Berlin where the strike of 16/17 June 1953 first developed. Historically, a statue of Frederick II was removed from Berlin and transferred to Potsdam in 1951. While the Bricklayer currently enjoys a festive banquet at the palace, he is not totally comfortable in his new role as a celebrated "comrade" or member of society, as his distaste of the buffet

---


\(^73\) This theme is based on the historical Lohndrücker, Hans Garbe, who repaired an oven in 1948/49 at a Siemens factory in Berlin and received a medal for his exceptional service to society. His colleagues, however, feared repercussions in the form of Normerhöhungen and less pay.
signifies. The Comrade explains: "Am kalten Buffet ist er neu. Was willst du. Wenn wir
Kohlsuppe löffeln mit der Bevölkerung, machen sie Hackfleisch aus uns, hier ist
Deutschland, Genosse. Diktatur des Proli[e]tariats auch in der Küche" (46) ("But he is new at
the buffet supper. What can you do about it. If we spoon cabbage soup with the people,
they'll make chopped meat of us; this is Germany, Comrade. Dictatorship of the Proletariat,
even in the kitchen"). The mention of the word, "Deutschland" as opposed to "GDR",
signifies a connection to the "old Germany" and its form of government, namely: dictator-
ship; while at the same time the word "Genosse" implies a sense of equality in the new
society that may, however, be misleading. The choice of luxury food items at the buffet, for
example, belies this supposed equality. As Müller had feared and tried to warn about, a new
"Elite von Funktionären" (Schmitt 91) ("functionary elite") is developing, which receives
special treatment, contrary to the demands for and claims of equal status for all citizens. The
worker's distaste for and literally, inability to digest these symbols of an aristocratic or
privileged group in society, are proof that the GDR leadership is itself in danger of evolving
into the very form it is supposed to despise and obliterate. As discussed in Chapter Three, a
privileged group did develop in the GDR and, contrary to his original warnings, Müller
eventually benefited from this membership. The term "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" is one
of the stages of social and political development on the way to a free and classless society as
mapped out by Karl Marx. But as everyone now knows, given the benefit of hindsight, a
"dictatorship of the proletariat" would, by its very nature of being a dictatorship, not prove to
be a better form of government than the previous one. Müller uses it here to show the
"provocative and manipulative role" (Hamilton 170-171) it played in the 1920s by the KPD
in the struggle for political power and control of the working class, which, however,
backfired and alienated many workers instead. The praise the Bricklayer has received from
the GDR government functionaries stands in contradiction to the beatings and jeers he must
endure from his coworkers, who resent his privileged position and fear the resultant increases in the work norms. The Bricklayer, who has a bandage around his head, presumably as a result of being hit by the bricks they work with, tells the President: "Das ist der Dank der Arbeiterklasse. Sie wollten mich zum Denkmal umarbeiten. Das Material kam aus dem vierten Stock" (47) ("That is working class gratitude. They tried to recast me as a monument. The materials came down from the fifth floor"). Because of the norm increases, the pressure is mounting, and with it, the tension among the workers. Even though the Bricklayer has supposedly performed a great service for society, his fellow workers correctly perceive that they will all have to suffer in the long run: higher norms will be imposed without a corresponding increase in wages.

Müller depicts the legacy of Prussian rule as a danger still faced by the proletariat, here represented by the Bricklayer. As Bach's *Brandenburg Concerto* is heard, the vampire Frederick II approaches the Bricklayer, who has seated himself on the "Empire Chair", the favorite resting place of the Prussian King. The Bricklayer does not show him any subservience, which is in direct contrast to the behavior of Clown 2, the Miller, in the second scene. The historical hierarchical structure of the previous centuries is no longer dominant in the mid-twentieth century in the GDR. Raddatz explains that: "Es gilt also für die Arbeiterklasse in der DDR, das verinnerlichte preußische Erbe, abzuschütteln und den ihr gemäßen Platz -- 'Empire-Stuhl' -- einzunehmen" (78). The usual respect shown to the King of Prussia and the fear he evoked have been replaced by a newfound sense of strength and independence; the question is if these positive attributes will be able to survive in the GDR. Indeed, far from feeling any sense of humility or even respect for the old king, this member of the newly established GDR has enough confidence in this new system to take the stick from Frederick and break it. Schmitt refers to this symbolic act as: "[. . .] ein Schritt zur
By this action, Müller demonstrates a positive element in the development of a new German identity which has been achieved due to the establishment of the GDR. However, as much as the working class in the new German state would like to consider itself free from its Prussian and militaristic past, it must still be careful and prevent, as Keller maintains: "[. . .] eine erneute Vereinnahmung durch die alten Autoritäten [. . .]" (216). The appearance of Frederick II as a vampire or "Geist" is evidence: "daß sich die DDR in der Realität -- trotz aller gegenteiligen, offiziellen Behauptungen -- nur wenig von der "Vorgeschichte" entfernt hat (Keller 216-217). "Vorgeschichte" refers to the period prior to the existence of the GDR, as early as the unsuccessful peasants' revolt during the feudal society when the Germans first learned to submit to authority and its violent power. During the era of Prussian dominance, as Müller demonstrates in "Brandenburg Concerto 1" through the action of Clown 2 swallowing the monarch's cane, German identity developed the destructive tendency to submit to authority. The struggle between Frederick and the Activist can thus be seen as a: "Symbol für den Kampf zwischen Alten und Neuem, für die Auseinandersetzung mit der verinnerlichten Unmündigkeit" (Wieghaus 90).

Frederick's attempt to defeat the Bricklayer by jumping on his back is not successful, and the vampire disappears. However, Müller has again shown that the threat of the Prussian legacy, the
"preußische Untertanenmentalität" (Schmitt 92) ("Prussian mentality of subservience"), has not been completely eradicated in the GDR as indicated by the appearance of Frederick as a vampire, a monster still able to attack, and which serves as a warning here to the proletariat.

**IV.1.2 The Germans and Their Class System**

**a) The Class Struggle: Proletariat versus Bourgeoisie**

The struggle between Frederick and the Activist i.e., the Prussian legacy of dictatorship and the willing subservience of the average German to such authority represents one of the inherent dangers present in the "new Germany" facing the GDR proletariat which Müller includes in *Germania Tod*. Another aspect from the German past which also still threatens to undermine this new GDR society is, most notably, the class struggle. The historical and ideological struggle between communism and the bourgeoisie plays a central role in this play, and, accordingly, Müller depicts the tense situation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. While focusing on this class struggle as he perceives it in the post-World War II GDR, at the same time he presents similarities from the German past, specifically from the post-World War I period. The economic situation after 1918 had political repercussions which led to the rise of Hitler and the National Socialists. In his short speech or *Rundfunkansprache* ("radio address") from 30 January 1933, *Aufbruch der Nation* ("Awakening of the Nation"), Göring addressed himself to the basic needs of the citizens and promised the German nation that Hitler would provide "Brot und Arbeit für den deutschen..."
Volksgenossen, Freiheit und Ehre für die Nation" (Gritzbach 16). He is referring to the desperate situation of the German workers, six million of whom were unemployed and living from "hand to mouth" since the government was not able to provide adequate relief. At the height of the worldwide depression with so many breadwinners out of work, Göring's words held a welcome promise. A similar dire economic situation could be found fifteen years earlier, after the First World War in 1918/19. Already in scene one, Müller lays the foundation for the primary confrontational constellation in this play: the (German) proletariat versus the (German) bourgeoisie. This confrontation, described as a "class war" by Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) in The Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848), is reiterated by the Russian communist, Nikolay Bukharin in The ABC of Communism: A Popular Explanation of the Program of the Communist Party of Russia, which he co-authored with E. Preobrazhensky in 1919. They write: "The class war arises out of the conflict of interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These interests are as essentially irreconcilable as are the respective interests of wolves and sheep" (63). In other words, both groups are natural enemies, facing each other from opposing viewpoints and only

---

80 ("Awakening of the Nation"; "bread and work for the German "Volksgenossen", freedom and honor for the nation") "Volksgenosse" is a Nazi term which combines the class-based Marxist appellation "Genosse" with the racial idea of the folk. While a Marxist "Genosse" is a member of the proletariat, the working class, "Volksgenosse" is a member of the German folk, consisting ideally of pure Aryans. In both systems the "community" stands above the individual.

81 I am using the English translation, written by Friedrich Engels in 1888 and translated by Samuel Moore. In the Preface Engels explains the "fundamental proposition" of the work: "[. . .] That in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, an from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that, consequently, the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class -- the proletariat -- cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class -- the bourgeoisie -- without at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles" (416).

82 As its subtitle denotes, the ABC offers an explanation of the Communist Party of Russia and is designed to clarify the ideas and plans of the program so that "every worker or peasant" could understand them (Foreword 15). Building on the ideas originally laid out in the nineteenth century by Marx in the Communist Manifesto, this book "in its day came to be widely regarded as the "manifesto" of latter-day Marxism embodied in the Bolshevik Party, the Soviet state, and the Communist International" (Heitman "New Introduction" no pagination).
one can survive. The definitions of the terms "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie" were originally established by Marx and Engels in the Manifesto: the "proletariat" is defined as: "the class of modern wage labourers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour power in order to live" and; "bourgeoisie" is described as: "the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production, and employers of wage labor" (Manifesto 419). This socio-economic dilemma, which has plagued Germany since the nineteenth century and the ensuing period of industrialization (1815-1848), continued to affect the development of Germany and eventually of the GDR as well.

In the first scene, "Die Straße 1" ("The Street 1"), Müller presents a representative street in Berlin of 1918. The political and social unrest throughout Germany during and especially after the war and the continued differences in political ideologies helped to further the revolutionary atmosphere which resulted in the Spartacus Revolution. According to the general Marxist view, this was "the first revolution of the German working class against imperialism and militarism since the Peasants' War" (Dorpalen 320). The failure of the Spartacus Revolution was of great importance for the political development of Germany, since it would greatly affect the future of German Communism. The Man, Woman, and Children represent the working class families, the Proletariat, and the poorer levels of the population, who, in Bukharin's words: "have nothing to lose but their chains" (ABC 89). The Baker and the Man Who Distributes Signs, described as "überlebensgroß" (37) ("larger than life"), represent the German bourgeoisie or middle class, although they themselves are "Kleinbürger" ("Petty Bourgeoisie"). Their size implies that they consider themselves to be more important and powerful than others in society (Schmitt 83). The Man, who has done his duty for the fatherland during the war and is back home again now that the war has ended,

83 Bukharin lists the members of the "urban Petty Bourgeoisie" as: independent artisans, small shopkeepers, minor intelligentsia, and the lesser officialdom which he calls not a class, but a "motley crowd" which fails to recognize its exploitation by capitalism (ABC 87).
can offer no hope for his family that their circumstances will improve, because neither the political nor the economic situation within Germany, or internationally, has changed as a result of the war. On the contrary, the four years spent fighting external enemies have not prevented the continuation of internal dissension between differing factions, rather has exacerbated it and has resulted in the formation of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands ("Social Democratic Party of Germany") or SPD and the Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands ("German Communist Party") or KPD. Bukharin, who had spent almost a year living in Germany as part of the six years he lived abroad from 1911 until 1917, was familiar with its recent history and kept himself informed concerning current events. He writes:

In Germany, where the proletariat is highly developed, there was nevertheless prior to the war no such militant party of the working class as that of the communist bolsheviks in Russia. Only during the war did comrades Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and others begin to found a distinctively communist party. This is why, during the years 1918 and 1919, notwithstanding a number of risings, the German workers proved unable to overthrow the bourgeoisie" (ABC 91).

Bukharin is referring here specifically to the Spartacus Revolution which was crushed by the provisional government with the aid of the regular army and the Freikorps ("Free Corps"), a para-military organization composed of displaced officers and soldiers or "of war lovers"

---

84 The internal differences of policy developing within the SPD during the period of the First World War culminated in the separation first into the Unabhängige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands ("Independent Socialist Party of Germany") or USPD in 1917 and then into the Spartakusbund ("Spartacus Confederation") or Sparatakus-Gruppe ("Spartacus-Group"). After William II abdicated on 9 November 1918, Philip Scheideman, the Socialist leader, proclaimed the "German Republic" while Karl Liebknecht (1871-1919) called for the establishment of a "freie sozialistische Republik" ("free socialist republic") and together with Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919) founded the Spartakusbund on 11 November 1918. This organization later became the KPD, officially established on 31 December 1918. The revolutionary group was in favor of a Rätesystem ("system of councils") for workers and soldiers. However, on 9 November the government had been turned over to the SPD who were joined by the USPD. The provisional government opted for the election of a National Constituent Assembly, but the Spartacists and the USPD opposed this plan, and initiated the Spartacus Revolution, which took place in Berlin from 5 - 12 January 1919.
This defeat was accompanied by the subsequent murder of the two leaders of the revolutionary communist movement, Liebknecht and Luxemburg, who were arrested, abused, and murdered on 15 January 1919 at the Hotel Eden in Berlin by members of this group. The efforts of the German proletariat to enact a successful revolution and defeat the bourgeoisie was unsuccessful and thus the economic situation within the country, despite the end of the war, was far from improving, as Müller shows in the opening scene.

The wife's naive belief that: "Alles ist beim alten" ("Everything is back to normal") because her husband has returned home from the war: "Kinder, s gibt Brot, der Vater ist zurück" ("Children, there is bread, father is back") is immediately contradicted by his reaction, "Wenn uns das Brot gehört und die Fabrik" ("If we owned the bread and the factory") (37). This dialogue between the man and the woman "articulates the political-economic contradiction that underlies not only the scene but the entire play" as Dagmar Jaeger writes in her essay, "Digging Deep: The Past Revisited in Works of Elfriede Jelinek and Heiner Müller" (46). Whereas the wife and mother has been dutifully waiting on the homefront for the war to stop and anticipating the return to a normal life, the Man, who has faced the horrors of war and has lost one arm in the process -- a foreboding for the total dismemberment of the German "body" yet to come in scene eleven -- is able to more realistically assess the civilian situation. His missing arm also symbolizes the loss of "his physical strength and labor power" as Fehervary points out in her essay, "Enlightenment or Entanglement" (85). As a representative member of the German working class, the Man is dependent on his physical attributes to support his family, a task he is no longer capable of performing due to his participation in the war as well as the political and economic developments within Germany. Stefan Schnabel confirms the Man's handicap in: "Totenreich Deutschland: Notizen für B.K. Tragelehns Inszenierung von Germania Tod in Berlin": "Mit

85 These men joined on a volunteer basis and their main duty, authorized by the provisional government, was to
einem Arm wird er nicht weit kommen" ("With one arm he will not get far") (45). The Man realizes that the war has not improved the economic situation for the common people, for the working class, rather has left them in more pitiable circumstances than before.

However, it is not just as a result of the war that the Germans find themselves in such dire economic circumstances, rather the missed opportunity to embark on a new political course with the Spartacus Group which has resulted in their current predicament. The class system of rich and poor, factory owners versus factory workers, which existed within Germany before the First World War and was not adversely affected by the Spartacus Revolution as the revolutionaries had hoped, is still extant and continues to threaten society and the well-being of all the citizens. As Mieth writes in his book, the father is convinced: "daß es Brot für seine Kinder erst geben wird, wenn die Besitzverhältnisse abgeschafft sind, die aus seiner Sicht diesen Krieg verursacht haben" (37). Müller's presentation of the contradictory political and economic conditions in this scene, which he continues throughout the entire play, demonstrates the cornerstone of his views relating to the course of modern German history and its subsequent adverse affect on German identity. The line: "DAS IST DER GENERALSTREIK" (37) is a direct reference to the general strike or "November-revolution" called for by Liebknecht and the Spartacus revolutionaries on 9 November 1918 which helped to ignite events in January 1919. His choice for the opening theme in this play is significant because it lays the groundwork for subsequent actions and sets the tone for the rest of the play. As Kalb writes in his book, it demonstrates: "an inter-generational betrayal - a betrayal of bourgeois capitalist values" and the German "children" learn only the "Pavlovian lesson about not challenging authority" (145). These "values" are not values at all, rather represent the bourgeois capitalist desire for wealth at the expense of others, in suppress the various uprisings by the extreme right or left occurring throughout Germany.

86 ("that there will be bread for his children only when the ownership conditions have been abolished, which in his opinion have caused this war.")
particular the working class. Like Pavlov's dogs, who learned to respond to the sound of the bell if they wanted food, the German working class, who, by its negative experiences with revolt, has learned that it is better to endure humiliation rather than suffer from starvation, which is the undesirable consequence for attempting to support a new social and political order. The construction of the scene and the characters' interaction demonstrate that the failed Spartacus Revolution has unfortunate economic consequences for the people, especially the proletariat, who have no money to buy the essentials for maintaining life, namely: food. They are willing to sell their souls if need be, in order to provide for their loved ones. Those who support the capitalists and have work, such as the Baker and the Man Who Distributes Signs, use the Children as "Manipulations- instrument" ("instrument of manipulation") (Mieth 38) to further the goals of the conservative ruling class. In return for carrying signs with the phrase, "NIEDER MIT SPARTAKUS" (37) ("DOWN WITH SPARTACUS"), the Children are promised money, which they need in order to buy bread. At the end of the scene, however, they are dismissed with only harsh laughter and empty hands as their unjust payment: "Es ist kapitalistisches Herrschaftslachen" ("It is the laughter of capitalistic supremacy") as Klussmann writes ("Denkmäle" 165). The Spartacists were defeated with the help of the common people, represented by the Children, but there is no reward as promised from the capitalists who, instead, are impervious to their pain and hunger and ignore their pleas. The Children i.e., the German people, have been exploited by the reactionary forces who are also responsible for the failure of the German Communist revolution.

Müller's use of children in the opening scene also serves to underscore his use of fairy tale aspects throughout the play. Schnabel writes: "Die Erfahrung der Ohnmacht und des Ausgeliefertseins gegenüber den Großen und Mächtigen versuchen die Kleinen in
Märchenbildern zu verarbeiten" (46)\(^87\) which results in their view of the powerful adults as "larger-than-life". In addition, Müller uses children to act as propagandists here because they are more naive than adults and thus are more easily convinced as well as intimidated into believing what they are told by authority figures or those with more wealth and power than their own parents. Referring to the general relationship between capitalists and children (as well as women) Bukharin confirms these traits as seen from the Marxist perspective: "They are more submissive, more easily intimidated; they are more ready to believe the priest and to accept everything they are told by persons in authority" (ABC 56). Children are also the representatives of the future so if the capitalist forces are able to convince them at a tender age that capitalism is better, then the future of capitalism will be secured. The line to the Children by the Man Who Distributes Signs: "[. . .]Es ist für Deutschland, wenn euch einer fragt" (37) ("You're doing it for Germany, if anyone should ask") implies that the actions against the revolution are being undertaken in order to help Germany when, in fact, the capitalists are only interested in their own monetary and political gain. His statement is misleading because the reactionary forces are trying to take advantage of patriotic feelings to suit their own purposes. The reactionaries are described by Marx and Engels as:

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant -- all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are, therefore, not revolutionary but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat; they thus defend not their present but their future interests; they desert their own standpoint to adopt that of the proletariat (Manifesto 424).

\(^{87}\)("The little ones try to process the experience of powerlessness and helplessness in face of the the adults and
Their fear of the changing circumstances which could cost them their businesses and their revenue should the revolution succeed is at least partially to blame for its failure. The Man's previous remark about ownership of the factory is no idle threat and so the Baker quickly locks his door when he hears the sound of gunfire from the streets of Berlin. The bourgeois had a significant role in undermining the revolution because of their fear of losing their materialistic wealth and power to the proletariat if their revolutionary efforts should succeed. The middle class desire for the "creature comforts" to which they had become accustomed made their cooperation unlikely. Not only their fear of losing wealth and power hindered the middle class from supporting the revolutionary movement, rather the rift among the workers' movement itself, which kept the political situation uncertain and explosive. Eke confirms this idea: "Angst der Besitzenden vor der verändernden Macht der proletarischen Gewalt, vor allem aber an der Inkonsequenz der in sich gespaltenen Arbeiterbewegung" (Reclam 174). After the defeat of the revolution, however, as evidenced by the voice, "RUHE UND ORDNUNG. WIEDERHERGESTELLT (37) ("PEACE AND ORDER. REESTABLISHED"), the Baker and the Man Who Distributes Signs make no secret of their manipulative scheming and their disregard for the plight of the Children and the poor. Müller thus depicts the failure of the Spartacus revolution as a result of "Kleinbürgerliches Besitzdenken, Manipulation und die (natürliche) Käuflichkeit des Armen wie des Hungernden" (Mieth 38). In other words, capitalist forces are at work in society taking advantage of the poor and unfortunate, who are not in a position to help themselves, rather are dependent on the ruling party. The view that: "Man bekommt den Eindruck, daß es falsch war, die Spartakisten nicht zu unterstützen" (Schmitt 83) is demonstrated by the following

---

88("the owners' fear of the changing power of the proletarian violence, but especially of the inconsistency of the internally divided workers' movement")
89("Petty bourgeois ownership thinking, manipulation and the (natural) venality of the poor as of the hungry")
90("One gets the impression that it was wrong, not to support the Spartacists.")
sequence of events. For example, during the war the soldier has fought for his nation, subordinating himself completely to society's needs. Now, after the war, he asserts his private needs as a husband and father who must provide for his family. He is willing to participate in the strike because the Spartacists support his claims. However, at the same time, the reactionaries exploit his war service by telling his children to oppose the strike for nationalistic reasons. Thus the Man Who Distributes Signs, and others like him, are tricking them and the naive adults into believing that the revolution is bad for Germany and needs to be suppressed. These "Children" will not forget the lessons they learned during this difficult time which will affect the way they act when they are adults and, ultimately, will lead to the continuation of political disagreement and strife with catastrophic results for Germany and German identity. The following section focuses on Müller's presentation of the proletarian characters and their role in this struggle.

b) The Proletariat of the GDR

I begin this section with an analysis of the main character representing the German proletariat: "Franz Hilse". Müller's use of the name "Hilse" provides a continuation from Germany's revolutionary past to the GDR's revolutionary present since "Hilse" is also the name of a character in Hauptmann's Geschichtsdrama, Die Weber: Schauspiel aus den vierziger Jahren. Müller's character Franz Hilse, however, is decidedly different from that of his predecessor, "Gustav Hilse": whereas the former is "klassenbewußt und diesseitsorientiert" and "gewaltbereit gegenüber den Feinden des Sozialismus", the latter is: "gottesfürchtig und jenseitsorientiert" and "pazifistisch gesinnt" (Schmitt 110). Hauptmann's character embodies a passive attitude accompanied by a lack of action, which is in direct contrast to Müller's character, who is actively engaged on behalf of his communist beliefs. In this way he more closely resembles Müller's character Balke from Der
Lohndrücker than Hauptmann's Hilse. Hermand confirms this idea: "In ihm ist immer noch der Balke des Lohndrückers lebendig [...]" ("Braut" 139) and also describes him as: "[...] eine Umfunktionierung des alten Hilse in Gerhart Hauptmanns Die Weber" ("Braut" 140). Rather than actively supporting the weavers' strike, Hilse's choice not to participate in it denies the path of historical social progress. Rather than protecting him, his refusal to avoid confrontation nevertheless results in his death, as he is struck by a stray bullet from the Prussian military forces sent in to suppress the uprising. His passivity has not saved him, as there seems to be no place to hide from the ensuing escalation and turmoil of socio-political events. Müller's Hilse is just as unwilling to join the strike as Hauptmann's Hilse, and each believes his decision is justified, but for different reasons: the former based on political faith, the latter based on religious faith. Thus although both characters are markedly different in regard to their personalities and circumstances, they share the trait of being unable to adapt to history's new path of social progress, as embodied in the respective strike. In contrast to Hauptmann's character, Müller's character is not willing to stand idly by as events proceed, rather he takes a stand on behalf of his beliefs. He represents a communistic revolutionary force in GDR society and "a last remnant of the German working class movement" (Fehervary "Enlightenment" 86). Müller's Hilse, who belongs to the proletariat, possesses a personal belief in Communism and wants it to succeed in the GDR. Because of his strong faith, he is willing to physically work towards this goal even at the risk of his own well-being and, therefore, endures both the verbal and physical abuse of the radical youths. Significantly, however, Hilse does not die as a result of the injuries sustained from this attack by external forces, rather from an internal condition: his inability to reconcile his inner beliefs with the

91("class-conscious and focused on this life", "prepared to act with force against the enemies of Socialism"; "god-fearing and afterlife-oriented, "pacifistic oriented")
92("In him Balke from the Scab is still alive [...]": ";[...] a refuconing of the old Hilse in Gerhart Hauptmann's The Weavers")
contemporary political and social situation lead to his cancerous condition which ultimately kills him.

In Müller's play, Hilse's opponent is the reactionary "General", who once served under the Nazi regime. Not only does their conflict represent the continuing enmity in the political arena still present during the formative years of the GDR, it also depicts the militaristic trait associated with German identity. The General's belief that he was merely performing his duty as a German indicates the need of the GDR citizens to shake off the recent fascist past. One of its roots lies in Prussian militarism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which helped pave the way for twentieth century fascism. Given Müller's portrayals throughout this drama, a German man who has served as a General under Hitler's fascist regime is no worse than a Prussian officer blindly following his king into a needless war or a Nibelung who senselessly destroys his fellow warriors. Müller presents the historical and mythical parallels pertaining to this military aspect of German identity. However, Hilse's desire to see the General and his kind executed: "Ich hätte euch alle an die Wand gestellt" (53) ("I would have made all of you face the firing squad"), presents a similarly distressing situation in the new society of the GDR, the "antifaschistischer Arbeiter- und Bauernstaat" ("anti-fascist workers' and peasants' state"), but one which has its origins in pre-World War II Germany: the enmity between communism and fascism.

The complexity of the situation in the GDR is underscored when the General calls Hilse a "Russenknecht" (65) ("Russian lackey"): his attitude demonstrates the resurfacing pride in being German and the underlying resistance of succumbing to the Soviet influence. The General's lines: "Kennst du das noch / Thälmann. WENN UNSER STARKER ARM ES WILL" (65) ("Are you still familiar with it / Thälmann. WHEN OUR STRONG ARM WANTS IT") are based on the Bundeslied für den Allgemeinen Deutschen Arbeiterverein by
the German revolutionary poet, Georg Herwegh (1817-1875). The General's derisive reference to Ernst Thälmann (1886-1944), chairman of the KPD from 1925-1933, indicates Thälmann's efforts to follow the orders of the Russian communist Party, and thus places Thälmann and Hilse in the same traitorous category, in the General's opinion. By associating Hilse with Thälmann, the General is in effect saying that Hilse is a traitor, but this is his "fascist" opinion. Müller's use of the altered excerpt from Herwegh's text draws a parallel between the social and political situations in Germany in 1848 and the GDR of 1953, over one hundred years later. After the General appeals to their proletarian sentiments: "Mir nach, wer kein Streikbrecher sein will" (65) ("Follow me, if you don't want to be a scab"), the Fat Bricklayer and the Young Bricklayer also put down their tools and participate in the developing strike. Hilse, however, remains at the building site and continues working: he is a "Streikbrecher" even though he believes he is doing the right thing. In the same way as the Activist originally believed that his actions would help further the cause of the working class, so too Hilse firmly believes that by continuing to work he is going to help the cause. The Activist regrets his action, which helps the state but raised the norms for all workers: "Wenn ich gewußt hätte, was die Prämie kostet" (54) ("If I had known what the bonus would cost"), because he has been branded a traitor by his fellow workers. The Fat Bricklayer makes the choice very clear when he asks the Minister: "Gehst du mit der Arbeiterklasse? / Ich geb dir einen Rat: wer nicht für uns ist / Ist gegen uns (65) ("Are you joining the working class? I'll give you some advice: Who isn't for us / Is against us"). Thus the constellation among workers has been decided and the strike takes its course without Hilse. "Der überzeugte Kommunist" (Schmitt 98) ("the committed Communist") Hilse reflects the older generation

---

93 The complete sentence reads: "Alle Räder stehen still, wenn unser starker Arm es will", indicating the strength of the working force which keeps the economy running but can also stop it if necessary. ("All wheels stand still, / when our strong arm wants it.") Acquainted with Karl Marx, Herwegh was active in the revolution of 1848 in Baden after which he fled to Switzerland where he lived in exile. Later he was allowed to return to Baden-Baden where he eventually died. Müller had included an idea by Herwegh in his Abitur-examination
of German Communism: he does not want to associate himself with such men as the General, former Nazis, and anti-communists whom he still considers to be the enemy. The fact that the General, a former Nazi, is one of the first to welcome the strike demonstrates the lack of political unity and the danger of differing factions which threaten the stability of this new German state. The former Nazis would benefit from a successful strike (Schmitt 109), while the Communist party would be weakened by it. This inability of the Germans to work together in order to build a new German Communist state reflects a form of "inner strife" which also caused the failure of the Spartacus Revolution in 1918. The German "brothers" have still not learned to cooperate for the sake of their ideals and for the future of their new state. In addition, the German-Russian aggression is threatening the stability of this new state. As Schulz writes in her essay, "Something is Rotten in this Age of Hope": "Mit Unterstützung aus dem Westen meinen sie rechnen zu können: der >>Russenstaat<< soll gestürzt werden, die deutsche Nation soll leben" (474). The General and other former Nazis are mistrustful of the Russian communists, the recent official enemy of Hitler's Germany, and, therefore, are not interested in learning to cooperate with the German communists in the GDR.

In the meantime, while he is working alone, Hilse is attacked by three bald-headed youths, a reference to West German skinheads, riding bicycles and listening to American i.e., capitalist music, who throw bricks at him while yelling insults. The First Teenager shouts: "Geh mit dem Volk, sonst kriegst du Ärger, Opa" (66) ("Go with the people, or you'll be in trouble, Grandpa") which reflects Hilse's actual situation: by refusing to join the strike, he is considered a traitor to the workers' cause. The Second Teenager yells: "Schnell ins Grab, / Opa, sonst kriegst du keinen Platz mehr. Deine / Genossen stehn schon Schlange vor dem

shortly after the end of the war (Tschapke Heiner Müller 11) so he was certainly familiar with Herwegh's revolutionary writings.

94 ("With support from the West they think they can calculate: the >>Russian state<< will be toppled, the German nation shall live")
Friedhof" (66) ("Get into your grave, quick, / Grandpa, or there won't be any room left. Your / Comrades are already waiting in line outside the cemetery") which draws a connection to scene eleven and Heym's image of the deceased workers in his sonnet. It probably also refers to the fact that after the Spartacus Revolt and the Munich Räterrepublik many of the defeated workers were shot by the victorious government troops: they stood in a line to be shot. The Second Teenager's line: "Sieht aus wie ein Arbeiterdenkmal" (67) ("Looks like a workers' monument") reflects Hilse's position as a representative of the old brand of Communism subservient to Moscow. His stoning, which symbolically turns him into a workers' monument, signals the "Versteinerung der Revolution" ("petrification of the revolution") as Schröder describes this event in his book (333). Hilse has remained faithful to his political party, but in so doing ignores the mistakes made by the functionaries, which have resulted in the strike. Continuing along the lines of Müller's use of religious symbolism in this drama to parallel political elements, Hilse's death in the final scene could be seen to represent the "messianic" death of the communist character. Even though he is not crucified, he has been stoned by the hooligans, who represent a different world order than the one in which Hilse still believes. Müller thus positions Hilse as a political martyr figure, who is stoned for his political i.e., communist beliefs. In his essay, " 'Der Tod eine Funktion des Lebens.' Stalinmythos in Texten Heiner Müllers", Horst Domdey compares Hilse's stoning to that of the first century martyr Saint Stephan and even refers to Hilse as: "Der heilige Stephanus der Stalinallee" (68). Similarly, Schmitt views the author's presentation of the Hilse character as a "Märtyrerfigur" ("martyr figure") (110). Müller is careful to explain, however, that Hilse is dying of cancer and not as a result of the stoning: cancer brought on by the impossibility to reconcile his political beliefs with the new changing world order.

The final scene, "Tod in Berlin 2" ("Death in Berlin 2"), takes place in a hospital in East Berlin, two weeks after Hilse's stoning which occurred in scene eight. The Young
Bricklayer thinks Hilse is dying because of injuries incurred at the hands of the hooligans:
"Das hab ich nicht gewußt. Ich hab gedacht / Das sind die Steine, die sie auf dem Bau / Auf deinen Knochen abgeladen haben / Vor vierzehn Tagen, weil du nicht gestreikt hast" (76) ("I didn't know that. I thought it was the bricks, which they piled onto your bones at the building site two weeks ago, because you didn't strike"). Hilse explains that he is dying of cancer:
"Wenn du mich fragst, mir gehts nicht gut. Aber ich bin bloss die Hälfte von mir, die andere hat der Krebs gefressen. Und wenn du meinen Krebs fragst, dem gehts gut" (76) ("If you ask me, I am not doing so well. If you ask my cancer, he is doing fine"). Hilse's cancer is an embodiment of the troubled German past which he has internalized. Fehervary explains that:
"[. . .] the pervasive cancer of German history has crippled him, invaded his body and mind, and made him 'only one half' of himself: a dis-human. It is this internalization of the oppressive German past that kills Hilse" ("Enlightenment" 86). More specifically, however, it is the current situation facing the GDR which is destroying the old bricklayer: Hilse can no longer live with this division in party politics, which is literally killing him. Jaeger refers to the "subject" which "carries something that is not of itself. It is half-dead, half-alive" (51). This deadly illness which is claiming his body: "[. . .] has become part of Hilse and has slowly consumed him. What is left of Hilse is a Fremdkörper, something other than himself" (Jaeger 51). Thus he has lost his total identity and what remains is only a part of his former complete self. Whereas his line: "Wir sind eine Partei, mein Krebs und ich" (76) ("We share the same party, my cancer and I") is an ironic statement given the division of political ideologies throughout Germany's history and the division in party politics in the GDR, it also signifies that Hilse has come to terms with his death as the logical result of his inability to adapt his political ideology.

In his final monologue, Hilse sees the image of Rosa Luxemburg in the figure of the Girl, formerly Whore 1, standing before him. Müller thus completes the cycle relating to the
metaphor of the prostitute which he began in the first scene and the reference by the Old Man with the Child on His Back to the murdered revolutionary. Luxemburg, a Jewish woman originally from the Russian section of Poland where she was an active revolutionary in the international Socialist cause, emigrated to Berlin in 1898 because she believed the revolutionary communist movement had a greater chance at success in Germany. According to Wilhelm Pieck, a witness, fellow journalist, and later the first president of the GDR, she was referred to as "die alte Hure" ("the old whore") by soldiers in the Hotel Eden (Hannover-Drück 141). Already considered a martyr after her murder in 1919, Müller transforms her into a mythical symbol for German Communism. During his hallucination on his deathbed, Hilse believes that he is seeing a vision of Rosa Luxemburg in the form of the Girl: "Die rote Rosa. So trifft man sich wieder. / Hat dir die Spree das Blut schon abgewaschen" (77) ("The red Rosa. So we meet again. / Did the Spree wash away the blood already"). His line: "Im EDEN. Ja, so sieht ihr Paradies aus" (77) ("In EDEN. Yes, that is what her paradise looks like") is a play on words based on religious symbolism, namely: the Garden of Eden, the paradise before the act of original sin. Used in this context, it also refers to the desired socialist utopia or paradise but also, paradoxically, to the hotel where Luxemburg was taken on the night of her murder. Hilse refers to the historical fact that her body was thrown into the Spree but later washed ashore: "Das Wasser hat dich nicht behalten, Rosa" (78) ("The water didn't keep you, Rosa"). At the burial of Liebknecht and thirty-one of his comrades on 25 January 1919, an empty coffin was used since her body had not yet been found, but after it was recovered in May she could finally be buried on 13 June 1919 (Hirsch 143). Hilse's explanation that he saw her: "im Januar / Als deine Augen blind warn, auf der Bahre" (78) (in January / When your eyes were blind, on the bier") is, therefore, not historically accurate. Müller has changed the historical facts here slightly: the public was allowed to pay their last respects in a long procession that filed past, but in January her body was not in the coffin. At the end of the
scene Hilse asks her: "Ists euch zu still draußen in Friedrichsfelde" (78) ("Is it too quiet out there for you at Friedrichsfelde?") which refers to Luxemburg and Liebknecht, who are buried at the cemetery of the same name in that district of East Berlin. Müller's image of the cemetery and in particular of the dead revolutionary symbolically represent the death of the German Communist movement. As Ernst Wendt writes in his article, "Ewiger deutscher Bürgerkrieg": "In Rosa Luxemburgs verwester Leiche [. . .] symbolisiert sich für Heiner Müller der Untergang einer Hoffnung, in der die Deutschen die Freiheit, verschieden zu denken und dennoch miteinander zu leben, hätten realisieren können" (263). The opportunity to end the brotherly "inner strife" which has plagued so much of German history died along with Luxemburg, and division remained the standard. In one of the last published articles shortly before her death entitled, Was will der Spartakusbund? ("What does the Spartacus Group want?"), Luxemburg writes that those who are against the organization and its goals do not realize: "[. . .] daß sie gegen ihr eigen Fleisch und Blut wüten, wenn sie gegen den Spartakusbund wüten" (Rote Fahne). Müller's presentation in scene one of the situation in Germany after the failure of the Spartacus Revolution reflects this aspect of her warning. He implies that if the average citizens had been more supportive of the movement, then they would have been in a better economic situation in 1918. However, Müller's criticism is not necessarily correct: firstly, there is no guarantee that had more citizens, especially from the bourgeois ranks, supported the movement that it would have succeeded. Rather, it might have been overthrown in any case because the opposition was too strong both in terms of voter majority as well as military power provided by the government. Secondly, it is in no way

---

95("Rosa Luxemburg's decaying body [. . .] symbolizes for Heiner Müller the end of a hope, in which the Germans could have realized the freedom to think differently, yet to live alongside each other.")

96("[. . .] that they are raging against their own flesh and blood, when they rage against the Spartacus Confederation.") Rosa Luxemburg, Was will der Spartakusbund?, Ed. Kommunistische Partei Deutschland (Berlin: Spartakusbund, 1919). The text was originally printed in Die Rote Fahne 29 from 14 December 1918 and then in Rote Fahne vom Niederrhein in the Düsseldorfer Nachrichten 14-18 from 8-12 January 1919. Die rote Fahne is the name of the Berlin Communist revolutionary newspaper written and published by the Spartakusbund.
certain that had the Spartacus Revolution succeeded, the economic situation would have
dramatically improved. After all, both the inflation caused as a result of the costs of the war and
the reparation payments following the defeat in the First World War were so extreme that the
economy would suffer the repercussions for years to come. As Helmut Heiber writes in Die
Republik von Weimar: "Auch Wirtschaft und Wirtschaftspolitik sollten die Inflation noch
lange spüren. [. . .] In diesem Sinne hat die Inflation einen kräftigen Beitrag zur großen
Wirtschaftskrise der Jahre 1929 bis 1935 geleistet" (98-99). Thus even though Luxemburg
believed, and Müller portrays in Germania Tod, that Spartacus offered all of the answers to
Germany's problems, a much more complex solution would have been required.

Continuing my analysis of the final scene, Hilse's monologue turns from these
specific time periods in German history to world history. Müller presents Hilse as the
representative of the proletariat speaking on behalf of all those individuals and groups of
workers who have been forced to labor throughout the ages for their imperialist leaders or
capitalist owners. Hilse explains his own confusion as to why Luxemburg looks young with
his response: "Ich bin der ewige Maurer" (78) ("I am the eternal bricklayer"). The author's
use of blank verse, the form usually "reserved for kings and queens" (Demetz 268), functions
here to stress the importance of the character's monologue, even though "Müller's replay of
German history does not focus on celebrated kings, Kaisers, and chancellors (Jaeger 46). On
the contrary, Hilse's monologue is based on Brecht's famous poem from 1935, "Fragen eines
lesenden Arbeiters"ô ç 98 in which the dubious greatness of history's famous rulers is

97("The economy and economic policy would feel the effects of inflation for a long time. [. . .] In this sense the
inflation contributed greatly to the great economic crisis of the years 1929 through 1935.")
98"Fragen eines lesenden Arbeiters": Wer baute das siebentorige Theben? / In den Büchern stehen die Namen
von Königen. / Haben die Könige die Felsbrocken herbeigeschleppt? / Und das mehrmals zerstörte Babylon, / Wer
es verschlang, / Die Ersaufenden nach ihren Sklaven. // Der junge Alexander eroberte Indien. / Er allein? / Cäsar
schlug die Gallier. / Hatte er nicht wenigstens einen Koch bei sich? / Philipp von Spanien weinte, als seine
examined. Similar to Brecht's version, Müller's text consists of a series of questions relating
to differing time periods and rulers throughout the historical time continuum and exploring
who, in actuality, performed the great deeds of the past. The answers, which are always the
same, reflect the developing self-awareness of the proletarian masses: it was not the kings
and rulers, those who consider themselves great and omnipotent, who performed these acts.
Rather, it was the slaves, peasants, subjects, and workers, who have been and still are being
abused and sacrificed by these various tyrants of history for their self-aggrandizement. In his
grand comparisons, Müller includes the slaves in Egypt who built the pyramids for the
Pharoahs, the slaves of Rome under the imperialistic reign of Caesar, who died a tyrant's
death on the stairs of the Capitol, and those workers who built the skyscrapers in New York
for the modern capitalist powers. Both Brecht's and Müller's ideas have their origins with
Marx, who wrote in his *Manifesto*: "In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians,
slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices,
serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations" (419). The main
antagonism of the play, based on Marxist philosophy, is evidenced in the form of the
proletariat i.e., communism versus capitalism. In Hilse's monologue, Müller contrasts the
capitalists who have reigned for ten thousand years with the workers in Moscow who have
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Flotte / Untergegangen war. Weinte sonst niemand? / Friedrich der Zweite siegte im Siebenjährigen Krieg. Wer
/ Wer bezahlte die Spesen? // So viele Berichte, / So viele Fragen. *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 9 (Frankfurt am
the books are written the names of kings. / Did the kings haul the heavy stones? / And Babylon that was
destroyed several times, / Who built it up so many times? In which houses / Of the gold-radiating Lima did the
construction workers live? / Where did they go on that evening, after the Chinese Wall was finished, / The
bricklayers? The great Rome / Is full of triumphal arches, who built them? Over whom / Did the Caesars
victories? Did the much sung about Byzantine / Only have palaces for its inhabitants? Even in the legendary
Atlantis / Shouted in the night, when the sea swallowed it, / Those drowning for their slaves. // The young
Alexander conquered India. / He alone? / Caesar defeated the Gauls. / Did he not at least have a cook with him?
/ Philipp of Spain cried, when his fleet / Had sunk. Did no one else cry? / Frederick the Second won the Seven
Years' War. Who / Besides him won? // Every page a victory, / Who cooked the victory feast? Every ten years a
great man. Who paid the costs? // So many reports. So many questions.")
built their own subway. "Und immer war es für die Kapitalisten / Zehntausend Jahre lang. Aber in Moskau / War ich zum erstenmal mein eigener Chef: / Die Metro. Hast du sie gesehen. Und jetzt / Hab ich die Kapitalisten eingemauert [...]") (78) ("And always it was for the capitalist / Ten thousand years long. But in Moskau / I was my own boss for the first time: / The Metro. Have you seen it. And now / I have walled in the capitalists [...]"). In his final thoughts, Hilse dreams of a victory over capitalism and thus paints a more positive image of the "real existierenden Sozialismus" than in reality exists in either Moscow or the GDR. In spite of the progress made by the workers in Moscow, there were still unequal living conditions dominating the Russian landscape. In his essay, "Stalinism and the Restructuring of Revolutionary Utopianism", Richard Stites refers to the discrepancies between the mighty and the masses in Moscow:

Beneath the ground rumbled the newly built Subway of the Revolution - the Moscow Metro - at the cost of hundreds of lives, a monument to power in its conception, its execution and its overpowering ornament. Above ground, the skies of Moscow were pierced with the edifices of an architectural counter-revolution - huge stone confections whose towers shouted out the might of Muscovy while in back streets and workers' quarters, buildings crumbled and people waited in queues for basic commodities (91).

Thus even in this great Russian city, in spite of the socialist rhetoric, the communist dream of equality for the proletariat has not been realized. The GDR, therefore, became the new center of hope for the communist believers, whom Müller represents in the character Hilse. His monologue, with its utopian aura, paints a rosy picture of the proletariat's freedom in Moscow and the communist victory over capitalism, but it is nothing more than the hopeful illusion of

---

99 Müller's reference to the subway refers to the Metro in Moscow, which Brecht wrote about in his text, "Inbesitznahme der großen Metro durch die Moskauer Arbiteerschaft am 27. April 1935" ("Taking possession of the great subway by the Moscow working class on 27 April 1935").
a dying communist. Hilse's dream remains merely that: similar to the revolutionaries of
Heym's poem in scene twelve who never experienced their desired revolution. His mistaken
belief that he has "walled in the capitalists" can be viewed as a trajectory for the future Berlin
Wall which will have the opposite function, namely: to keep the proletarian citizens of the
East confined within the GDR. Hilse's hallucinatory view of historical events mirrors the
"staatlich sanktionierten proletarischen Mythos" ("state sanctioned proletarian myth") (Mieth
76) but which has little in common with the GDR reality of 1953. His vision of "Die roten
Fahnen über Rhein und Ruhr" (78) ("The red flag flying over Rhine and Ruhr") refers to an
illusory unification of both Germanies under the communist flag, which the Girl confirms as
the Young Bricklayer whistles the tune of the communist hymn, "Die Internationale". They
play along with his vision in order to give him peace in his final moments.

The Girl, playing the role of the deceased Luxemburg for Hilse's sake, says to the
dying bricklayer: "Manchmal hören wir die Kinder spielen. Sie spielen Maurer und
Kapitalist" (78) ("Sometimes we hear the children playing. They are playing Bricklayer and
Capitalist"). Hilse laughs and responds: "Und keiner will der Kapitalist sein" (78) (And no
one wants to be the capitalist"). She answers with a simple "Ja" ("Yes") and Hilse dies.
Müller's drama thus ends on an illusory note, and Hilse's final vision before his death reflects
the dying dream of a generation which is itself becoming extinct. In his essay, "Väterchen
Stalin und die rote Rosa oder Trotzki als Transvestit: Stalinbild und Antistalinismus im Werk
von Heiner Müller", Carlos Guimarães compares the childhood games in a capitalist society
with those in proletarian Berlin at a time:

[. . .] als Kinder auf der Straße Räuber und Gendarm oder Cowboy und Indianer
spielten. Die Rollen waren nicht beliebig austauschbar, der Besitz der Requisiten
konnte entscheidend sein; aber die Auswechselbarkeit war durchaus möglich und
The decisive factor is that they are now in "proletarian Berlin", the symbolic city for the new beginning for German Communism, at least in theory. The problem, however, as portrayed in these last moments of an old bricklayer's life, is that the communist hope remains an illusion in the GDR. Klussmann, however, sees a positive note in Müller's play for the future of the GDR based on the: "agierende und erträumte Kinder, die einen hell ausgeleuchteten Platz zu Beginn und am Ende des Dramas besetzen" ("Deutschland-Denkmale" 164). He neglects the negative yet realistic aspect, however, that the children in the opening scene are being manipulated -- through their hunger -- by the reactionary forces to act against their parents' ideals and their own best interests. The image of the children evoked in Hilse's vision are not real and are not even a reflection of reality: they are only present as a final illusion in order to comfort the dying worker in his last moments of life in a world that was not able to fulfill the communist dream. Similar to a child who believes that fairy tales can come true, Hilse dies with the belief in the communist fairy tale. Eke's view supports my interpretation: "Was mit dem von den Widersprüchen im Sozialismus aufgefressenen Hilse auf der Krebsstation eines Berliner Krankenhauses stirbt, ist der -- im Wortsinn -- Kindertraum eines jungfräulich-reinen Sozialismus" (Reclam 185). Despite the fact that Hilse's cancer developed as a result of his inability to accept the division within the party, his dying dream remains the hope of a pure Socialism, such as that espoused by Luxemburg. Klussmann's contention that: "das heitere "Ja" des MÄDCHENS" (176) ("the happy 'Yes' of the girl") represents the

---

100 ("[. . .] as children on the street played cops and robbers or cowboys and indians. The roles were not arbitrarily exchangeable, the ownership of the props could be decisive; but the exchangeability was absolutely possible and could even be one of the rules. Here, in proletarian Berlin, the children play bricklayer and capitalist - and no one wants to be the capitalist [. . .]")

101 ("Müller's Germania does not only have the king-clown and the Thalidomide-monstrosities, rather also the playing and dreaming children, who occupy a brightly lit spot at the beginning and the end of the drama.")
promise of a future in which Communism defeats Capitalism is not supported by the text. The Girl's response to the old Communist's dying fantasy signifies her desire, at the request of the Young Bricklayer, to help ease the old man's imminent death, or, to use Domdey's term: "Sterbehilfe" (70). In his essay, "Braut, Mutter oder Hure?" Hermand refers to the Girl and her significance to Hilse's vision of Luxemburg: "Die wiederauferstandene ,rote Rosa', die an die Stelle der Germania tritt, ist zwar nur eine Illusion des alten, sterbenden Hilse, aber sie ist zugleich ein wirklicher Mensch und nicht nur eine Geistererscheinung oder eine Allegorie" (Sieben Arten 140-141). Hermand is not only referring here to the physical presence of the Girl, but to what she represents throughout the play and particularly in this closing scene. Hilse's final vision of Luxemburg as the "red" or Communist "Rosa" reveals Müller's desire for German Communism to reincarnate itself in the GDR by escaping the tyrannical shackles of Stalinism. Now that Stalin is dead, which is explicitly stated in "Tribute to Stalin 2", the chance exists that the GDR can make a new start, as illustrated allegorically by the Young Bricklayer who is willing to take a chance on a relationship with the Girl. The shadow of Stalin, however, sardonically referred to as a "tribute", still hangs over the GDR and threatens the young couple's future happiness i.e., the success of German Communism.

Turning now to the character of the "Young Bricklayer", he represents the new generation of the proletariat in the GDR and his connection to the German Communist Party or KPD, which has been transformed into the SED, is demonstrated in his relationship with "Whore 1", later referred to as the "Girl". Whereas Hilse can no longer live with the changes in party politics which have caused his cancer from which he is dying, the Young

---

102 ("What dies with Hilse, eaten away by the contradictions in Socialism, on the cancer ward of a Berlin hospital, is the -- in the literal sense -- child's dream of an immaculately-pure Socialism.")
103 ("The resurrected 'red Rosa', who takes the place of Germania, is indeed only an illusion of the old, dying Hilse, but at the same time she is a real person and not only a ghostly appearance or an allegory.")
Bricklayer has made his peace with the political past, allegorized by the Girl and, despite her sordid history, is willing to start over with her. Hilse and the Young Bricklayer thus represent the duality of German political identity: the former still believes in the pure form of German Communism, or the KPD, represented by Luxemburg, and the latter is willing to accept a tainted version of the KPD, namely that found in the GDR under the SED, represented by Whore 1 / the Girl.

Whereas Berlin is referred to as a whore in scene two, the role of Whore 1 throughout Germania Tod holds special political significance. It is not until the closing scene and the Young Bricklayer's monologue, however, that it finally becomes certain, as Domdey also contends (69), that Whore 1 / the Girl is an allegory for the KPD. The Girl finally told the Young Bricklayer about her past, which he was too blind or ignorant to comprehend on his own: "Was soll ich machen. Sie ist eine Hure. / Ich hab gedacht, sie ist die Heilige Jungfrau" (77) ("What shall I do. She is a whore. / I thought, she is the Holy Virgin"). Now that he knows the truth about "her" and her sordid past i.e., the Party's various and differing political affiliations over time, "he" i.e., the representative of the new communist generation in the GDR is willing to accept her and make a fresh start. The Young Bricklayer continues: "Wenn dir zum Beispiel einer sagt, deine / Partei, für die du dich geschunden hast / Und hast dich schinden lassen, seit du weißt / Wo rechts und links ist, und jetzt sagt dir einer / Daß sie sich selber nicht mehr ähnlich sieht / Deine Partei, vor lauter Dreck am Stecken / Du gehst die Wände hoch und ohne Aufzug" (77) ("When someone tells you, for example, your / Party, for which you have slaved / And you let yourself be treated badly, since you know / Where right and left is, and now someone tells you / That she no longer looks the same / Your party, which is not totally innocent / It will drive you up the wall and without any help"). He is referring directly to politics and admits that it is a shock to learn that "his Party" is neither

---

104 The union between the KPD and the SPD in the Soviet-occupied zone created the SED which was officially
pure nor innocent. Nevertheless, his decision to remain with "her" signals the willingness to establish a new beginning for the German Communist in the GDR. Müller constructs the play and their storyline in such a way that the relationship between Hilse and the Young Bricklayer reflects a generational conflict based on their differing political ideologies. In scene six, "Tribute to Stalin 2", Hilse tries to stop the Young Bricklayer from pursuing Whore 1, but is unable to convince his younger colleague about her profession: "Junger Maurer geht. Hilse will ihn zurückhalten. Junger Maurer: "Ich brauche keinen Vormund. Junger Maurer stößt Hilse zurück" (53) ("Young Bricklayer leaves. Hilse tries to hold him back. Young Bricklayer: I don't need a guardian. Young Bricklayer pushes Hilse back"). The prostitute is the reason for the division between these two men: the old form of Communism and the new, represented by Luxemburg and the SED, respectively. Although the Girls' pregnancy and the paternity of the child are not certain, the Young Bricklayer is willing to accept her word that she is pregnant and that he is the father of the child she carries, even though this may not be true: "Sie kriegt ein Kind. Sie sagt, es ist von mir" (77) ("She is going to have a baby. She says, it is mine"). A pregnancy, which traditionally signifies hope for the future, serves a different purpose here: Whore 1, representing the political party of the GDR, uses her supposed pregnancy to convince the Young Bricklayer, the representative of the proletariat, to remain with her. There is, however, no concrete basis to believe that any real hope exists for their future or for the future of German Communism in the GDR. Mieth's view supports my claim: Es bleibt unklar, ob der Maurer und die ehemalige Hure glücklich sein werden können" based on the uncertain possibility "eines produktiven sozialen Lebenszusammenhangs überhaupt" (77). Given the troubled history of the proletariat and its own internal division, combined with the fickle character of the political party, whose foremost

established on 21-22 April 1946.

105 ("It remains uncertain, if the bricklayer and the former whore will be able to be happy.") ("of a productive social life relationship in general")
interest lies in the pursuit of its own advantage, it remains doubtful that this union will prove to be of long duration. Given her emergence in scene thirteen as the "Girl", transformed from being "Whore 1", the question remains as to how long it will last before she again reverts to her profession. The chances are that she will leave the Young Bricklayer, the proletarian, when someone or something better comes along, thus reverting to her former ways.

Müller includes several intertextual elements in the Young Bricklayer's monologue which are important in regard to German identity. The Young Bricklayer utters the phrase: "Wasser für Canitoga" ("Water for Canitoga") (77), which refers to the title of a proletariat three-act play from 1932 by the author Hans José Rehfisch (1891-1960). The plot takes place in the Canadian city of Canitoga, where a large water pipe system or aqueduct is under construction, but is threatened by internal sabotage. The willingness of one individual to risk everything for the sake of the community is the ultimate message to be found in this text, which bears a striking resemblance to the message in Müller's production play, *Der Bau*, and Hilse's actions in scene eight of *Germania Tod*. The fact that Oliver and Trafford were

---

106 Rehfisch also wrote under the pseudonyms René Kestner, Syndey Phillips, and for this play, Georg Turner. He was a popular dramatist during the Weimar Republic and social criticism is an important element in his works. Together with Erwin Piscator (1893-1966) he worked as co-director at the Central Theater from 1922-1923. Because Rehfisch was of Jewish descent, he was arrested in 1933 and incarcerated until 1936. Upon his release, he emigrated first to Vienna and then in 1938 to the United States. In 1950 he moved to the GDR where he worked in Berlin as a director and screenwriter. In 1938/39 a cinematic film loosely based on Rehfisch's play but with a decidedly different plot was produced by the director Herbert Selpin (1902-1942).

107 For those not familiar with the play, a brief summary may prove helpful. The main character in *Canitoga*, the engineer Oliver, risks his life in order to repair the damage done by the saboteur, Ingram. As one of the workers, Howlett, explains to the boss: "Wird alles nichts nützen, Herr Trafford, ein Mann muß hinunter in den Caisson, die Naht schweißen!" (60) ("Nothing will work, Mr. Trafford, a man must go down into the caisson, to weld the seam"). All of the workers refuse to go down into the caisson or watertight chamber because of the extreme danger, as exemplified by the words of the worker, Travis: "[. . .] Aber für das bißchen Lohn mit dem Tod Poker spielen -- nein!" (61) ("But to play poker with death for such little pay -- no!"). Oliver, however, is determined to face the risk and refuses to let his comrade Trafford attempt the repair. He is successful in repairing the damage, but not without dire consequences for himself. Oliver, whose real identity is Monstuart, has already killed a saboteur, Jimmy, several years earlier in order to save the aqueduct at another construction site. The widow of the murdered man, Dorothy, is coincidentally present at this new site and her presence, in addition to that of the boss's secretary and love interest, Winnifred, provides fuel for the element of intrigue as well as for the romantic storyline and love triangle, as both women fall in love with Oliver. Oliver and Trafford share a common past as officers during the war when Oliver saved Trafford's life, as Winnifred mentions: "[. . .] Das einzige, was er mir von Ihnen erzählt hat, war, daß ihr Kriegskameraden seid und daß Sie ihn an der Somme aus einem verschütteten Unterstand herausgegraben haben" (15) ("[. . .] The only thing he told me about you, was, that you are war comrades and that you dug him out of a rubble-covered foxhole at the Somme.") Trafford in
comrades in arms during the First World War at the Battle of the Somme in 1916 adds an interesting dimension to the play. It serves to emphasize the importance of the underlying themes of loyalty, camaraderie, and sacrifice which play a major role during times of war but which can be and -- given the play's context -- apparently should be carried over into civilian life. The inclusion of this battle in Canitoga is based on the fact that the Canadian forces played a crucial role in this battle which contributed to the development of Canada as a nation. Müller's reference to this play may have been occasioned by this element of developing nationality which would also apply to the newly established GDR. In addition, the proletarian aspect of the play, a major component of Rehfisch's works and those of the director, Piscator, also represent a significant parallel to the ideas and themes found in much of Müller's work.

The romantic storyline between the young proletariat and the prostitute has an intertextual source, namely: Brecht's Trommeln in der Nacht which he wrote in 1919. The protagonist of this play, a young bourgeois man named Andreas Kragler, engaged to the bourgeois girl, Anna Balicke. Serving in World War I, after four years he is presumed dead by his fiancée and her family. Meanwhile, she has become engaged to another man, Friedrich Murk, and is pregnant with his child when Kragler returns from Algeria. The line in Müller's play: "Im Oktober sinds vier Jahre" (53) ("In October it will be four years") has two sources: firstly, it is an intertextual reference to the four years Kragler was gone, 1914 to 1918, and it is the last line of Trommeln in der Nacht spoken by Kragler: "Jetzt sind es vier Jahre" (124) ("Now it has been four years"). Secondly, the Young Bricklayer is referring to the period from 1949 to 1953 and the last time he had seen the prostitute, which is also an allusion to the establishment of the GDR and the June uprising four years later. In Brecht's drama the romance is between the bourgeois and the prostitute; whereas in Müller's drama it is between turn displays loyalty and gratitude to his former comrade by hiding him from the police, who are looking for Jimmy's murderer.
the proletarian and the prostitute. During his monologue, the Young Bricklayer uses the term "Rinnstein" which is also found in Brecht's Trommeln in der Nacht.\(^{108}\) He repeats the phrase: "KOMM ZU MIR AUS DEM RINNSTEIN" (77) ("COME TO ME FROM THE GUTTER") three times. This phrase resembles songs from Hans Ostwald's collection of Berlin folksongs entitled, Lieder aus dem Rinnstein. Ostwald (1873-1940) was a goldsmith who traveled for three years exploring Berlin and its environs, concentrating on the lower echelons of society: prostitutes, tramps, and vagabonds. He subsequently wrote about his experiences and published collections of songs, jokes, and anecdotes which are considered valuable Zeitdokumente ("documents of an era") of the early twentieth century. Referring to Oswald's collection, Schönfeld writes that they reflect: "ein ganzes Spektrum von Dichtungen über und von Prostituierten" (33).\(^{109}\) Considering Ostwald's historical and literary contribution, Müller's inclusion of this term underscores his interest in demonstrating the importance of Berlin throughout history and continuing into contemporary times as well.

At the time Müller completed Germania Tod, Honecker had taken office, which initially brought a glimmer of hope for the future path of German Communism in the GDR. Müller, however, left the play open-ended because the future was yet to be written. The play thus ends with the symbolic end of an era, represented by the death of Hilse, accompanied by a new relationship in the present era, symbolized by the Young Bricklayer and the Girl. The future, however, represented in the form of an uncertain pregnancy by a former whore, remains ambiguous. David Barnett offers a similar view in Literature versus Theatre: "In the final seconds of the scene we see the death of the past (Hilse), the problems of the present

---

\(^{108}\) The character Babusch says: "Aber der Liebhaber wird die Geliebte in den Rinnstein hauen und die Höllenfahrt vorziehen. O Sie romantisches Institut, Sie" (107) ("But the lover will knock the beloved into the gutter and prefer the journey to hell. Oh you romantic institute, you"). The term is also expressed by Kragler who says: "Mein Fleisch soll im Rinnstein verwesen, daß eure Idee in den Himmel kommt? Seid ihr besoffen?" (122-123) ("My flesh should rot in the gutter, so that your idea can go to heaven? Are you drunk?"). Kragler was only interested in the Spartacus Revolution due to unrequited love, but once Anna returns to him, he forgets the revolution and instead returns to his bourgeois way of life.

\(^{109}\) ("a complete spectrum of poems about and by prostitutes")
(the 'Junger Maurer' and the 'Mädchen') and an as yet unknown future (the unborn child)"
(171). The character of the whore or prostitute plays a significant role throughout Germania Tod and is, therefore, the topic of the next section.

c) The Role of the Whore (Prostitute)

By the end of the nineteenth century Germany had become a strong capitalist industrialized nation with a politically organized working class, but following Germany's defeat in the First World War and the imposition of the harsh and vindictive terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the economic situation had become disastrous and the people were suffering. Similarly, during the period immediately after the Second World War, criminality and prostitution prospered (Birke 30). The people could only depend on themselves since there was no government or state office which could offer viable assistance. At the same time some of the major cities of Germany, such as Hamburg, Dresden, Cologne, and particularly Berlin lay in ruins from the barrage of American and English bombs, the populations of these cities began their struggle for survival. As the Germans faced the vicissitudes of this post-war situation, they were forced to fend for themselves in order to stay alive: thus many turned to criminal activity or prostitution. In her book, VEB Bordell: Geschichte der Prostitution in der DDR, Uta Falck writes:


110 ("The visible destruction of many cities corresponded invisibly with the dissolution of social relationships, which led to the degeneration of moral values and standards. A number of women prostituted themselves purely out of fear for their existence, and their acquaintances tolerated it silently, after all, everyone needed to hold his own in daily life after the war.")
Forced to exist among the rubble and debris, not much of the the bourgeois existence could survive in the early post-war years. Morality, therefore, had a diminished importance during this period of hardship. The role prostitution played in the post-World War II GDR is a realistic element demonstrated in *Germania Tod*, but its significance goes even beyond that: Müller connects politics with prostitution and the city of Berlin. Following the tradition established by Alfred Döblin in his *Großstadtroman* or novel about metropolitan society, *Berlin Alexanderplatz* from 1929 and the "Hure Babylon" ("whore Babylon"), Müller draws a parallel between the city of Berlin and prostitution, often referred to as: the "oldest profession". Beginning in the second scene, "Die Straße 2" ("The Street 2"), he presents the whore as a metaphor for Germany's historical political development since 1871. The scene takes place on an average street in what has become "East" Berlin of 1949; a crucial time in the history of Germany, since in that year the FRG and, most importantly for Müller, the GDR, were officially established: on 23 May and 7 October, respectively. The references to "Staatsfeiertag" (39) ("national holiday") by the Man and Whore 1 as well as the words from the loudspeaker: "ES LEBE DIE DEUTSCHE DEMOKRATISCHE REPUBLIK" (38) ("LONG LIVE THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC") signify that the timeframe represented is the day of the GDR's official establishment. With Whore 1's reproach to Whore

111 The text from Döblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz*: "Und nun komm her, du, komm, ich will dir etwas zeigen. Die große Hure, die Hure Babylon, die da am Wasser sitzt. Und du siehst ein Weib sitzen auf einem scharlachfarbenen Tier. Das Weib ist voll Namen der Lästerung und hat 7 Häupter und 10 Hörner. Es ist bekleidet mit Purpur und Scharlach und übergüldet mit Gold und edlen Steinen und Perlen und hat einen goldenen Becher in der Hand. Und an ihrer Stirn ist geschrieben ein Name, ein Geheimnis: die große Babylon, die Mutter aller Greuel auf Erden. Das Weib hat vom Blut aller Heiligen getrunken. Das Weib ist trunken vom Blut der Heiligen (Book 6, 260). ("And now come here, you, come, I want to show you something. The great whore, the whore Babylon, who is sitting there on the water. And you see a women sitting on a scarlet colored animal. The woman is full of names of slander and has seven heads and ten horns. She is dressed in purple and scarlet and covered with gold and precious stones and pearls and has a golden cup in her hand. And on her forehead is written a name, a secret: the great Babylon, the mother of all horrors on earth. The woman has drunk from the blood of all the saints. The woman is drunk from the blood of the saints.")

112 The terms "prostitute" and "whore" are used interchangeably: each trades sexual favors for money, but in addition each term implies an unscrupulous or immoral person, one who is willing to do anything to attain his or her desires, particularly materialistic. Müller chose the term "Hure" or "whore" for his character, even though the profession is generally referred to as "prostitution".
Müller makes a conscious connection to the *Reichsgründung* ("establishment of the Second German Empire") in 1871. By using this constellation, he clearly demonstrates the relationship between the: "Prostitutionsgewerbe und Politik" ("trade of prostitution and politics") (Schmitt 85). The character of the "Old Man with the Child on his Back" personifies the city of Berlin as a whore: "Die Kaiserhure war Proletenbraut / Für eine Nacht, nackt im Novemberschnee" (38) ("The Emperor's whore was the proletarian bride / For one night, naked in the November snow"). He is describing the general experience shared by the proletarian fighters of the November 1918 and January 1919 revolutions out in the cold streets of Berlin. Whereas the president, Friedrich Ebert, satirically referred to as: "DerPräsident. EinArbeiter wie wir" (38) ("The President. A worker like us"), planned the execution of the movement's leaders, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, from the comfort of the palace: "Die Bonzen saßen warm im Schloß, berieten" (38) ("The party bosses sat warm in the palace, conferring"). Rather than supporting the movement, the president and other members of the party separated themselves from the revolution and found the means to end it and the revolutionary leadership, which led to the KPD's ultimate dependency on the Soviet Communist Party. The Old Man again refers to Luxemburg and Liebknecht and their murders when he says: "Im Schloß die Bonzen ritten auf den Stühlen / Und stimmten Karl und Rosa an die Wand (38) ("In the palace the party bosses were riding on the chairs / And voted to have Karl and Rosa executed"). The anachronistic connection can be made to the first president of the GDR, Wilhelm Pieck, who was also a former worker and Spartacist (Eke Heiner Müller 177), and, coincidentally, was in the Eden Hotel the night of 15 January 1919 and later testifed at the court trial of Luxemburg's murderers. The Old Man, "der als St. Christophorus der Arbeiterbewegung in symbolischer Weise ein Kind auf dem Rücken trägt"
represents a sense of continuation from the important "Vorgeschichte" or "pre-history" of the GDR, the Spartacus Revolt and its leaders, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, to contemporary events in the newly-formed GDR. At the same time he reminisces about the unsuccessful Spartacist movement of the past, the child on his back is there to symbolize the still present communist hope for the future. This future has supposedly been realized in 1949 with the creation of the GDR: "DER ERSTE ARBEITERUND-BAUERNSTAAT AUF DEUTSCHEM BODEN" (38). The Old Man's line: "Und rollten unsern Himmel wieder ein" (38) ("And roll up our heaven") indicates that the revolutionaries admitted defeat at that moment and packed their plans and hopes away until a future moment of success would arrive.

Müller demonstrates an ambivalence towards the establishment of the GDR, which occurs at even the lowest level of society: the prostitutes on the street. Two of the three prostitutes; Whore 2 and Whore 3, decide to migrate to the capitalist FRG, indicated by the "Ku'damm"; whereas "Whore 1" chooses to remain in the GDR (40). In this sense, for Schmitt, Whore 1 thus represents those German people who choose to break with the fascist past and affirm Socialism (85). However, Whore 1 is not interested in politics, rather only in her own personal advantage, as her dialogue indicates: "Den Dicken nehm ich noch aus. Eine Strumpfabrik in Sachsen. Lange macht er nicht mehr, hat schon dreimal die Volkskontrolle gehabt. Die Gemahlin wird auch renitent. Einen Nerz will ich noch herausschlagen" (40) ("I'm going to take advantage of the fat man. A nylon factory in Sachsen. He won't be at it much longer, has already had three national controls. His wife is also becoming stubborn. I still want to get a fur coat out of him"). A factory owner is becoming a rarity in the GDR:

114 ("who like St. Christopher of the workers' movement symbolically carries a child on his back")
115 In Müller's text, Herakles 5, there is a similar line: "Herakles rollt den Himmel ein und steckt ihn in die Tasche (156). ("Herakles rolls up the heaven and sticks it in his pocket.") The meaning in this text is that Herakles takes matters into his own hands and no longer waits for help from the gods. The revolutionaries from
soon the government will confiscate his factory on behalf of the collective so Whore 1 wants to exploit his situation while it is still possible. Similar to Whore 2 who plans to retire from this profession soon: "Vorm Frühjahr spring ich ab" (40) ("By spring I will be out of here"), Whore 1 is most interested in earning the most profit as she can now, so that she can escape from this profession in the near future. In Dialektik und Utopie: Die Prostituierte im deutschen Expressionismus, Christiane Schönfeld presents the literary background of the prostitute in European and particularly German literature, originating in Hans Jakob Christoph von Grimmelshausen's (1622-1676) Der Abenteuerliche Simplicissimus (1668) in the Baroque period, extending to the early twentieth century in Frank Wedekind's (1864-1918) "Lulu plays": Erdgeist (1895) ("earth spirit") and Die Büchse der Pandora (1904) ("Pandora's box") until finally culminating in the Expressionist period, the focal point of her study. She remarks that: "Ehen wie Prostitution dienen nur dem Überleben" (29) which certainly seems to apply to Whore 1, who is interested first and foremost in her own survival but would also like to have a more pleasurable and convenient life: perhaps she aspires to a bourgeois existence. Whore 1's comment that the blonde policeman would marry her in order to get her off the street and thus have less work -- no more reports to write about her -- signifies that she is apparently very active in her profession. The fact that she admits she would be willing to marry him: "Der Blonde gefällt mir" (40) ("I like the blonde") shows that she is primarily interested in her own advantage and in improving her lifestyle, and also attests to her acceptance of the GDR state, personified by the policeman, or as Schmitt writes, the: "Verkörperung dieses Staates" (85) ("personification of this state"). In direct contrast to Whore 1 is Whore 3, who would rather live and "work" in capitalistic West Berlin, and is disgusted that Whore 1 would even consider marrying the cop i.e., forging an alliance with an

November 1918, however, could not expect any godly help and, contrary to Hercules, lacked the power to master their situation.

116 (marriages, like prostitution, serve only the purpose of survival"
official representative of the new state. Although the policeman was probably not serious, it shows that Whore 1 is looking for a way to improve her situation. Schönfeld points out that:

"Oft wird die Prostituierte in der Literatur als Antipode zur Jungfrau oder Ehegattin verstanden" (27). Müller, however, uses the prostitute in a different manner: rather than being juxtaposed against the wife, the whore becomes the wife: which is why her signification is transformed from "Whore" to "Girl". She sings the first line from a German folksong about the death of a husar's beloved from 1825: "Es war einmal ein treuer Husar", which serves as a portent that any relationship with Whore 1, who will stop at nothing to improve her lifestyle, may eventually end in death and sadness. At the end of

---

117 ("In literature the prostitute is often understood as the antipode to the virgin or wife.")

118 Here is the text of "Der treue Husar": "Es war einmal ein treuer Husar, / Der liebt' sein Mädchen ein ganzes Jahr, / Ein ganzes Jahr und noch viel mehr, / Die Liebe nahm kein Ende mehr. // 2. Der Knab' der fuhr ins fremde Land, / Derweil ward ihm sein Mädchen krank, / Sie ward so krank bis auf den Tod, / Drei Tag, drei Nacht sprach sie kein Wort. // 3. Und als der Knab' die Botschaft kriegt, / Daß sein Herzlieb am Sterben liegt, / Verließ er gleich sein Hab und Gut, / Wollt seh'n, was sein Herzlieben tut. // 4. Ach Mutter bring' geschwind ein Licht, / Mein Liebchen stirbt, ich seh' es nicht, / Das war fürwahr ein treuer Husar, / Der liebt' sein Mädchen ein ganzes Jahr. // 5. Und als er zum Herzlieben kam, / Ganz leise gab sie ihm die Hand, / Die ganze Hand und noch viel mehr, / Die Liebe nahm kein Ende mehr. // 6. "Grüß Gott, grüß Gott, Herzliebste mein! / Was machst du hier im Bett allein?" / "Hab dank, hab Dank, mein treuer Knab'! / Mit mir wird's heißen bald: ins Grab!") // 7. "Grüß Gott, grüß Gott, mein feiner Knab. / Mit mir will's gehen ins kühlle Grab. / "Ach nein, ach nein, mein liebes Kind, / Dieweil wir so Verliebte sind." // 8. "Ach nein, ach nein, nicht so geschwind. / Dieweil wir zwei Verliebte sind; / Ach nein, ach nein, Herzliebste mein, / Die Lieb und Treu muß länger sein. // 9. Er nahm sie gleich in seinen Arm, / Da war sie kalt und nimmer warm; / "Geschwind, geschwind bringt mir ein Licht! / Sonst stirbt mein Schatz, daß's niemand sicht. // 10. Und als das Mägdlein gestorben war, / Da legt er's auf die Totenbahr. / Wo krieg ich nun sechs junge Knab'n, / Die mein Herzlieb zu Grabe trag'n? // 11. Wo kriegen wir sechs Träger her? / Sechs Bauernbuben die sind so schwer. / Sechs brave Husaren müssen es sein, / Die tragen mein Herzlieben heim. // 12. Jetzt muß ich tragen ein schwarzes Kleid, / Das ist für mich ein großes Leid, / Ein großes Leid und noch viel mehr, / Die Trauer nimmt kein Ende mehr. //" Volkslieder aus aller Welt. Ed. Frank Petersohn. 3 Feb. 2003 <http://www.ingeb.org/grinder.html>. ("A faithful soldier, without fear, / He loved his girl for one whole year, / For one whole year and longer yet, / His love for her, he'd ne'er forget. / This youth to foreign land did roam, / While his true love, fell ill at home. / Sick unto death, she no one heard. / Three days and nights she spoke no word. // And when the youth received the news, / That his dear love, her life may lose, / He left his place and all he had, / To see his love, went this young lad. // Oh mother dear, bring light to me, / My darling dies, I cannot see. / He was indeed a soldier true, / Who loved his girl, a whole year through. // And as to his dearheart he went, / Without a word, her hand she lent. / She lent her hand, and then much more. / That love would last for evermore. // Hello my dear, love of my own, / What do you here, in bed alone? / Thank you, thank you, my faithful friend, / With me, it soon will be the end. // Hello my dear, my faithful knave, / Soon I will be in a cool grave. / Oh no, oh no, my honeychild, / Our love will make your illness mild. / Oh no, oh no, not quite so fast, / Not for as long our love would last. / Oh no, oh no, dearheart to me, / Our love and faith must longer be. / He took her in his arms to hold, / She was not warm, forever cold. / Oh quick, oh quick, bring light to me, / Else my love dies, no one will see. // And when the maid, in death lay here, / Her body he laid on a bier. / Where can I get six strong young men, / To the grave carry my love then. // Pallbearers we need two times three, / Six farmhands they are so heavy. / It must be six of soldiers brave, / To carry my love to her grave. // A long black coat, I must now wear. / A sorrow great, is what I bear. / A sorrow great and so much more, / My grief it will end nevermore. //") Folksongs around the world. Ed. Frank Petersohn. 3 Feb. 2003 <http://www.ingeb.org/grinder.html>.
scene two, the Young Man, later known as the Young Bricklayer, saves Whore 1 from the unwelcome advances of a drunken man. Even though she resists his invitation at this point in time: "Heute ist Feiertag. Heute geh ich allein" (40) ("Today is a holiday. Today I go alone"), the two will meet again in scene six when she will realize that she can use him to achieve her goal of a better way of life.

Situated in a tavern in East Berlin, scene six, "Hommage à Stalin 2" ("Tribute to Stalin 2"), takes places in 1953: the date of the action becomes clear only through the text itself. With the first line Müller makes a direct reference to its significance, as Petty Bourgeois 1 states: "Stalin ist tot" (51) ("Stalin is dead"). The Activist's reference to the buffet, "Heute das BUFFET" (54) ("Today the BUFFET") verifies that both scenes four and six take place on the same date: Stalin died on 5 March 1953. Müller substitutes the prostitutes' street scene with a tavern scene during the course of the play. In scene two, which takes place in 1949, we see the prostitutes pursuing their profession on the street; whereas by scene six, 1953, they have taken their business to the local tavern. Müller accurately depicts the fact that, in the fifties, the method of prostitution changed: "In stärkerem Maße hat sich die Prostitution in die Lokale verlagert. Dort sitzen die Prostituierten als Stammgäste an einzelnen Tischen" (Falck 38). In a general sense, prostitution is a metaphor for capitalism: selling one's body for money. Similarly, in the first scene, the children are also willing to sell themselves: their services and their beliefs (or those of their parents) for something to eat. Both of these elements demonstrate that people resort to whatever means they have available to them in order to survive: for soldiers it is cannibalism and for civilians it is crime and prostitution. The middle class is represented alongside the proletariat and the prostitutes: "der Tod des Alten und die Geburt des Neuen" (the death of the old" and the birth

119 ("To a greater extent prostitution shifted to the taverns. There the prostitutes sit at separate tables as regular guests.")
of the new") occurs in the "Kneipenmilieu" ("tavern milieu")\textsuperscript{120} (Schulz 132). Whereas Stalin's death is the "death of the old", the "birth of the new" takes the shape of the GDR. In a more specific way, Müller uses prostitution in \textit{Germania Tod} as a metaphor for politics to describe the relationship in the GDR between the proletariat and the SED. The line by the Young Bricklayer: "Das ist sie. Im Oktober sinds vier Jahre" (53) ("That's her. It will be four years in October") is a direct reference to the date of the official establishment of the GDR on 7 October 1949: Whore 1 is thus an allegory for the KPD and, specifically, the political party of the GDR, the SED, which is confirmed in the final scene of the play in the Young Bricklayer's monologue, as discussed above.

Whore 1's line: "Es gibt keine Mütter mehr" (51) ("There are no mothers anymore"), suggests two further implications for the state of German identity following the Second World War. Firstly, it serves to stress that in her profession, children are not a desired result of the sexual act: sex is not an expression of love, rather it is used as a means to make money. Her situation thus reflects the poor economic situation in the GDR four years after it was founded: the citizens, particularly the members of the proletariat, are still struggling for survival by any means available. Falck points out that a large portion of those women who turned to selling their bodies in order to survive stemmed from the "Arbeiterklasse" ("working class") (22), a fact which demonstrates the desperate plight of this particular group. Secondly, there is an allusion to the fact that so many mothers lost their sons during World War II, in particular at Stalingrad: women, therefore, do not want to have children anymore, especially sons, who would have to go to war and most likely be killed. The line by Petty Bourgeois 2: "Ein Bier für die Witwen und Waisen" (51) ("A beer for the widows and
\textsuperscript{120}Müller explains in \textit{Krieg ohne Schlacht} that he often visited pubs or taverns in East Berlin, which provided him with much material for his texts: "Ich bin damals zwangsläufig viel in Kneipen gegangen [. . .] Das war sehr wichtig für mich. Man lernt ja in Kneipen ungeheuer viele Leute ganz anders kennen. Das war der Bauch von Berlin. Später ging ich oft ins Café Nord [. . .] Das war wirklich eine gute Zeit, viel Arbeitsmaterial" (89-90). ("Back then I went to taverns a lot out of necessity [. . .] That was very important for me. In taverns you learn a
orphans") also attests to this interpretation: the men are gone, many were killed in the war or
died in prison camps after the war, and all that remains of the families are the wives and their
orphaned children, to whom they offer a toast. A connection to scene five exists given
Gunther's words to Gernot: "Was meinst du, wozu deine Mutter dich geboren hat. Wir
werden es solange üben, bis du es im Schlaf kannst" (50) ("Why do you think your mother
gave birth to you. We are going to practice until you can do it in your sleep"). Gunther is
referring to the act of killing: a soldier needs to know how to kill others and, viewed from the
German perspective, that is the only reason his mother gave birth to him. This theme is
expanded when the Drunk explains that he played war games with a former comrade who had
to lock his wife in the kitchen since she got mad when they started to outline the Kessel at
Stalingrad with beer on the nice wooden parquet of their middle class living room: "Er hat sie
eingeschlossen in der Küche" (55) ("He locked her in the kitchen"). The idea corresponds to
Gunther's line in the previous scene that: "Der Krieg ist Männerarbeit" (50) ("War is men's
work"). The act of locking the woman (wife) in the kitchen further underscores the mother
motif: women belong at home in order to procreate for their country, but they have no other
connection to a war or battle. Even though the war in the living room is a simulated game,
the men still get excited about it, which also represents Müller's tenet of the characteristic
German desire or need to fight. Clown 2 asserts in scene three that his actions are based on an
inherent trait, so here also the inference is that the German's love of war is based on a
psychological inner need or force. In addition, the Nibelungs' banter in scene five about
having been on the battlefield for so long that they have forgotten how to perform the sexual
act points to a much more serious aspect of the post-war situation: Germany's decreased male
population and lack of young men to produce offspring. In the final phase of the war, Hitler
great deal about people in a different way [. . .] That was the belly of Berlin. Later I often went to the Café
North [. . .] That was really a good time, a lot of subject matter.")
recruited old men and boys to serve in his army because the healthy, young men were either
dead or in captivity: thus Germany's future and its identity are in danger. Just as the prostitute
in scene six has sex for money but without love or the desire to procreate, the warriors' act of
masturbation will not lead to anything significant or lasting; it represents only the momentary
self-satisfaction of fighting soldiers, doomed to death or imprisonment, far from their
families, homes, and fatherland. The situation facing the citizens of the GDR in 1949 and
even in 1953 is thus not only a result of the recent war, but a continuation of it as well.

The action has skipped from 1918 to 1949, where the situation has changed
drastically. Anti-Russian sentiments abound in this scene, which takes place in 1949 in East
Berlin of the newly established GDR. Müller depicts the aggression present between those
Germans who oppose the establishment of this "Russenstaat" (38) ("Russian state") and those
who support it. The characters referred to only as "Mann" ("Man"), who represents German
nationalism, and "Andrer" ("Other"), who represents German Communism with Russian
affiliations, have a brief physical altercation before the Man threatens the Other: "Es gibt
noch Bäume, Äste dran, in Deutschland. / Wir sehen uns wieder, Russe, wenn du hängst"
(38) ("There are still trees, with branches on them, in Germany. / We'll see each other again,
Russian, when you are hanging"). The Man is able to escape arrest by the GDR police due to
the help of others in the crowd who share his sentiments and hopes. The conversation
between the characters "Einarm" ("One-armed Man") and "Mann 2" ("Man 2") points to a
definite awareness of German nationalism as well as a continuation from the war of the
German-Soviet aggression. The One-armed Man asks sardonically: "Seid ihr noch
Deutsche?" ("Are you still Germans?") and Man 2 replies sarcastically with: "Hast du einen
Arm / Zu viel" (39) ("Do you have one arm too many?"). One-armed Man reminds him:
"Smolensk, Kamerad. Das nächste Mal besser" (39) ("Smolensk, camarade. The next time

---

121 In fact, during the Nazi regime, a special medal was created for women, called the Mutterkreuz ("Mother's
better") which implies that a further war is inevitable and only a matter of time. The significance for German identity is that the German still demonstrates aggression: he is willing to fight on behalf of Germany against the Russians, the conquerors, even if it means starting another war. He fails to remember, however, that Hitler invaded Russia first. He uses the Russian city of Smolensk, which was conquered by the Wehrmacht during the battle from 16 July to 5 August 1941, to demonstrate that the Germans were strong and powerful then, and will be able to achieve even greater victories in the future war he anticipates against Russia. The One-armed Man, who most likely lost his arm during the battle at Smolensk, draws a connection to scene one and the man who lost an arm fighting during World War I on behalf of Germany, the fatherland, which had also declared war on Russia on 1 August 1914.

Müller's expression of anti-Russian sentiments continues with the characters of the "Windjacken" ("Windbreakers"). These young men, who rode on bicycles from West Berlin to East Berlin in order to distribute their pamphlets containing anti-GDR slogans, are based on historical fact. Because they also desecrate a flag, these Windbreakers are subsequently taken away by the "Staubmäntel" ("Trench Coats"), who represent the secret police of the GDR, or, as Schmitt refers to this character type: "Staatsfeinde suchenden Staubmantel, der auf den Staatsicherheitsdienst der DDR vorausweist" (84). The fact that one of the men anonymously (he is again only referred to as "Mann" but without the number 1, 2, or 3) tries to help the Windbreakers by stating that they are drunk: "Die sind blau" (39), demonstrates a

---

122 In his autobiography Müller writes about 17 June 1953: "Dann kamen die Jugendlichen aus West-Berlin, Ringelsocken und Windjacken, das war die Jugendmode damals, große Fahrradkolonnen, die sich da ein-mischten" (KoS 132-133). ("Then youths from West Berlin came, ringlet socks and windbreakers, that was the adolescent style at that time, great gangs of bicycles, who joined in.") Because "The Street 2" takes places in 1949, however, Müller has slightly altered the actual fact to suit his literary purpose.

123 Credit for the translation of the term "Trench Coats" belongs to Carl Weber; the German term literally translates to "dust covers".
certain amount of sympathy and perhaps collaboration with these young German men from West Berlin. Müller thus shows that not all Germans living within East Berlin are in favor of the division of Germany, and many are especially opposed to this "Russian state", which, coincidentally, is the term used by this same "Mann" at the beginning of this scene.

d) The Petty Bourgeois

In scene six, "Tribute to Stalin 2", Müller presents two "Kleinbürger" or "Petty Bourgeois" characters, differentiated by the numbers one and two, respectively. Similar to scene two, in which various characters interact with each other on the street, then move on and the next constellation of characters exchange dialogue, scene six follows the same pattern, only their dialogue occurs in the bar setting. The Innkeeper and the Salesman are the only constants i.e., the only two characters present throughout the entire scene, ostensibly observing the others, even though they do not partake in each interaction. In the first interaction, the two Petty Bourgeois characters have a seemingly superficial discussion with the three prostitutes, which includes important information concerning the economic and social situation in the GDR. The line by Petty Bourgeois 1: "ROSEMARIE. ROSEMARIE / SIEBEN JAHRE MEIN HERZ NACH DIR SCHRIE" (53) is an intertextual reference to the well-known folksong by Hermann Lõns (1866-1914). Müller employs this folksong

---

124 ("Trench Coat, who anticipate the national secret service of the GDR, on the lookout for enemies of the state")
125 The song is entitled "Abendlied" and is found in the collection, "Der kleine Rosengarten: Volkslieder" by the Heidelyriker, Hermann Moritz Friedrich Lõns. Often classified as a Heimatdichter, in contrast to authors who used more universal, often modern topics, he is known for his texts about nature, animals, and harmonious themes, located in the Lüneburger Heide, where he lived in the countryside Lõns, a soldier in the German Army during World War I, was killed at a very early stage of the war, on 26 September 1914 near the city of Loivre in France. After 1933, the Nazis appropriated this popular author and his life, death, and literary work were manipulated for their own propaganda purposes. In his third novel, Der Wehrwolf: Eine Bauernchronik ("The Werewolf: A Peasants' Chronicle") which Lõns wrote in 1909, the main character, Harm Wulf, leads a group of peasants trained in guerilla warfare against marauding soldiers during the Thirty Years' War in order to save his village and community (Sämtliche Werke 263-467). The title is actually a play on the German word "Werwolf" which has the same meaning as the English word "werewolf". Lõns, however, spells it "Wehrwolf", which means a wolf who defends himself [cf. German "sich wehren"]). In his critical study, Mythos Lõns: Heimat, Volk und Natur im Werk von Hermann Lõns, Thomas Dupke writes that the Nazis considered this conservative author from the "Kaisereich" a forerunner to National Socialism (25) and interpreted his works accordingly. In him they had found a national identification figure which they used to advance their propaganda concerning the ideal soldier. In 1944, Himmler ordered the establishment of a Kleinkrieg-Verband ("guerrilla warfare unit")
excerpt for several reasons: first, to indicate that a relationship is developing between the Young Bricklayer and Whore 1 which will increase in significance as the play progresses. Secondly, it represents a bridge connecting the militarism from the First World War to the Second World War and leading into the GDR. The fact that the once intact society was destroyed by 1918 and the end of the First World War, Müller carefully constructs in the first scene of the drama. The inner strife of the political leaders was creating catastrophic economic and social conditions for the once affluent middle class. The SPD, which wanted to improve the working conditions for the workers and thus give them a better life but without making substantial changes in the infrastructure of society, was divided from within and so the Spartacus wing emerged, which later developed into the KPD. The leaders of this radical group, however, were interested in changing society by eradicating capitalism and the middle class in order to position the worker as the central group in society. After the KPD's leadership was obliterated by violent measures, the door was open for further future violence bearing the name "Werwolf" (Dupke 128) based on the section in Löns' novel entitled, "Die Wehrwölfe" (337-361) which appealed to the elite Nazi SS group which arrested, tortured, and killed in the name of order and the fatherland. The Nazis perverted the subject matter of the novel to suit their own violent inclinations and actions. The influence Löns' text had on Hitler can also be seen in the nickname of Hitler's headquarters in the Ukraine: "Werwolf" (Dupke 128). In order to further promote the Nazi propaganda concerning Löns for the purpose of elevating the status of the soldier, Hitler ordered his supposed remains exhumed from the soldiers' cemetery in Loivre in order to have them buried with military honors and pomp and circumstance in Germany, thus emphasizing Löns' Heldentod ("hero's death") for the fatherland (Dupke 315). The plan for the placement and commemoration of Löns' earthly remains at a special gravesite provided them with "eine arische Tradition und Identität von der Steinzeit über die Germanen bis zum faschistischen Deutschland" (Dupke 25) ("an Aryan tradition and identity from the stone-age through the Germanic tribes up to fascist Germany"). By his use of the term "stone-age", Dupke is stressing the Nazis' attempts to exaggerate the importance, superiority, and supposed longevity of the Aryan race. There were several problems which developed concerning the planned gravesite and so the supposed remains were shuffled and moved around until they finally came to rest in the Lüneburger Heide. However, it is still not certain if these are truly Löns' remains. Dupke offers a detailed account of the events concerning the burial plans and sites in his book mentioned above, pages 23ff. Fortunately, Löns' reputation survived its association and misuse by the Nazis. With its emphasis on Heimat, Löns' work enjoyed great popularity during the 1950s; for example, the film, "Grün ist die Heide," is based on his Heidelyrik (Dupke 19-20). The entire text is: "Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / Sieben Jahre mein Herz nach dir schrie, / Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / Aber du hörtest es nie. // Jedwede Nacht, jedwede Nacht, / Hat mir im Traume dein Bild zugelacht, / Kam dann der Tag, kam dann der Tag, / Wieder alleine ich lag. // Jetzt bin ich alt, jetzt bin ich alt, / Aber mein Herz ist noch immer nicht kalt, / Schläft wohl schon bald, schläft wohl schon bald, / Doch bis zuletzt es noch hallt: // Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / Sieben Jahre mein Herz nach dir schrie, / Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / Aber du hörtest es nie." Hermann Löns, Sämtliche Werke in acht Bänden, ed. Friedrich Castelle, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Hefe & Becker, 1923-1924) 322-323. ("Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / Seven Years my heart called to you, / Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / But you never heard it. // Every night, every night, /your image smiled at me in my dream, / Then came daybreak, then came daybreak, / Again I was lying alone. // Now I am old, now I am old, / But my
in the form of Nazism. In this way, the path was set for future disaster, which, after
Germany's defeat in 1945, led to its division and the formation of the FRG and the GDR. The
time element provides a connection from Germany's defeat in 1918 to the debacle at
Stalingrad in 1942, which contributed to the division of Germany and the founding of the
GDR seven years later. Finally, Müller, who, coincidentally, had to complete a Wehrwolfaus-
bildung ("werewolf training") shortly before the war ended (Tschapke Heiner Müller 11),
uses the Nibelungs and the heroic, undefeated soldier of World War I (Löns) to debunk the
essence of the German warrior: to demystify or demythologize this myth, in order to reach
the truth about this facet of German identity. Whereas Müller uses the Nibelung characters in
Stalingrad directly in scene five, in scene six he presents Löns in an indirect manner through
an intertextual element, namely the opening line from his folksong. The association is clear:
Hitler and the Nazis endorsed and spread the myth about the ideal or perfect soldier, who will
fight bravely and without complaint until his very last breath. Göring's speech with the
Nibelung reference, further advances the Nazi's glorification of the soldier and particularly,
the soldier's death. Müller recognizes the lies hidden in the myths and, therefore, presents
them in a manner which "de-glorifies" them and instead, reveals the horror behind the
realities of modern warfare.

Müller's placement of the Löns text in scene six and its associations to the mythical
soldier is a sentimental tribute to the German soldier or "Landser" who pines for his beloved.
This idea stands in direct contrast to the views of the General. Hilse's advice to him: "Sei
froh, General / Daß dich der Russe auf den Bau geschickt hat" (52) ("Be glad, General / the
Russians made you do construction work") implies that they should have shot him or sent
him to Siberia. It shows us that Hilse has understood the criminal nature of Hitler's war of
aggression; while the General's response: "Ich hab nur meine Pflicht getan als Deutscher"

heart is not yet cold, / Will go to sleep soon, will go to sleep soon, / But until the end it will echo: // Rose Marie,
Rose Marie, / Seven years my heart called to you, / Rose Marie, Rose Marie, / But you never heard it.")
"I've only done my duty as a German") tells us that he has not learned anything, not even from defeat. While Hilse accuses the General of complicity in the crimes which were perpetrated during the war of conquest in the Soviet Union, the Löns' song romanticizes the life of the soldier, thus playing into the hands of the Nazis. They liked to stress the heroic stature of the individual fighter, a naked hero who strides into battle with nothing but his trusty sword in his hand, while they knew full well that the war was going to be won by the most modern weapons of mass destruction, as exemplified by their mania for bigger and better tanks and the most modern guns and airplanes. Müller sees the contradiction in their portrayal and the reality of war. His remedy is to employ all, like the General, in constructive work for the benefit of the entire society. Petty Bourgeois 1, on the contrary, demonstrates the nationalist-reactionary forces who are still interested in undermining the GDR, when he says: "Ich sage, es gibt Krieg. Was sagst du ("I say, there will be war"). However, Petty Bourgeois 2's apathetic response: "Von mir aus" (54) ("I don't care") shows the growing indifference by the middle class concerning a subsequent war, the purpose of which would be to liberate the Germans in the GDR from their Russian oppressors.

After the Whores and the Petty Bourgeois leave the bar, the General also expresses anti-Russian sentiments and increasing German pride and nationalism: "Kann sein, manches wird anders hier demnächst / Und manche Leute haben nichts zu lachen (54) ("May be, a lot will change around here soon / And some people won't have anything to laugh about"). In addition, the impulse to safeguard what is left of the traditional German identity is expressed by another character in scene six, the Fat Bricklayer: "Der Deutsche läßt sich viel gefallen. Nicht alles" (54) ("A German can take a lot. But not everything"). His words reflect a sense of the subtle renewal of German patriotism which had been suppressed since Germany's defeat in 1945. The tone also implies a sense of impending action against the influence and role of Soviet Russia in the GDR and is thus a foreboding of the upcoming strike. This
implication is further strengthened by the Drunk's dialogue: "Der Krieg ist nicht zu Ende. Das fängt erst an. / Mich kratzt es nicht mehr. Ich kenn den Arsch der Welt / Von innen wie von außen." (55) ("The war isn't over. It's just beginning. It doesn't affect me anymore. I know the arse of the world both inside and out"). His use of the word "war" underscores that a future action by the Germans will be of a violent nature which not only corresponds to Müller's continuous past portrayal of the German tradition of violence, but also to the use of force by the GDR leadership such as in suppressing the forthcoming uprising using Soviet tanks. The importance of the dialogue is underscored by the scene's setting at a tavern, which is the topic of the next section.

e) The "Loaferproletariat" and "Pub Environment"

The tavern location is an important element relating to German identity in this play and is the focus of this section. Throughout Germania Tod, Müller depicts various characters from the societal class known as the Lumpenproletariat ("loaferproletariat"). Closely associated with this group are the Kneipe ("pub") and the Kneipenmilieu ("pub environment"), which reflect important components of post-World War II German identity. In the words of Christian Graf von Krockow in his essay, "Das Dilemma der deutschen Identität -- Historische und aktuelle Perspektiven", a familiar Milieu provides: "Sicherheit, Lebensperspektive, kurz Identität" ("security, perspective on life, in short: identity") (92). The

---

126 The expression, "arse of the world", which is used here as a reference to Stalingrad, is also found in Wolf Biermann's satirical text, Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen. Biermann's text, modelled after Heine's, is a modern-day satire with its own references to the deutsche Misere. Biermann, referred to as the "Troubadour der deutschen Zerrissenheit" ("troubadour of German inner strife") (Süddeutsche Zeitung 2 October 1987), is famous for his song texts which strongly reflect this facet of German identity. Although his work was first published in 1972, he started writing the text in 1965 and it is possible that Müller had heard this term from Biermann when he completed Germania Tod in 1971. On the other hand, it is a popular, if obscene expression often used by the common people.

127 In 1919, Nikolay Bukharin (1888-1938) defines the term Lumpenproletariat in his book, The ABC of Communism, which he co-authored with Evgeny A. Preobrazhensky (1888-1937). They write: The industrial reserve army gives examples of complete brutalisation, destitution, starvation, death, and even crime. Those who are out of work for years, gradually take to drink, become loafers, tramps, beggars, etc. In great cities -- London, New York, Hamburg, Berlin, Paris -- there are whole quarters inhabited by these out-of-works. [. . .] Here, we no longer find the proletariat, but a new stratum, consisting of those who have forgotten how to work. This product of capitalist society is known as the lumpenproletariat (loaferproletariat) (56).
various constellations portrayed in scene six reflect interaction among the different groups of citizens. The "Kneipe" thus represents the pulse of society in Müller's view and was the source for much of his material relating to social and political problems and opinions. He spent much of his time in these establishments after the war, even sleeping there on numerous occasions, when he had nowhere else to go, as he admits in his autobiography. Taverns or pubs were Müller's means of "exploring the inner secrets of society through observing and partaking in its innermost everyday rituals" as Anke Gleber writes in, "Drama and War without Battle: Space and History in Heiner Müller's Works" (131). He felt very comfortable in this environment, and in addition to offering him a sense of security, it obviously provided him with a sense of identity, as it most likely did for other Germans following the war, who were feeling bewildered and disoriented. The question arises as to what kind of people frequent a bar, or did after the war and during the early years of the GDR. Certainly not the Großbürgertum, the bourgeoisie, rather, as we have seen, primarily the Proletariat and the Lumpenproletariat, the lower levels of society who comprise Müller's Kneipenmilieu including: prostitutes, drunks, workers, bricklayers, and even the petty bourgeois. These characters can also be described as "die kleinen Leute" or the "Mann auf der Straße".

128 "Die beste Informationsquelle über die Lage in Deutschland waren für mich immer die Kneipen. Du lernst eine Stadt von innen kennen und nicht touristisch. Kneipe ist das Gegenteil von Tourismus (88). ("For me the bars were always the best source of information about the situation in Germany. You learn about a city inside and out and not the tourist information. Bar is the opposite of tourism.") He also writes: "Ich bin damals zwangsläufig viel in Kneipen gegangen. Ich hatte höchstens eine Couch zum Übernachten, nicht mehr, und war sehr auf Kneipen angewiesen" (89). ("In those days I necessarily went into bars a lot. At the most I had a couch to sleep on during the night, no more, and was always dependent on bars.")

129 Georg Weippert explains two important terms in his lecture given on 5 May 1952 in Berlin entitled, "Die Ideologien der „kleinen Leute" und des „Mannes auf der Strasse" ("The ideologies of the "little people" and of the "man on the street"). He makes a distinction between the societal "Schichtungswerferungen" ("warping of layers") in the period after 1918 and the results that inflation, the world economic crisis, national socialism, the Second World War, and Germany's collapse have had on the various echelons of German society and its composition by 1952 (12). His four groupings from 1914 consist of: 1) workers and poverty-stricken; 2) Petty Bourgeois; 3) middle class and; 4) those holding authorized power. In comparison, by 1952 the situation has changed, and he presents six different categories based on weakest to strongest in terms of power and importance: 1) the poverty-stricken including refugees, the old and the sick; 2) peasant farmers, artisans, and retailers; 3) intellectuals with no steady income; 4) workers, employees with weak market positioning; 5) entrepreneurs, farmers, artisans, and retailers with strong market positioning and; 6) those holding authorized power ("Verfügungsmächtigen") (12-13). Similar to Bukharin, Weippert distinguishes between weaker and
Generally speaking, pubs were the meeting point of the proletariat or, as Gleber terms them, "proletarian public houses" (132), which were considered dangerous by the SED leadership, who tried to transform them into "controllable bourgeois cafés" (132). Müller recognized that taverns served as potential danger spots where discontented workers could meet and express their dissatisfaction and perhaps forge revolutionary plans: "[. . .] Es gehörte auch zur Politik in der DDR, diese Milieus auszurotten (KoS 88-89). For Müller, the "real" German could be found in the local tavern, or what he calls the "belly of Berlin" and the patrons are the source for some of his realistic characters and their dialogue.

The character of the "Drunk", for example, and his dialogue in scene six is based on an actual person whom Müller met in the Café Nord and who shared his experience of Stalingrad with him. By including this particular reminiscence, Müller is providing a connection from the catastrophic Hitler-era to the GDR's formative years which are still full of danger and hardships for the general population. Once a German soldier and one of Hitler's victims at Stalingrad, the former soldier is now a drunk, who cannot escape the past: his life has been ruined by his personal experience during the Nazi era. The Drunk expresses the stronger artisans, farmers, and retailers. Weippert considers the "kleine Leute" and the "Mann auf der Straße as members of the first four categories.

130 ("[. . .] It was part of the politics in the GDR to stamp out this environment.")

131 Müller writes: "Das war sehr wichtig für mich. Man lernt ja in Kneipen ungeheur viele Leute ganz anders kennen. Das war der Bauch von Berlin. Später ging ich oft ins Café Nord. [. . .] Das war wirklich eine gute Zeit, viel Arbeitsmaterial" (89-90). ("That was very important for me. You get to know a great many people in a whole different way. That was the belly of Berlin. Later I often went to Café North. [. . .] That was a really good time, a lot of workable subject matter.")

132 Müller writes: "Meine Kenntnisse über das Arbeitermilieu, über die Anfänge der DDR-Industrie, stammten aus der Zeit in Frankenberg, wo ich Drehbänke entrostet hatte. Und ich hatte keine Schwierigkeiten, Arbeiter zu beschreiben. Ich kannte ihre Sprache. Das war die Welt, in der ich aufgewachsen war" (KoS 143). ("My knowledge about the workers' environment, about the beginnings of the GDR-industry, stemmed from the time in Frankenberg, where I removed rust from lathes. And I had no problems describing workers.")

133 Zum Beispiel hörte ich dort die Geschichte von dem Stalingrad-Kämpfer, die ziemlich wörtlich in "Germania" steht. Ich habe nichts dazugerührt. Der Stalingrad-Kämpfer kam besoffen herein, der Wirt gab ihm nichts mehr, und er setzte sich zu mir. Ich habe dann etwas bestellt, und er fing an, diese Geschichte zu erzählen. Auch die mit dem Staatssekretär, den er später in der DDR wiedergetroffen hatte, ist von ihm. Der Staatssekretär hatte bei ihm in Stalingrad gedient und konnte immer noch robben" (90). ("For example, I heard the story there from the Stalingrad-fighter, which is depicted pretty much word for word. I didn't add anything to it. The Stalingrad-fighter came in drunk, the barkeeper didn't give him anymore, and he sat down next to me. I then ordered something, and he began to tell this story. Also the one with the state secretary, whom..."
cannibalism theme: "Wir hätten Gras gefressen, aber ich hab / Kein Gras gesehn. Wir haben keinen Knochen / Gefragt, ob er vom Pferd ist oder ICH / HATT EINEN KAMERADEN" (55) ("We would have eaten grass. But I did not / See any grass. We didn't ask the bone / If it came from a horse, or I / ONCE HAD A COMRADE"). The phrase, "ICH HATT EINEN KAMERADEN", also found in Die Schlacht, is Müller's euphemism for cannibalism.  
He transforms this traditional song so that it no longer reflects camaraderie and the positive connection to the homeland, rather in Müller's hands it represents an act of desperation by unfortunate soldiers or desperate civilians, namely: cannibalism. The topic of cannibalism is
also touched upon at the beginning of the scene, when the discussion turns to Fritz Haarmann, a famous serial killer of the 1920s, celebrated in print and song, who sold his victims' body parts to meat shops. Petty Bourgeois 2, referring to Haarmann's unsavory practices and the current high meat prices, complains: "Bei dem Fleischpreis ist sowas schon beinah Notwehr" (52) ("With the price of meat, I'd nearly call it self-defense"). Petty Bourgeois 1 answers: "Ich will nicht wissen, wen alles ich schon gegessen hab" (52) ("I don't want to know whom I've already eaten") which is a none too subtle reference to the mixing of different kinds of meat in sausages and minced meat during times of war and meat shortages. Schmitt's reference to the "Stalingrad-Nibelung- Monster" which has survived in the GDR (97) reflects the worst elements of the war and the desperate fight for survival which affects even the civilian population. There is a significant difference, however, between the Stalingrad soldiers and the Nibelungen in the previous scene ("Tribute to Stalin 1") who have been trained to kill, and a convicted murderer of innocent victims who was eventually executed for his bestial crimes. The Petty Bourgeois and Whores of the GDR depicted here cannot be compared to trained soldiers and a psychopathic killer who committed murder for his own perverted pleasure as well as for financial gain. Their assumption that they may have been "victims of cannibalism" by unknowingly eating human meat does not mean that they would be capable of tearing off someone's arm and proceed to eat it, as Soldier 1 did to the Young Soldier in scene five, or that they would willingly murder someone in order to consume the meat or to earn money by selling the body parts. In both instances, however, at the time of Haarmann's arrest and execution and later in 1953, the characters' fear of and aversion to the memory of Haarmann's actions, despite being hungry and desperate, are disgusted by such reprehensible and heinous behavior. Müller demonstrates that the civilians of the GDR, specifically the Petty Bourgeois and the Lumpenproletariat, contrary to Schmitt's
assertion, are not willing to resort to "Menschenfresserei" ("cannibalistic gluttony") (97).

Petty Bourgeois 2's comment: "Vielleicht ein Denkmal" (52) ("Maybe it's a monument") implies that murder and cannibalism are monuments to the war which are still remembered rather fondly by the reactionary bourgeois elements in the GDR who celebrate the death of Stalin and even envision a new war -- on the side of the Western powers -- against the Soviet Union. This reference to a monument is directed at the character called "Schädelverkäufer", who is the topic of the following section.

f) **The Skull Salesman**

By associating the serial killer Haarmann with the mysterious figure in the pub, Müller has successfully set the mood for the forthcoming macabre character. While pubs or taverns were not a type of recognized or acceptable locale for the middle class or educated members of society, such as academics, professors, or historians, in scene six, however, this singular character, a former historian, emerges from the shadows of the tavern and takes center stage for a few brief moments. The significance for German identity of this short but effective appearance by the character appropriately named the "Schädelverkäufer" ("Skull Salesman") and situated at the heart of the play, must not be underestimated. The connection made in the pub, the traditional proletarian meeting place, between the Skull Salesman and Haarmann serves the added function of depicting a historical parallel between the similar economic and social situations found in the first post-World War period and post-World War II GDR. Although Müller maintains that the Salesman is essentially a fictional character, his origins can be traced to a tale told to him.136 Because he sells his ware, unusual though it is,

---

consisting of skulls and skeletons, he earns a living by exploiting the dead: whereas before he interpreted history, he now sells it, or as Jaeger explains he: "literally sells the past that he himself has dug out" (48). Barnett writes that his "profession" is grotesque (175), but his appearance must be equally ghastly or grotesque, based on the horrified reactions of the others in the pub. Upon spotting the character Whore 2 says: "Wer ist das Gespenst. Huh!" ("Who is the ghost. Ooh!") and Whore 1, perceiving no response from the figure, treats it as a thing by using the neuter form: "Es hat sich nicht bewegt" (52) ("It hasn't moved"). The characters then ignore this grotesque individual until he approaches the young couple, the Young Bricklayer and the Whore, with an offer to sell them a specimen of a human skull: "ein kleines Souvenir" as: "Ein Memento mori für das neue Heim" (56) ("a small souvenir"; "A memento mori for your new home"). By using this familiar phrase from the Middle Ages, he intentionally conveys a reminder of man's vulnerability and mortality which stands in direct opposition to the new beginning characterized by the GDR. Thus the Salesman who juxtaposes: "das >>Memento mori<< gegen den Geschichtsoptimismus" as Schulz describes it ("Something is Rotten" 480), reflects the author's negative and apocalyptic view of the future. The couple refuses his offer, however, since they are not interested in this grisly reminder of history and death, rather look forward to a positive future in a communist state. Their experience is in direct contrast to the opening scene in which the children, symbolizing the working class, are exploited by the Baker and the Man Who Distributes Signs. This young couple represents the new communist generation in the GDR and, as Frank Raddatz

In creating the character of the Salesman, Müller may have been thinking of Rolf Hochhuth's play, Der Stellvertreter, and the author's description of Hirt: "(Der historischer Hirt war ein abstoßender Zyniker, Geierkopf mit zerschossener Kinnlade)" (28). ("The historical Hirt was a repulsive cynic, vulture's head with a jaw-bone riddled with bullet holes.") Kater also refers to Hochhuth's description of Hirt (246).
writes: "die Emanzipation der Arbeiterklasse in der DDR" ("the emancipation of the working class in the GDR") (73) who have learned from the proletarian mistakes of the past.

Nevertheless, the Salesman, with his unsavory appearance and ghastly wares, evokes only disgust and fear in the young couple and the other characters present in the shadowy pub. Viewed under the bright light of literary interpretation, however, and because he exposes history in its most basic form, namely: the earthly remains of Germany's ancestors, I consider the Salesman to be a personification of Müller's self-declared obsession with German history. In this character Müller combines the three most important elements of his personal philosophy which pervade most of his literary work: exposing the past so there is nothing left to hide, accentuating the important role of the dead among the living, and expressing an apocalyptic view of the future based on the past. Holding an eighteenth century skull in his hand, the Salesman offers only the realization that, based on biological and historical fact, death awaits everyone in the end. Jaeger explains that: "As someone who digs out the dead, he becomes the bridge between the present and the past [. . .]" and he: "thus becomes the link between the memory of the past to the present [. . .]" (48). The dead may live on in memory by those who inhabit the present and in this way they establish a connection to the present and the future.

The character refers to Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz (1646-1716), a German philosopher, physicist, mathematician, and one of the great minds of his day, and his "Essais de Théodicée" or "theodicy" published in 1710. A theodicy, a term coined by Leibniz and taken from the Greek meaning "justice of God", is a theological argument designed to justify or prove that despite the great measure of evil and suffering in the world, God does indeed exist. In his essay, Leibniz explores the pertinent questions relating to God, good, evil, and the world, claiming that the existing world, with its inherent measure of evil, is, nevertheless,

138 ("memento mori" against historical optimism)
the best of all possible worlds.\(^\text{139}\) Given the subject matter and close proximity to Hitler, the Third Reich, and the atrocities of this period, along with the Salesman's expression of disappointment concerning ideologies and his forthcoming dialogue which focuses on primarily negative historical aspects, it can be surmised that the author is expressing scepticism regarding Leibniz's positive world perspective.

During the course of his conversation, the Salesman refers to various literary works which strongly symbolize the element of death, such as Martin Luther's German translation of the Latin song text, "Mitten wir im Leben sind vom Tod umfangen" (56) ("in the middle of life we are surrounded by death") from 1524. The song expresses the theme of the awareness that death is always present and can strike at any moment. Originally from a church hymn dating back to the Middle Ages, as Hellmut Rosenfeld explains in *Der mittelalterliche Totentanz*, the line: "*Media vita in morte sumus*" reflects the Christian belief that death is a natural part of the life process and although it represents the last step of earthly life, it is the first step towards attaining "eternal life" (10). The motive behind this "memento mori" theme during the Middle Ages and later in Luther's day is that the individual, by being reminded that death may come unexpectedly, should lead a good life so that he is prepared for his afterlife. Although the Salesman is a former historian, he claims that his new job of "digging up the dead" has afforded him a new perspective about life and death: a theological perspective, which helps to explain his use of Biblical and Christian allusions. Not only in this scene, but throughout the play, Müller uses traditional religious themes and symbols to express communist ideas and ideals: he thus parallels religion with communism, a type of Marxist religion or substitute for religion. The Salesman borrows the line: "GRAUT LIEBCHEN AUCH VOR TOTEN" (57) ("DOES DARLING ALSO SHUDDER AT THE

---

\(^{139}\) See Chapter Two, section II.6.1.
DEAD") from Gottfried August Bürger's (1747-1794) famous "Storm and Stress" ballad, "Lenore" (1773). This particular line emphasizes the horror of death faced by a young woman who has lost her beloved, Wilhelm ("William"), presumably killed while fighting in one of Frederick's wars. While she lies in bed dying from a broken heart, in her feverish hallucination she believes it is her own William who has come to claim her as his bride, when it is really a grim personification of death who is escorting her to her own death. In addition, the line: "UNDER BLUOMEN UNDE GRAS" (57) "(under flowers under grass") is taken from a love song by the most famous Minnesänger, Walther von der Vogelweide (c.1170-c.1230) entitled, "Under der Linden", in which a young girl tells her tale of a forbidden romantic encounter with a knight who, given his profession, constantly faces death. By

140 This essential idea asserted by Leibniz was subsequently but exquisitely and unforgettable satirized in Candide (1759) by Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet de Voltaire) (1694-1778), the most famous French author of the eighteenth century Age of Enlightenment, and, coincidentally, much admired by Frederick the Great.

141 This line is found in stanzas twenty, twenty-four, and twenty-seven of the ballad, "Lenore" which are included below: 20: "Zur rechten und zur linken Hand, / Vorbei vor ihren Blicken, / Wie flogen Anger, Heid und Land! / Wie donnerten die Brücken! - / »Graut Liebchen auch? - - Der Mond scheint hell! / Hurra! die Toten reiten schnell! / Graut Liebchen auch vor Toten?« - / »Ach nein! - - Doch laß die Toten! - //"; 24: "Wie flogen rechts, wie flogen links, / Gebirge, Bäum und Hecken! / Wie flogen links, und rechts, und links / Die Dörfer, Städte und Flecken! - / »Graut Liebchen auch? - - Der Mond scheint hell! / Hurra! die Toten reiten schnell! / Graut Liebchen auch vor Toten?« - / »Ach! Laß sie ruhn, die Toten!« - //; 27: "Wie flog, was rund der Mond beschien, / Wie flogen in die Ferne! / Wie flogen oben über hin / Der Himmel und die Sterne! - / »Graut Liebchen auch? - - Der Mond scheint hell! / Hurra! die Toten reiten schnell! / Graut Liebchen auch vor Toten?« - / »O weh! Laß ruhn die Toten!« - //"

Gottfried August Bürger: Sämtliche Werke. Eds. Günter Häntzschel and Hiltrud Häntzschel (Munich: Carl Hanser, 1987) 178-188. ("To the right and to the left hand, / Past your glances, / Here to the right and there to the left / Flow fields of corn and clover, / And the bridges flashed by to the dazzled eye, / As rattling they thundered over, / "What ails my love? the moon shines bright: / Bravely the dead men ride through the night. / Is my love afraid of the quiet dead?" / "Ah! no; -- let them sleep in their dusty bed!""); How flew to the right, how flew to the left, / Trees, mountains in the race! / How to the left, and the right and the left, / Flew the town and market-place! / "What ails my love? the moon shines bright: / Bravely the dead men ride thro' the night. / Is my love afraid of the quiet dead?" / "Ah, let them alone in their dusty bed!" // How flew the moon high overhead, / In the wild race madly driven! / In out and how, the stars danced about, / And reeled o'er the flashing heaven! / "What ails my love? the moon shines bright: / Bravely the dead men ride thro' the night. / Is my love afraid of the quiet dead?" / "Alas! let them sleep in their narrow bed." /") The English translation is by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, The Kudzu Monthly 10, vol. 2 (October 2002).

combining such intertextual quotes with his description of himself as a "Hinterbliebener" ("survivor") of the dead, the Salesman demonstrates: "im Angesicht des jungen Paares auf den Zusammenhang von Liebe und Tod" (Mieth 56). Jaeger, however, sees no valuable associations in his or other characters' use of quotes: "When they use quotes, the subjects only reproduce utterances of the past. This language becomes merely reproduction; it is used artificially" (51). On the contrary, although their language cannot be considered original dialogue, Müller's use of intertextual references adds new dimensions to the overall text and the readers' interpretations of the characters. In the case of the Salesman and based on these intertextual associations pertaining to death, he can be considered an allegorical figure for the "memento mori" theme, and the skull as representative of a "Symbol der Vergänglichkeit" ("symbol of transience") as Matzkowski maintains (52). By using these historical literary texts as intertextual references in this scene, Müller underscores the long tradition in German literature of portraying death in various forms of literature and thus establishes it as a component of German identity. At the same time, he also demonstrates the importance of differing literary forms, such as the ballad and the folksong, originating with the mediaeval minnesingers, which have remained integral elements of the German literary tradition well into modern times. For example, Brecht also used the ballad form for his "Legende vom toten Soldaten" ("Legend of the dead soldier") in 1917 and Biermann is famous for his folksongs. Thus in this scene and throughout _Germania Tod_, Müller combines historical and literary associations from Germany's past -- thereby literally allowing the past to speak for itself -- in order to demonstrate German identity in the post-World War II era of the GDR.

---

Prosa, 1972, Ed. Friedrich Maurer, Uni-Taschenbücher 167 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1995) 122-125. ("1. Under the linden tree, on the heath, / where our bed could be found, / there you could find nicely collected, both flowers and grass, / before the forest in a valley, / tralaladee, / the nightingale sang sweetly.// 2. There I was greeted, holy lady, / so that it will keep me forever happy, / did he kiss me? about a thousand times! / tralaladee, / see how red my mouth is!/ // 3. There he had prepared so splendidly / a resting place made of flowers. / It would still be heartily laughed about, / if someone were to come across that place. / From the roses one can still / tralaladee, / see the spot where my head rested. // 4. That he lay there with me, if anyone knew, / (God forbid that!), I would be so ashamed. / What he did with me there, no one shall ever know, / except for him and me, / and a little bird, / tralaladee, / which can keep quiet about it.")
At the close of this scene, the Salesman recites a short poem which he attributes to Vergil, the Roman poet most famous for having written the Roman national epic, *Aeneas*. The *Eclogae* by Publius Vergilius Maro (70-19 B.C.) are "Hirtengedichte" or "Bucolica" ("shepherds' poems" or "pastorals") written in imitation of Theokrit (c. 310 B.C. - 250 B.C.), the original Greek author of bucolic pastorals. The most famous of Vergil's ten eclogues, poems in which shepherds converse, is the fourth one, which includes references to persons and events from the Roman past. It is often referred to as the "messianic" eclogue, because...
Vergil describes the anticipation of a "golden era" due to occur in connection with the birth of a baby boy. Müllers's text is not taken verbatim from Vergil's "Fourth Eclogue", rather he has borrowed some of Vergil's basic imagery to reflect his own views about the anticipated communist utopia. Müllers's use of a modified Vergil quote and its abrupt end by the
barkeeper's crude interruption that the bar is closing implies a lack of seriousness or credibility of the Salesman's true belief in the idea he is quoting. The Salesman had been a true believer in National Socialism and the Third Reich, but, after its criminal actions and ultimate defeat, realizes it was merely: "Ein Fehler in der Periodisierung, das Tausendjährige Reich" (57) ("A mistake of periodization, the thousand years' empire"), and has become disillusioned or "immun gegen das Leichengift der zeitlichen Verheißung" (57) ("immune to the ptomaine of the temporal Promised Land"). Literally, in his job moving corpses, he has become immune to the poisonous bacteria emitted by the decaying bodies, because he numbs himself with alcohol. In actuality, however, given his disappointment with the Third Reich, combined with his musings about the religious emphasis of Leibniz' writings, he no longer has any faith in the validity of political visions or ideals. He concludes that: "Der Materialismus ist ein Irrtum, glauben Sie mir (56) ("Materialism is a mistake, believe me"). By denying the theory of historical materialism, with its premise that all of human history is based on the existence of individual human beings and their continuous survival through successive generations, the Salesman is negating the very existence of human beings.

Because he emphasizes death and views the human struggle for survival as futile, he offers no hope for the future. Ironically, his own personal fight for survival reflects the class struggle present throughout history, since, in Marxist jargon, the history of class struggle is based on economic conditions. Thus through the words of the Salesman: "[. . .] hat Müller ein
utopiekritisches Moment in das utopische Denken selbst eingetragen", according to Eke (Heiner Müller 180). By questioning the path of human history and casting a shadow of doubt over its future, the Salesman questions the utopia itself and, at the same time, negates any belief in the possibility that a communist utopia could still be a viable design in the world order. Klussmann, however, views the Salesman's musings and particularly his modified Vergil quote in a positive manner: 

"[. . .] so ist auch dieser kleine Abschnitt über das goldene Zeitalter im Munde des Autors eine neue Verkündigung der Hoffnung auf zukünftige Veränderungen in der Zeit und in Deutschland" (170). Based on this character's pessimistic observations, remarks, and historical as well as literary references, Klussmann's interpretation that he expresses a sense of hope for the future is unfounded. On the contrary, the Salesman incorporates a general sense of "Geschichtspessimismus", which thematically corresponds with the overall tone of this Geschichtsdrama.

On a broad scale, the Skull Salesman represents the downfall of the middle class in society. He seems to no longer believe in any political dreams based on his own personal history which has resulted in his being forced to work in his current occupation: digging up corpses and relocating them. Despite his prior profession as an educated man, there is nothing left for him now but his own survival: food and drink. The latter seems to be especially important to him and given that he spends much of his free time in a bar, it may well be that he has become an alcoholic. Thus he has reached the lowest possible abyss of the middle class existence. Given his comment about the thousand year empire being a historical mistake, it is most likely that he is a former Nazi, and perhaps even participated in unsavory activities which helped lead to his own downfall. The concept of a "Skull Salesman" calls to mind the infamous and unscrupulous Nazi scientists who misused their position and power to

148 ("[. . .] Müller brought an utopian-critical impetus into the utopian thought itself")
149 ("Thus this short paragraph about the golden times is also in the words of the author a new proclamation of hope for future changes in time and in Germany.")
attain skulls and skeletons from concentration camp victims in order to study them. There was an organization devoted to such studies known as, "Die Forschungs- und Lehrgemeinschaft, "Das Ahnenerbe" ("The research and learning institution, The ancestral heritage"), created by Heinrich Himmler and Dr. Herman Wirth (1885-1981) on 1 July 1935, with the main intent of proving the superiority of the German or Aryan race. In Das Ahnenerbe der SS 1935-1945, Michael H. Kater explains the origins of this organization and describes it as Himmler's attempt: "[. . .] die politische Macht der SS auch auf den Bereich des geistigen Lebens auszudehnen" (7).

Equipped with its own newspaper entitled, Germanien (Kater 46), the professionals associated with this organization enacted unscrupulous and immoral deeds. The leading scientists of this organization, Dr. August Hirt and Dr. Bruno Beger, conducted inhumane experiments on concentration camp prisoners, including exposing them to freezing temperatures, high air pressure, and poison, and afterwards collected and studied their skulls. Considering that all of these atrocities were performed in the name of science, it is no wonder that the former historian Salesman has become disillusioned with National Socialism.

The Salesman is present in the bar throughout the entire scene, observing human behavior and waiting for the right moment to approach possible customers because he needs money to purchase alcohol. His language reflects an educated person, as does his use of religious imagery to express his historical and political ideas. As a former historian and educated member of German society, he is well acquainted with the intimate details of the course of historical progress which makes him an expert and his opinions on this subject valuable. However, given that he has been reduced to being a "gravedigger" of sorts, he is no longer a respectable member of society and thus represents a victim from the middle class, which was also victimized and destroyed by Hitler. The result in his own life has been that he

---

150 ("[. . .] to extend the political power of the SS to the intellectual area of life")
has given up on himself, has resigned himself to his unfortunate fate and, as he himself states, the only way to survive his new job is with alcohol consumption. As a member of the Nazi culture, the Nazi defeat took him down with it, as it did the rest of the German middle class. His reduced personal circumstances reflect the fall of the bourgeoisie as a result of Hitler's actions. Even though Stalin won the battle of Stalingrad and defeated Germany and Hitler, his death four years after the establishment of the GDR has not improved the situation in society for the average citizen. Müller's choice of situating this scene in a "Kneipe" demonstrates that not only prostitutes and drunks congregate here, rather the petty bourgeois and the bourgeois who have fallen, as exemplified by the Salesman. Nothing has changed under Stalin's rule, the conqueror of Stalingrad, of Hitler and the Nazis: German Communism in the GDR has been unable to create the new or better man which it had promised. In addition, the June strike of 1953 further shows the failure of German Communism in the GDR and the lack of positive change for the workers specifically and for society in general. Those who thought that the situation might improve with Stalin's death are equally proved wrong as the Soviet tanks are called in at the request of the GDR leadership. The titles of these two scenes are significant because they imply derision, sarcasm or even irony: Stalingrad is Hitler's long-standing legacy and the struggle for survival is Stalin's legacy: important themes which Müller also explores later in Germania 3. The economic and social situations in the GDR, which its citizens initially viewed as hopeful: after Stalin, things can only get better, proved to be an illusion only four years later. The Salesman, therefore, is primarily an instrument for Müller to lament the diminished hope of the communist utopia which will never become a reality, or, as Eke writes: "die nicht eingelöste Utopie des Goldenen Zeitalters" (Heiner Müller 179).\(^\text{151}\) The hope that once existed after Stalin emerged as the victor at Stalingrad has been replaced by a sense of resignation.

\(^{151}\) ("the unredeemed utopia of the golden era")
Müller's text, in which he substitutes the "new generation" for the "baby boy" in the original Vergil text, refers to the separation of Germany into the FRG and the GDR. The Salesman cynically refers to the prediction of the much-anticipated arrival of a golden era brought in on wings from heaven by a new generation, when the land will be prosperous and fruitful, and it will no longer be necessary to guard the city with walls, possibly a subtle reference to the Berlin Wall. The two lines immediately preceding this modified Vergil quote reflect his cynical viewpoint: "Das goldene Zeitalter liegt hinter uns. Jesus ist die Nachgeburt der Toten" (57) ("The Golden Era lies behind us. Jesus is the afterbirth of the dead").

Considered by Christians to be the savior of the human race and the hope for its future, the name Jesus is used here to represent the hopelessness of the dead, and his significance as a savior is belittled and rendered powerless. The use of his name is a continuation of Müller's appropriation of religious metaphors throughout the play. Müller's mention of "Jesus" in connection with the term "das goldene Zeitalter" also suggests a reference to the idea of angels who were used as messengers to announce the coming of the savior or Messiah and Benjamin's angel of history, who yearns for a return to the allegorical "goldenes Zeitalter" which is no longer possible because it exists only in the past.152 This interpretation is confirmed by Raddatz, who writes that the Salesman is a representative of the conservative Geschichtsphilosophie, which does not view progress as a possibility of utopia, because utopia, or the golden era, has already existed and cannot return (93): the collapse of the "Tausendjährige Reich" after only twelve years. In this sense, and considering that Müller was strongly influenced by the writings of the historian Benjamin, the assertion by Heinz-Dieter Weber in his essay, "Heiner Müllers Geschichtsdrama -- die Beendigung einer literarischen Gattung" that: "Im Stück selbst tritt Walter Benjamin als Schädelverkäufer auf"

152 See Chapter One, Section I.3.
(56), becomes credible. Schmitt sees in the Salesman or "Geschichtswissenschaftler" ("scholar of history") (101), as he refers to him, a "Vertreter des Todes" ("representative of death"), who embodies the violence and brutality of the German past but will not do anything to stop the continuation of brutality and inhumanity, which must first be overcome for the new golden era to be realized (102). Schmitt's assumption that the Salesman should be able to act against the brutality of the past because he was once a historian is based on a false premise: just as Benjamin's angel of history is not a participant of history, merely a helpless observer, so too the historian is not capable of changing past events or of influencing the future. The historian may try and warn his own and future generations, as Tacitus warned the Romans concerning the Germanic tribes, but that is the extent and limit of his power. Although the Salesman tries to profit from the dead by selling specimens of skulls and complete skeletons, he is in no way an active force in the course or progress of history. It is the responsibility of the new generation of German Communists, represented by the Young Bricklayer and the Girl, to enact such positive changes in the GDR. This glimmer of hope, in terms of a better society, depends on the members of this new society in the coming era, the German Communists of the GDR. Before this utopia can be established, however, the Germans must first come to terms with their past and discover their new identity. This discovery is also dependent on another factor: the Germans' ability to get along with one another. Before they can move forward with their new identity, therefore, they need to make peace with their past by learning to cooperate with each other. The following section explores the historical roots of the Germans' bitter internal rivalries which have harmed German identity in the past and continue to threaten its present and future.

(bottom of page)

153 ("In the play itself Walter Benjamin appears as [the] Skull Salesman.")
IV.1.3 The Germans and Their Political Ideologies

a) Flavus and Arminius

Müller's search for German identity has taken him back to the earliest Germans, die Germanen. Scene nine, "Die Brüder 1" ("The Brothers 1"), consists of a passage taken from Germania, found in the Annales (A.D. 112-120) ("Annals") by the Roman historian Tacitus. Müller uses the exact excerpt from Tacitus' passage about the two Germanic brothers, Arminius and Flavus and their confrontation from the year A.D. 16, most likely taken from the German translation by Professor Dr. Karl Ludwig Roth from the mid-nineteenth century since his text is identical to Roth's translation. Müller enjoyed reading the works of Tacitus: "[. . .] Ich habe sehr früh Tacitus gelesen, das ist für mich eine ständige Lektüre, ich lese immer wieder Tacitus" ("Ich schulde der Welt einen Toten" 19). The passage concerning the two brothers must have impressed him early on because he discusses the theme of conflict between brothers and its long history in Germany in 1982:

154 The term Germanen represents the very essence of the German people and the German nation that existed as the Germanic tribes and about whom Tacitus (c. AD 55-116) wrote in the first century A.D. in his report entitled, Germania, which is an ethnographic study of central Europe, and particularly the Germanic tribes. These people of antiquity did not consider themselves to be a single ethnic group even though they were classified in one group through ignorance or for the sake of convenience by Tacitus, according to J.B. Rives, trans. Tacitus: Germania. Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1999 (11). Further, there is "no evidence that the Germanic-speaking peoples of antiquity had a common name for themselves or adhered to a common historical tradition" (Rives 11). However, according to Rives, Renaissance scholars chose to interpret the Germanen as the "ancestors of the modern deutsch-speaking peoples and used the classical texts for the "promotion of a German national identity (70). In addition, scholars from the nineteenth century onwards built upon incorrect information to formulate and expound their own theories and thus "the tendency developed to identify the ancient Germani as simply the deutsche Volk in an earlier time" (Rives 3). Since there was no substantiated unified group of Germans as far back as the first century and well into the medieval period upon which later generations could build, this situation is partly to blame for the lack of a solid German identity in later periods and the modern period as well. The claim of being a unified group from antiquity was not valid, rather it was based on a false tradition. In other words, it was an attempt to unify various regions and principalities which did not however share common traditions for primarily political reasons. The Nazis also employed this technique and reached back to the roots of Germany to the "Germanen" in order to extoll the traits and virtues of the Aryan race. Müller used these supposed origins of the German race for the opposite purpose as the Nazis: namely to demonstrate that the tendency of division between brothers had existed for centuries.

155 Although no exact source material or written statement by Müller has been found, Roth's translation is the most likely since it is an exact match to Müller's version in Germania Tod. Schmitt also credits Roth as the source of this passage (111).

156 ("[. . .] I read Tacitus very early, that is continuous reading material for me, I read Tacitus again and again.")

His interest in the theme of brothers at odds with each other is based on the political circumstances he experienced during his lifetime and the damage and destruction caused by ideological differences. The situation of the first century among the Germanic tribes mirrors the continuous divisions and rivalries occurring during modern times. The theme of a divided nation and brother competing against brother is also found in his text, Der Horatier. In his essay, "The Horatian: Building the Better Lehrstück", Jonathan Kalb also refers to Müller's interest in this legend which he believes reflects: "his lifelong artistic fixation on the divided Germany and the splitting of the Communist left after 1919, later seen in the repeated theme of warring brothers" (163). Müller's choice of text for this scene provides a direct and concrete source for the Germans' internal strife.

The section by Tacitus referring to the Germanen has played an important role for the Germans and their sense of national identity since its rediscovery during the period of Humanism in the early sixteenth century. It has served to stimulate "das Nachdenken über Deutschland" and to awaken or strengthen "das nationale Selbstbewußtsein der Deutschen"
Müller was following a tradition in German literature by demonstrating that the differences in ideology have an extensive history. Flavus is associated with the Romans and Arminius with the Cherusker, but Müller offers no specific clues as to which brother represents which modern nation (Lotringer *Germania* 23).

Arminius' words as recorded by Tacitus: "Verpflichtung fürs Vaterland", "alte[n] Erbe der Freiheit", and the "heimatlichen deutschen Götter [n]" ("sacred claims of country, of their ancestral freedom, of the national Gods of Germany") are terms which refer to nationalistic or patriotic attitudes. Arminius warns Flavus not to become an "Ausreißer und Verräter" (68) ("deserter and betrayer"), as the two brothers part ways in conflict, each viewing the other as his enemy. Raddatz writes:


The message about German identity in one sense is clear: there is "inner strife" and tension among the Germans, so much that even brothers cannot live peacably together. Thus there is a definite parallel between German brothers of the first century to those in the twentieth century.

---

158 ("the reflection about Gemany"; "national self-confidence")  
159 ("With the representation of "inner strife" and the resulting tendency to violence of the German 'national character', Müller can rely on the earliest testimony about the Germanen. Thus in *Germania*, a report by Tacitus about the conversation between the brothers Flavus and Arminius is quoted. Their differences of opinion turn into the proclamation of a violent confrontation, after the reproach of treachery has been made.")
b) Communist Brother versus Fascist Brother

The contemporary dichotomy of German identity, symbolized by the Nazi and the Communist in an East Berlin prison on 17 June 1953 is illustrated in scene ten, "Die Brüder 2" ("The Brothers 2"). Müller's characters represent some of the various political ideologies present in the GDR but which had been forbidden in Nazi Germany. By the mid-twentieth century, the "old German brother conflict" as Müller phrases it, has not yet been resolved and any remaining hope for a harmonious conclusion is fading. The term or concept of "brothers" does not necessarily imply actual blood relatives, it rather denotes the brotherhood associated with citizens of a country who share a common heritage and national ancestry, or even all human beings.160 The two characters, the Communist and the "SA-Mann" or Nazi, have met before in Die Schlacht as A and B, respectively in the scene, "DIE NACHT DER LANGEN MESSER" (68) ("THE NIGHT OF THE LONG KNIVES"), which was originally found in the scene, "Der Entlassene" ("The Dismissed") in Brecht's play from 1935, Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches ("Fear and Misery of the Third Empire"). The knife is a metaphor for betrayal: "Zwischen uns geht ein Messer das heißt Verrat und der bist du der das geschmiedet hat." (68) ("Between us there stands a knife, that's called treason / And it is you who has forged it").161 Schalk relates Müller's "metaphorical use of the English term to describe the night when the Reichstag was destroyed by fire" to this scene in which the major theme is "fratricidal war", which has its origins in the first century (69) and which Müller depicts in the previous scene, "Brothers 1". When he was tortured by the "brown shirts", Brother B was faced with the choice of fascism versus communism, "auszulöschen oder ausgelöscht zu werden" to employ Müller's terminology; subject or object; kill or be killed. During the Third

---

160 One may think of Beethoven's "Ninth Symphony" or Schiller's "Ode an die Freude".
161 Müller writes: "Die Geschichte von den beiden Brüdern war zuerst Teil von >>Schlacht<<. Sie geht zurück auf eine von Weißkopf aufgeschriebene Anekdote, die ich sehr früh gelesen hatte" (KoS 254). ("The story of the two brothers was a part of >>Schlacht<< at first. It goes back to an anecdote written down by Weißkopf, which I had read very early.")
Reich, the methods which the National Socialist *Geheime Polizei* ("Secret State Police"), better known under the abbreviation of the "Gestapo", employed on suspects and prisoners were compelling in their brutality. The authorization of "verschärfte Vernehmung" ("intensified interrogation") contains enough generalities not only to encompass political dissidents but a wide range of differing cultural beliefs as well. The second of four directives dated 12 June 1942 states:

```
Die verschärfte Vernehmung darf unter dieser Voraussetzung nur angewendet werden gegen Kommunisten, Marxisten, Bibelforscher, Saboteure, Terroristen, Angehörige der Widerstands bewegungen, Fallschirmagenten, Asoziale, polnische oder sowjetrussische Arbeitsverweigerer oder Bummelanten (Zimmermann 205-206).
```

The "prerequisite" referred to above is based on the first directive which states that intensified interrogation may only be used on suspects presumed to be withholding important information concerning enemy activities (Zimmermann 206). The other inmates, the Saboteur and the murderer Ghandi, are also enemies of the Communist. The Saboteur reviles him: "Lump. Vaterlandsverräter. Russenknecht" (73) ("Scoundrel. Traitor of the fatherland. Russian lackey"). The murderer, ironically named Ghandi, warns him: "Vorsicht / Hier bist du in der Minderheit, Genosse" (72) ("Better be careful. / You're a minority in here, Comrade"). Müller demonstrates the new dilemma with which Germany, specifically the GDR, is now faced, eight years after the war and the Nazi threat has ended: the choice between East and West: Russia and the USA, respectively. The Nazi is still fearful that the Soviet army will squelch the uprising: "Hoffentlich klappt es, eh der Russe eingreift (72) ("Hopefully it will succeed before the Russians attack"). His fear reflects past antagonisms.

---

162 ("The intensified interrogation is permitted under this prerequisite only against communists, marxists, Jehovah's Witnesses, saboteurs, terrorists, members of resistance movements, parachute agents, anti-social members of society, Polish or Soviet-Russian workers who refuse to work or loafers.")
which culminated in Hitler's march on Russia. The Saboteur is hopeful that the Americans
will not disappoint them: "Und wenn. Der Ami läßt uns nicht im / Stich" (72) ("And if. The
Ami won't let us down"). The anti-Socialist Saboteur believes that the anti-Communist
Americans will come to the aid of the striking workers and keep the Soviets in check.
Gandhi, however, believes that the war-time allies will act in concert when it comes to
keeping the Germans down and under control: "Gegen den Deutschen sind sie alle einig" (72)
("They're all united against the German"). His words mirror the overall German paranoia of
being surrounded by a world of enemies which would thus further diminish German identity.
The Saboteur's response:"Die werden sich wundern, was im Deutschen steckt" (73) ("They'll
be amazed at what the Germans are capable of") reflects the will and the power still to be
found within the Germans to defend themselves even if violence is required.

In addition to the external dangers, however, there is still the problem of internal
German fighting for which no solution has yet been found. The Communist's bitter speech
about his arrest and mistreatment at the hands of his fellow countrymen in his own homeland,
where even the German birds perform their actions in a military-type formation, mirrors this
internal conflict in which German men, women, and children threaten to destroy Germany
and thus German identity. As a prisoner he was taken: "Mit Handschelln durch die schöne
deutsche Heimat" (73) ("With handcuffs through the beautiful German countryside") and was
subjected to both verbal and physical insults of his fellow Germans. The unwillingness or
inability of the differing German ideological factions to reach an understanding with each
other and work towards a common aim has not only prevented the formation of a single,
viable German state, it will, based on the Communist's imagery of his negative experiences,
result in the utter destruction of German identity: "Die deutschen Kinder krochen aus den
Bäuchen / Der deutschen Mütter, rissen mit den Zähnen / Den deutschen Vätern die
deutschen Schwänze aus / Und pißten auf die Wunde mit Gesang. / Dann hängten sie sich an
The Mutterbrust / Und soffen Blut, solang der Vorrat reichte. / Und dann zerfleischten sie sich
eins das andere. / Zuletzt ersoffen sie im eignen Blut / Weil es der deutsche Boden nicht mehr
faßte" (73-74). ("The German children crawled out of the bellies / Of the German mothers,
ripped out with their teeth / The German dicks from the German fathers / And pissed on the
wounds with song. / Then they fastened themselves to the mothers’ breasts / And sucked
blood, as long as the supply lasted. / And then they tore each other apart one after the other. /
Finally they drowned in their own blood / Because the German soil could not absorb it
all.")163 This graphic portrayal of German self-destruction, another recurring theme
throughout Germania Tod, reflects Müller's pessimistic view of German history and
particularly the failure of German Communism.

Meanwhile, as the prisoners look out the window of their prison, the strike which
initially sparked new hope for German Communism has taken an unexpected and unwelcome
turn as the Soviet tanks enter the city. Müller writes:

[. . .] Ulbricht bat die Russen, einzugreifen, und die wollten nicht. Sie haben
zunächst gesagt: >>Das ist eure Sache.<< Und erst über Moskau hat Ulbricht
erreicht, daß sie doch eingegriffen haben. Das ist, glaube ich, ein Drehpunkt in der
DDR-Geschichte, der 17. Juni als die letzte Chance für eine neue Politik, für eine
andere DDR-Geschichte, verpaßt aus Angst vor der Bevölkerung und vor dem
übermächtigen westlichen Gegner. Aber vielleicht ist auch das eine Illusion (KoS
137).164

The fact that Russian tanks were rolling at the request of Walther Ulbricht and the main
functionaries of the SED in order to calm the situation in East Berlin was a bitter defeat for

---

163 This same speech is also found verbatim in Traktor.
164 ("Ulbricht asked the Russians to intercede, and they did not want to. At first they said: "This is your
problem." And only by way of Moscow did Ulbricht get them to intercede. That is, I believe, a turning point in
the GDR-history, June seventeenth as the last chance for a new policy, for another GDR-history, missed due to
fear of the populace and of the overly powerful Western opponent. But perhaps that is also an illusion.")
the advocates of a German-run Communist state. The long-standing ideological conflict between German "brothers" is represented here as: "eine Allegorie der DDR [zu erkennen], das Dilemma des Kommunismus, der mit fremden Panzern verteidigt werden muß" (Schulz Heiner Müller 135). The strike's origins in scene eight, which Müller presents as a conflict between the older generation, Hilse, and the younger generation, the Young Bricklayer, point to an internal communist struggle as well. Originating in post-World War I Germany and the Spartacus Revolution of 1919, it continued during Nazi Germany and World War II and has extended into the post-division era characterized by the FRG and the GDR. The two German states and their respective attempts to maintain dominance over German identity will remain at the center of the developing Cold War between the Soviet Union and the USA; thus substantiating the German paranoia of being caught in the middle. In the meantime, the violence raging on outside their cell is paralleled by the prisoners' move to attack and presumably kill the Communist. His final comment: "Wer bin ich" ("Who am I") is answered with violence: "Die drei stürzen sich auf ihn" (74) ("The three of them rush at him"). Their actions demonstrate that even in the GDR, the German Communist is not at home and is still persecuted. Schulz writes: "[. . .] Die Häftlinge erschlagen in ihm den Kommunisten, der für sie die staatliche Unterdrückung verkörpert; die Kommunisten an der Macht wiederum kerkerten ihn als den potentiellen Bündnispartner des Klassenfeinds ein ("Something is Rotten" 475). He is trapped between ideologies and is powerless to change this historical situation. Schmitt expresses a similar idea: "Es hat sich anscheinend nichts geändert an den Grundkonstellationen deutscher Geschichte, auch in der DDR nicht" (Schmitt 115). Schalk views the character of the Communist in this scene as the "opponent of Ulbricht, once imprisoned by the Nazis and also now doing time", who expresses: "Müller's central

165 ("an allegory of the GDR, the dilemma of Communism, which has to be defended with foreign tanks.")
166 ("[. . .] The prisoners kill the communist in him, who embodies for them the governmental suppression; the communists in power, on the other hand, imprisoned him as the potential alliance partner of the class enemy.")
statement on Germany" (71). His query: "Who am I" reflects the destruction of the German Communist's identity. After the events of 17 June 1953, it became increasingly difficult for Müller to believe that the GDR could ever break free of Soviet rule. His disillusion concerning German Communism is evident in the Communist's query, "Who am I", which can be interpreted as the existential dilemma faced by the ideologist whose value system, as he has understood it until now, and his belief in a communist utopia, have been put in doubt given recent events occurring in the GDR. Schulz confirms this idea: "[. . .] Selbstzerflesung, Selbstzerreißung, Vernichtung der Identität -- so kann der Kommunist im Gefängnis seines eigenen Staates von seinen Gegern niedergeschlagen werden [. . .]" ("Something is Rotten" 475). Again, Müller's focal point in this scene is the inability of the German Communist within the GDR to freely and openly express his political ideology; instead, he is treated as an outsider and a danger. Müller's character represents the beleaguered German Communist who can find peace neither in his original, nor in his new homeland i.e., the GDR. Persecuted by the Nazis and rejected and betrayed by the GDR leadership, the German Communist is at home nowhere and his utopia is doomed to remain an illusory quest.

Viewed as an expression of "die Ursprungsidee des Sozialismus" ("the original idea of Socialism"), his line reflects the ultimate insignificance of the individual's sacrifice as well as the "Ausdruck einer Entfremdung" ("expression of an alienation") in which this "original idea" is being forced upon the people by the use of violence (Eke Reclam 182). An important

167 ("Apparently nothing has changed in the basic constellations of German history, not even in the GDR.")
168 ("[. . .] self-mutilation, self-dismemberment, destruction of the identity -- so the communist is beaten up by his opponents in the prison of his own country [. . .]")
169 Müller also published a prose text with this same theme, a Communist in jail: "SCHOTTERBEK, als er, an einem Junimorgen 1953 in Berlin, unter den Schlägen seiner Mitgefangenen aufatmend zusammenbrach, hörte aus dem Lärm der Panzerketten, durch die preußisch dicken Mauern seines Gefängnisses gedämpft, den nicht zu vergessenden Klang der Internationale (Texte 5, Rotbuch 176 15). ("SCHOTTERBECK when he, on a June morning in 1953, collapsed with a sigh of relief under the blows of those who were in prison with him, heard in the noise of the approaching tanks outside, muffled by the thick Prussian walls of his prison, the tune of the"
aspect of Marxist philosophy is the idea that the individual must suppress his personal feelings and goals and in fact, must subordinate them to the enhancement of society: "Da sich das Individuum nur im Gesellschaftlichen vergegenständlichen, Identität gewinnen kann, verliert es, wenn die Gesellschaft abhanden kommt, die Identität" (Schivelbusch 130). According to this statement, the concepts of identity and society are inexorably intertwined and each is dependent upon the other for its very existence; without one, the other supposedly cannot exist. In the Marxist view, the idea of individuality is less important than the interests of the general society and thus a paradox ensues, which is the point Müller is attempting to convey with the Communist's line, "Wer bin ich". Thus the idea behind socialism which was originally to enhance society has manifested itself into the very element which is hindering the communist's utopian pursuit. The workers' attempt to improve conditions for themselves and the society overall is met once again -- as earlier in German history: the peasants' revolt, the revolution of 1848, and the Spartacus Revolution -- with violence. The importance Müller placed on the topic of revolution is discussed further in the following section.

c) The Dead Revolutionaries

Scene twelve, "Tod in Berlin 1" ("Death in Berlin 1") consists of a poetic text taken from the sonnet entitled, Berlin VIII dated 25 December 1910 by the Expressionist writer Georg Heym (1887-1912). He wrote a series of sonnets relating to Berlin which offer somber images of the evolving industrial city. Müller only uses the two "Terzette" consisting of six lines. This particular sonnet with its references to Berlin and the poorest members of

International, never to be forgotten.

170 ("Because the individual can realize his potential, can gain his identity, only in the community, he loses it, his identity, when the community goes astray.")
society who are buried in the cemetery there yet not really dead, reflects another recurring theme in this play: the Untoten ("non-dead"). In the same way that the Nibelungs are dead yet "non-dead" because they are able to continue their senseless fighting, so too the dead of Berlin's cemetery for the poor not only listen to but "become intoxicated" by the strains of the most famous revolutionary song of all time, that of the successful French Revolution of 1789 with its demands for liberté, égalité, fraternité ("liberty, equality, brotherhood"). Any sense of hope, however, is squelched by the fact that the non-dead are impotent to implement any change in society. The hope for a revolution to improve the lives of the contemporary workers has been buried and with it the hope for a better future of the German proletariat. Their inability to find peace reflects the despair and disappointment which characterized not only their lives but their deaths as well. Schmitt writes that: "Diese große Enttäuschung war kennzeichnend für ihr Leben. Dennoch aber existiert ihre Sehnsucht nach revolutionärer Veränderung weiter, so daß sie sich noch als Tote an der roten Farbe des Himmels und an den Klängen der >>Marseillaise<< berauschen können" (117). The Marseillaise, the French national anthem, written by Claude-Joseph Rouget de Lisle in 1792 during the revolutionary period, symbolizes the successful struggle for freedom and equality by those who have been oppressed. Heym may have chosen to include the Marseillaise rather than the

---

Georg Heym, *Berlin VIII. Georg Heym Dichtungen und Schriften. Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Karl Ludwig Schneider, vol. 1 Hamburg and Munich: Ellermann, 1964) 188. ("Chimneys stand in great spaces / In the winter day and carry his burden, / The black sky's darkening palace. / Like golden steps its lower edge burns. // Far between leafless tress, some house, / Fences and sheds, where the metropolis abates, / And on icy tracks struggles with difficulty / A long freight train / wearisome forward. // A cemetery for the poor towers, black, stone next to stone, / The dead observe the red sunset / From their graves. It tastes like strong wine. // They sit knitting along the wall, / Caps of soot on the naked temple bone, / To the Marseillaise, the old storm song.")

Raddatz refers to Müller's treatment and presentation of death, his aesthetic articulation of death is in the form of a : "von Geschichte beherrschten Totenreiches ("a kingdom of death ruled by history") (80). He writes that in this "Totenreich" ("kingdom of death") the historical conflicts are resumed and carried on by the participants so that no difference is recognizable between the historical events which caused their death and the afterlife (81). See also Schmitt: "Die Toten finden keine Ruhe, sie tun das, was sie als Lebende getan haben, auch nach dem Sterben weiter" ("The dead find no peace, they do whatever they did when they were alive, even after they have died.") (93). He is referring here to scene 5 but his idea applies to the other dead in this play, such as in this scene.

("This great disappointment was symptomatic for their lives. Nevertheless, in spite of it, their desire for revolutionary change still exists, so that they, even as dead persons, can become intoxicated by the red color of the sky and the sounds of the >>Marseillaise<<").
Internationale\textsuperscript{174}, the hymn of the international socialist movement, because the former hymn
is associated with a successful, albeit bourgeois, revolution. The latter cannot be associated
with a successful revolution, since it was written in 1871 by Eugène Pottier for the Pariser
Commune, which was crushed by the government forces. Brecht includes the Internationale
in Trommeln in der Nacht when the Spartacus revolt begins: Kragler and the others can hear
it while they are drinking in the "Picadillybar" (97). As a symbol of revolutionary movements
throughout the world since its inception, the hymn has enduring revolutionary significance in
Germany despite the fact that the desired successful revolution has yet to occur. Müller was
familiar with this song since his childhood because his father used to listen to this
"entschlossene" ("resolute") hymn at home (Tschapke Heiner Müller 10). He refers to the
Internationale in scene ten when the Nazi says scornfully to the Communist: "[. . .] Hörst du
die Internationale / Wenn sie gesungen wird mit Panzerketten" (74) ("[. . .] Do you like hearing it, the Internationale / When it's sung by tank tracks"). The Nazi is mocking his
communist "brother" whose visions of a communist utopia are literally being crushed outside
at that very moment as the Communist can only sorrowfully and despairingly observe events
from his prison cell. This comment reveals the author's disillusion with the revolutionary
communist movement in the GDR and hints at the greater despair to come. In a parallel
situation to the Communist's disappointment when the tanks roll into Berlin on 17 June 1953
and the realization dawns that the anticipated revolution is not materializing as hoped, those
poor revolutionary souls died without experiencing a successful revolution in their era.

\textsuperscript{174} Here, the first stanza of Die Internationale: "Wacht auf, Verdammte dieser Erde, / Die stets man noch zum Hungern zwingt! / Das Recht, wie Glut im Kraterherde, / nun mit Macht zum Durchbruch dringt. / Reinen Tisch macht mit dem Bedränger! / Heer der Sklaven, wache auf! / Ein Nichts zu sein, tragt es nicht länger, / alles zu werden, strömt zuhauf! // Chorus: Völker, hört die Signale! / Auf, zum letzten Gefecht! / Die Internationale erkämpft das Menschenrecht!" Walter Moßmann and Peter Schleuning, Alte und neue politische Lieder (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1978) 174-175. ("Awaken, condemned of the earth / Who are still being forced to go hungry! / Equality, like glowing fire inside the earth, / now with force breaks through. / Make peace with the oppressor! / Army of slaves, awaken! / No longer to be nothing, / to be everything, rush together! //
IV.1.4 The Germans and Their Self-Destruction

a) The Doll of Despair: A Pantomime of German Identity

The eleventh scene entitled "Nachtstück" or "Nocturne" has a unique position in the constellation of the drama because it is the only scene which does not have a partner scene. As the title implies, like a musical composition, its significance lies here in a sober reflection of the historical progress -- or lack of progress -- concerning the path to the communist goal of achieving a functioning socialist state. The opening sentences: "Auf der Bühne steht ein Mensch. Er ist überlebensgroß, vielleicht eine Puppe. Er ist mit Plakaten bekleidet. Sein Gesicht ist ohne Mund" (74) ("A man stands on stage. He is larger than life, maybe a doll. He is dressed in posters. His face is without a mouth"). There is no dialogue, only a pantomime with the recurring phrase: "Der Mensch, der vielleicht eine Puppe ist" (74-75) ("The human being, who is perhaps a doll"). The central activity consists of the Doll's attempt to catch a bicycle: "Der Mensch, der vielleicht eine Puppe ist, läuft hinter dem Fahrrad her" (74) ("The human being, who is perhaps a doll, runs after the bicycle"). The bicycle represents the vehicle of historical progress throughout German history which Müller uses along with the Doll to portray the unsuccessful path of the German revolutionary. In scene three, Clown 2's failure to pull himself together and play his role, even after Clown 1 as King has ordered him to do so, represents the German man's inability to enact a successful revolt against the king (45) and thus is similar to the Doll who continually tries to stand up but cannot.\footnote{175} The scene reaches its climax with this macabre image: "Aus den leeren Augenhöhlen des Menschen, der vielleicht eine Puppe ist, kriechen Läuse und verbreiten sich schwarz über sein Gesicht. Er schreit. Der Mund entsteht mit dem Schrei" (75) ("From the hollow eye sockets of the human being, who is perhaps a doll, lice crawl out and his face is covered with their blackness. He

Chorus: Nations, heed the signals! / Forward, to the last battle! / The International is fighting for the rights of men!")
screams. His mouth is formed with the scream"). The historical destruction of Germany, begun and demonstrated in the first scene by the Man who lost his arm in World War I and completed by Hitler, depicted in scene seven when his men symbolically kill Germania, is represented here as the Doll's i.e., Germany's utter self-destruction with which an era in German history has ended. Müller portrays the gradual deterioration of any hope until nothing is left but the Doll with its face blackened by lice. The Doll loses its identity through its own fatal actions, as it literally and symbolically tears itself to pieces. This pantomime is symbolic for Germany's self-destruction based on a myriad of historical events presented throughout the play. In this scene, as Klussmann explains: [. . .] sind alle Erkenntnisse des Germania-Stücks zusammengefaßt, so daß der erzählte Angsttraum des KOMMUNISTEN nun im Spiel vorgeführt wird" ("Denkmale" 175). Klussmann is referring to the Communist's description in the previous scene of his horrific experience in his own country, which he sarcastically refers to as: "die schöne deutsche Heimat" ("the beautiful German homeland") (73). This tale is surpassed only by his tragic vision of what is yet to come for the fatherland, which ends with the apocalyptic lines: Und dann zerfleischten sie sich eins das andere. Zuletzt ersoffen sie im eignen Blut / Weil es der deutsche Boden nicht mehr faßte" (73-74) ("And then they mutilated each other. Finally they drowned in their own blood / Because the German soil could not hold any more"). This gruesome scenario has manifested itself in "Nachtstück" and the Doll's grisly actions which leave it helpless.

The Doll's final utterance, the scream, offers no hope for another chance: the formation of the mouth, the basic means for communication, has developed too late to help the Doll express its needs, wants, and demands. This scream of despair can be viewed as an:

"Ausdruck der Germania-Schändung und der Verzweiflung der Lebenden" as Klussmann

---

175 The German word "Puppe" is also reminiscent of the scene in Leben Gundlungs, "Ein patriotisches Puppenspiel" (18-19) in which Frederick's soldiers act in accordance with the king's demands: in effect, they act like puppets or toy soldiers with no will of their own.
describes it ("Denkmale" 175). Germania, the ultimate allegorical representation of Germany and German identity, had been abused for the sake of Prussian honor under Frederick II and then destroyed by the callous and barbaric actions of Fascism serving Hitler. Those Germans remaining, including the German Communists who suffered and were martyred at the hands of their fascist brothers, were left to pick up the pieces of the desecrated cities, in ruins from the enemies' bombs: an image of utter despair. In his article, "Anmerkungen zu 'Germania Tod in Berlin' ", Georg Wieghaus interprets the Doll's actions as having resulted in: "Die totale Selbstverstümmelung" and its subsequent scream means that: "Eine Puppe ist es nicht mehr, ein Mensch noch nicht" (265). Even though it may no longer be considered a Doll because of the formation of the mouth, it cannot be considered human either; and the scream offers no hope because the Doll has mutilated itself beyond all recognition. In a parallel to the Thalidomide-Wolf which is a mutated form of German identity, so too the Doll, as an allegory for German man, represents a self-destructive mutation of German identity caused by events occurring throughout German history. Understood from a Marxist viewpoint, its efforts to enact a revolution have ended unsuccessfully and in the process it has destroyed itself. The Doll's scream is reminiscent of Lucile's scream in Büchner's Dantons Tod and of Lessing's scream in Müller's other Geschichtsdrama, Leben Gundlings (Steinbach 39-40). Lucile's desperate scream will result in her arrest and execution at the guillotine, thus joining her lover in death: her action is calculated and has a specific goal. On the contrary, the Doll's scream of despair reflects its inability to enact positive change. Similarly, Lessing's "dumpfer Schrei" (43) ("muffled scream") reflects his lack of "any revolutionary relevance or impact" and is symbolically "drowned by applause" (Teraoka 76). The implication is that one of the greatest minds of the

176("[. . .] all the perceptions of the Germania-play are combined, so that the COMMUNIST'S narrated dream of anxiety is now exhibited in the game")
177("expression of the Germania-desecration and the despair of the living")
Enlightenment period, Lessing, was not able to evoke positive change in the course of historical events and has been rendered helpless. The Doll has also become helpless but as a result of its own miscalculated actions. The Doll's scream most vividly brings to mind the image of the Expressionist painting from 1893 entitled, *The Scream*, by the Norwegian painter Edvard Munch (1863-1944). Originally entitled, "Despair", the emotion evoked by this famous painting symbolizes the expression of isolation, fear, and utter despair which Müller depicts through the actions of the Doll in this pantomime scene.

Moray McGowan views the behavior of the Doll from a different perspective in his essay, "Marxist - Postmodernist - German: History and Dramatic Form in the Work of Heiner Müller". He writes that the "human being, who is perhaps a doll", represents alienation, but that out of "deepest despair and destruction" there comes a sense of something positive developing from something negative: growth and change are the positive results which are represented by the Doll or "human" developing a mouth (141). Similarly, although Domdey refers to this overall scene as a "Verzweiflungsbild", he perceives a certain "befreiendes Zerreißen" in the Doll's scream after the "Tiefpunkt der Selbstzerstörung" has been reached: "Opfer heilen, Tod ist nicht nur Vernichtung, sondern auch Schöpfung" ("Der Tod eine Funktion" 74). There is no evidence offered in the text, however, which leads to the conclusion that the Doll has or will become human. The black lice spreading from the eye sockets to cover the Doll's face present an image of horror without a positive element. As with McGowan and Domdey, Dietrich Steinbach advances a similar interpretation concerning the scream in his book, *Geschichte als Drama. Georg Büchner: Dantons Tod; Heiner Müller: Germania Tod in Berlin; Friedrich Schiller: Wallenstein*: "So entsteht Leben aus der

---

178 ("The total self-mutilation"); "It is no longer a doll, not yet a human")
179 ("image of despair"); "liberating dismemberment"); "nadir of self-destruction"); "Victims heal, death is not only destruction, rather also creation")
Zerstörung. Der entsetzliche Schrei der Humanität ist die Geburt des Neuen" (39). Again, Müller presents no evidence that the scream will result in the rebirth of the Doll as a human; rather, the implication in the context of the preceding and proceeding scenes confirms that the outcome of the Doll's i.e., German's self-mutilation will result in death and further despair. The last line of the preceding scene, "Wer bin ich" spoken by the Communist, juxtaposed with this destructive pantomime, signifies the troubling answer as seen from the Marxist perspective. The Doll's resultant self-mutilation has resulted in an end to any hope concerning the future of German Communism in the GDR. In his essay, "The Dream and the Scream: "Die Deutsche Misere" and the Unrealized GDR in Heiner Müller's Germania Tod in Berlin", Robert von Dassanowsky-Harris confirms that this scene "presents German self-destruction on the allegorical level" and "is the central point of the work" (16). Indeed, this scene and the actions of the Doll reflect a turning point in the play, namely: all of the pain and despair suffered on behalf of German Communism with the hope of a better future receive a negative answer as the last spark of hope is extinguished by the Doll's self-destructive actions. In their joint essay, "Byzanz gegen Rom: Heiner Müllers Manichäismus", Horst Domdey and Richard Herzinger explain that:

Die Schrecken der Vergangenheit, an die Müller erinnert, und die Schrecken der Zukunft, die er prophezei, verweisen auf das Jetzt als den Moment, in dem Vergangenheit sich wiederholt und Zukunft vorausgenommen ist. Alle Möglichkeiten zum Bruch, die sich in der Vergangenheit ergeben haben und die sich in Zukunft ergeben werden, sind in der Gegenwart verborgen (247).

180 ("Thus life generates from destruction. The horrible cry of humanity is the birth of the newness.")
181 ("The horrors of the past, which Müller recalls, and the horrors of the future, which he prophecies, point to the current time as the moment, in which history repeats itself and from which the future proceeds. All possibilities to the fissure, which have resulted in the past and which will occur in the future, are hidden in the present.")
Although not referring specifically to this drama or this particular scene, their words are applicable here because they are in essence describing the opportunity which Müller's Doll has missed. As an allegory of socialism and German man throughout time, the pantomime physically demonstrates the lack of understanding on the part of the German individual for socialism which causes him to destroy himself while attempting to forcibly reach this goal and thereby also eliminating any chance for future success in this endeavour. The "moment" about which Domdey and Herzinger write, in which the past and the future meet in the present, are made void by the Doll's self-mutilation. The sufferings endured by the Doll in the past in order to reach his utopian goal have come to naught in the face of his own destruction. Given the perfect vision of hindsight after the events of 1989 and reunification in 1990, the Doll's pantomime can be interpreted as Müller's insightful portrayal of the final moments of German Communism on a path which has caused much pain and suffering and left despair and destruction in its wake.

IV.2 Summary

The history of a nation is an important determining factor in establishing its identity for any given era. While Müller was writing for his generation during the era of the GDR and the period of division, his Geschichtsdrama, by definition, carries a message for later and future generations as well. His main interests were in depicting the evolution of German identity and the situation facing the communist state, especially its possibilities for eventual success or the reasons for its ultimate failure. The history of German Communism is a dismal one, evidenced by the failure of the Spartacus Revolution and the subsequent murders of Luxemburg and Liebknecht which resulted in the domination of the German Communist Party by Moscow, and culminated in the persecution and extermination of German Communists throughout the Hitler regime. After the formation of the GDR and particularly after Stalin's death in March 1953, German Communists experienced a brief flicker of hope
for a German-led communist government which was, however, extinguished as early as 17 June 1953, as Müller aptly portrays in scene ten, "The Brothers 2". The reliance of Ulbricht and the SED on the Soviet leadership transformed the iron bonds forged earlier by Thälmann into non-malleable shackles for German Communism which not even the changes initiated later by Erich Honecker could loosen.

The title of this Geschichtsdrama signifies that death is the major underlying theme, specifically, death in Berlin. Müller concentrates on representing various deaths in Berlin to make his point that the heart of Germany and of German identity has suffered greatly and has been destroyed by various elements from its past. Steinbach writes that both of these themes namely, Germany and Berlin: "sich im Todesthema vereinigen" ("are united in the death theme") (Geschichte als Drama 37). Indeed, throughout Müller's Geschichtsdrama the main focus remains the various deaths which occur or have occurred in Berlin and the impact of these deaths on contemporary German identity. However, Müller does not limit his portrayal only to the aspect or event of death, rather he incorporates the dead as well to further enhance his ideas concerning German identity of the past, present, and future. Müller's purpose in presenting the dead or the "undead" is not merely as a form of memoriam; it is more profound than that, when seen as a legacy for German identity. He perceives the strong connection between the legacy of the past, represented by the dead, and those living in the present and those who will exist in the future of Germany. By presenting graphic images of the "undead" in Stalingrad and their continuous barbaric actions, he emphasizes the threat of the past in contemporary German society. Wieghaus writes that "Stalingrad steht für alle Kriege und Krieger der Vergangenheit, die die Gegenwart immer wieder einholt: die Toten fressen die Lebenden" (265).  

182 ("Stalingrad stands for all the wars and warriors of the past, who get caught up in the current time again and again: the dead consume the living.")
Müller's obsession with the German past is an expression of his interest and hope for the future of Germany which is determined in the present. His primary concern at the time he wrote *Germania Tod* was for the current and future Dasein ("existence") of the GDR and German Communism. Even though the FRG was viewed in one way and the GDR in another, there was and is no denying that "being German" extends far beyond the wall separating the two states from each other, since both share the same cultural and historical heritage, no matter what propaganda was spread by the contemporary governments. The average citizens of Germany, who function here as an "object" of history, had neither a choice nor a voice in the division of the fatherland: the decision was forced upon Germany by external forces as a direct political result of Hitler's war. The causes leading up to 1949, however, as presented by Müller in *Germania Tod*, have a much longer history.

The city of Berlin has been the very heart of the German nation and its official division in 1949 had a severe impact on German identity. The important role played by Berlin in modern German history commences with the year 1701, when Friedrich III of Brandenburg crowned himself King Friedrich I and made Berlin the capital for his court. During his absolutist reign (1740-1786) Friedrich the Great turned it into a major European metropolis and cultural center: thus there is a clear and strong Prussian legacy that relates to Berlin and therefore to modern German identity. Dietrich Steinbach writes: "Berlin, so sieht es der Autor, ist ein zentraler und fataler Punkt der preußisch-deutschen Geschichte. In ihm spitzt sich die Geschichte der letzten Jahrhunderte und, vor allen Dingen, der jüngsten Vergangenheit [. . .]" (*Geschichte als Drama* 37). During the turbulent nineteenth century, it became the focus of an uprising on 18 March 1848 when various echelons of Berlin society attempted to improve political and social conditions. In 1871 under Chancellor Otto von Bismarck and King Wilhelm I, it became the capital of the Second German Empire. The
Weimar Republic had its short-lived existence here. The Spartacus Revolution took place on the streets of this capital city; it is the location where Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht made their impassioned speeches and where both subsequently met their untimely and violent deaths. Hitler rose to power, forged his plans for European domination and Jewish extinction, and finally took his own life in this historical city. Berlin has thus long been at the center of military action and political power and has served as a stronghold for centuries. Berlin and her inhabitants would pay a high price for the legacy of World War II: in mid-April 1945, with only a hundred thousand German soldiers to defend her, the Red Army, a million Russian soldiers, marched into Berlin. By the official end of the war and after the bombing had finally stopped, the city with a population of 4.3 million was reduced to 2.8 million consisting mostly of women and children (Birke 184). Although the Allied Forces promoted the four "Ds": "Denazifizierung, Demilitarisierung, Dezentralisierung, and Demokratisierung" (Birke 28) during the period immediately following the end of the war in Berlin and other German cities, in reality the main struggle was one for basic human survival: food, water, and shelter. While the inhabitants struggled to meet these basic human needs, Berlin and the rest of the "Reich" was being divided into four occupation zones by the Allied Forces: Hitler's bitter legacy was thus established. With the start of the Cold War, Germany became a pawn in the hands of the superpowers, and four years later, after the division of the country into the GDR and the FRG, Berlin remained the capital of the former while Bonn became the new capital of the latter, but Berlin's grand atmosphere and old majesty could never be replaced. In a manner reminiscent of the uprising in 1848, workers in the East German capital went on strike and took to the streets on 17 June 1953 in the hope of improving their working and living conditions. With the construction of the Berlin Wall, 183

183 ("Berlin, as the author sees it, is a central and fatal center of Prussian-German history. The history of the last centuries reached its zenith here and, above all, of the most recent past [. . .]")

184 ("denazification, demilitarisation, decentralisation, democratization")
which commenced on 13 August 1961, the city and the nation would be petrified until finally, on 9 November 1989, the German citizens once again marched through the streets of Berlin and successfully demanded the removal of the Wall; thereby reclaiming their city and their whole German heritage. The struggle to reclaim their identity would take much more time and effort and is a process which continues even today. In the next chapter, I analyze Müller's last dramatic work before his death, Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann, in which he offers his insights into the reasons for the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Socialist experiment: "DER ERSTE ARBEITERUNDBAUERNSTAATAUF DEUTSCHES BODEN", along with the aftermath and the lasting effects on German identity.
V. Analysis of *Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann*

V.1 Major Themes and Characters Reflecting German Identity

Drama

Die Toten warten auf der Gegenschräge
Manchmal halten sie eine Hand ins Licht
Als lebten sie. Bis sie sich ganz zurückziehn
In ihr gewohntes Dunkel das uns blendet.

(Heiner Müller, November 1995)

Heiner Müller's obsession with German history and its legacy of the dead, who never really seem to die, but return to haunt the world from his stage as the "undead," is once again graphically displayed in his ominous and final Geschichtsdrama, *Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann*. Published and performed posthumously in 1996, this play presents his last thoughts and impressions about German identity through characters, places, and events which include: Luxemburg, Thälmann, Hitler, Stalin, World War II, Stalingrad, Brecht, Harich, Communism, the former GDR and its demise, and ultimately, the reunification of Germany.

Müller's death, whether by destiny or design but quite appropriately in Berlin on 30 December 1995, left his last work to speak for itself. As he had always insisted and often stated, as in an interview with Uwe Wittstock in February 1992: "Die Autorität ist der Text, nicht der Autor" and "Der Text ist klüger als der Autor" (*GI3* 161). For Müller the artist's creation has a spirit of its own, the artist thus functions as an instrument or servant to art. The above poem about the "Drama", which the playwright wrote shortly before his death, reflects this artistic aspect while also revealing his preoccupation with the dead and his belief in their enduring connection to the living. The poem's title reflects his vision of the theater and can

---

1Heiner Müller: Werke 1: Die Gedichte, Frank Hörnigk, ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1998) 323.

2The German quotes from this play are taken from: *Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann*, 2nd ed., Stephan Suschke, ed. (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1996). Unless otherwise stated, the English translations are my own.

3("The authority is the text, not the author" and "The text is more knowledgeable than the author.")
therefore be applied in particular to his last Geschichtsdrama: a dance of light and shadow, of spirit and flesh, of revelation and retreat between the dead and the not-yet-dead. The reader is left with the impression that the dead are waiting in the dark behind the curtain, like actors waiting for their cue, until the final "blackout" removes them all from the stage of life. The poem evokes an image of finality as if Müller knew that he would soon belong to that other realm, the Totenreich from which he himself, however, unlike the characters he inexhaustibly portrayed, would never be able to return. Thus his last dramatic literary work assumes an even greater significance because it contains Müller's final message: the task remaining is to decipher his words.

The first step in this process, to explain the play's origins, has already been presented in Chapter Three, along with a brief overview of the political situation during the 1980s both prior to the Wende or political "turning point" in 1989 and after reunification in 1990. The following analysis focuses on the effects of these events as Müller perceived and portrays them in the themes and characters which reflect German identity, with special emphasis on his significant use of other German literary texts from various periods by varying German authors. Müller's plays and their major themes are a reflection of and correspond to the differing political events occurring at various times throughout the forty year existence of the GDR, but with Germania 3, his only play completed after the reunification of Germany, he takes a retrospective look at what happened to the GDR, the reasons why, and the subsequent and longterm effects on German identity. Thus political ideologies and those who represent them again take center stage in this play as Müller looks to the period before the GDR, particularly Stalingrad, and the forty years of the GDR's existence to explain contemporary events, the continuous development of German identity, and possibilities for Germany's future based on its most recent past. In my analysis of the major themes and characters

---

4The term "Blackout" is a theater term which refers to the sudden and total switching off of all stage lights; it usually lasts only for a few seconds and is often used to emphasize a moment of surprise. Gero von Wilpert, Sachwörterbuch der Literatur, 6th ed. (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner, 1979) 98.
Müller depicts in his final play my focus is on presenting the legacies left by those persons and events which have affected and which continue to affect German identity including: German Communism, Luxemburg, Thälmann, and Ulbricht, fascism and Hitler, Stalinism and Stalin, the German-Russian aggression, and Brecht.

V.1.1 The Communist Legacy

I have chosen to begin my analysis with the communist legacy because of its relevance as an essential element of German identity inherent in the political mix of most of the twentieth century and its key role in this Geschichtsdrama. The central elements in this play relating to the communist legacy are three historical characters and a structure known all over the world: Rosa Luxemburg, Ernst Thälmann, Walter Ulbricht, and the Berlin Wall. They form the basis of my analysis in this section.

a) Rosa Luxemburg

The main historical figure pertaining to the communist legacy as depicted by Müller in both Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 is, without a doubt, Rosa Luxemburg. More than any other historical person, she served as his inspiration and Müller devoted much attention to her as an element inseparable from Germany's modern political history. Due to her decisive influence, even after her tragic death, or, more accurately, due to the manner of her death, the course of German Communism, with which her name is synonymous, was forever altered. Luxemburg, whom the renowned historian Hermann Weber describes as a "glühende Revolutionärin und Kämpferin" ("fervent revolutionary and fighter") in, Von Rosa Luxemburg zu Walter Ulbricht: Wandlungen des Kommunismus in Deutschland (31), has become a political legend. He explains the inevitable impact of her murder: "Eine direkte Folge des Doppelmordes war eine Schwächung der Kommunistischen Partei Deutschlands. Auf weite Sicht bedeutete der Tod insbesondere Rosa Luxemburgs für den demokratischen

---

5 In subsequent references I will list this book as Wandlungen.
Müller positions Luxemburg at the end of scene one, after Thälmann poses the question, "Was haben wir falsch gemacht (8) ("What did we do wrong"): she appears as a ghost or a vision as she walks past with Liebknecht and their murderers, Oberleutnant ("first lieutenant") Kurt Vogel and Feldjäger ("infantry soldier") Otto Wilhelm Runge. In Weltkommunismus im Wandel, Ossip K. Flechtheim sums up the result of their heinous crime when he writes: "[. . .] daß Rosa Luxemburgs Tod von den Mörderhänden der deutschen Freikorps eine Tragödie war, nicht nur für die deutsche, sondern für die internationale Arbeiterbewegung, in der die von ihr gefürchtete Entwicklung nun ihren Lauf nahm" (131). By her untimely death, the course of German Communism was drastically altered and, as Müller continually demonstrates in this play (and in Germania Tod), it was the main factor relating not only to the misguided development of the KPD, but to the later formation and ultimate downfall of the GDR as well. In order to better understand the significant repercussions of her murder and why her death plays such an important role for Müller, it is essential to be acquainted with her main ideas concerning communism.

Hermann Weber offers a concise summary:


---

6 ("A direct result of the double murders was a weakening of the KPD. In the broader perspective, especially Rosa Luxemburg's death meant a defeat for democratic Socialism.")
7 A collection of detailed eyewitness accounts has been compiled by Elisabeth Hannover-Drück and Heinrich Hannover in, Der Mord an Rosa Luxemburg und Karl Liebknecht: Dokumentation eines politischen Verbrechens (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1967).
8 ("[. . .] that Rosa Luxemburg's death at the murderous hands of the Freikorps was a tragedy, not only for the German, but also for the international workers' movement, which now developed along the course she had feared.")
9 ("Rosa Luxemburg was the forerunner, yes the actual founder of democratic communism. The altercations between dictatorial-bureaucratic communism and democratic communism are an essential attribute of the history of communism.")
Luxemburg expands her theory of communism in her own words in, Die Russische Revolution, which appeared posthumously in 1922; Weber considers it to be the "Motto des demokratischen Kommunismus" (motto of democratic communism") (32). For Luxemburg, Communism is based on the following central ideas found in her posthumous text: "Freiheit nur für die Anhänger der Regierung, nur für Mitglieder einer Partei -- mögen sie noch so zahlreich sein -- ist keine Freiheit. Freiheit ist immer Freiheit des anders Denkenden" (109) and: "Es ist die historische Aufgabe des Proletariats, wenn es zur Macht gelangt, anstelle der bürgerlichen Demokratie sozialistische Demokratie zu schaffen, nicht jegliche Demokratie abzuschaffen" (116). She spoke out in favor of a "democratic communism" which, with the proletariat securely in power, would provide equal rights for all citizens rather than imitating the mistakes and crimes of its predecessors in government. The efforts of the Soviet revolutionary Lenin had a strong influence on German revolutionaries and the ensuing development of Communism in Germany. Luxemburg was also influenced by Lenin but she herself had a major impact on German Communism and wielded strong influence on its future course; even or especially after her murder she still played a significant role. The German Communists were left without strong native leadership, and Soviet Communism gained greater influence on and control of the KPD due to Thälmann's and later Ulbricht's strong ties to Moscow. The fact that the KPD lost its leader Luxemburg, who -- as historians such as Flechtheim and Weber believe -- would have kept German Communism separate from that of Stalin and the Soviet Union, is also a cornerstone of Müller's beliefs. He believes that if she had not been murdered, the KPD would have had a fighting chance and the GDR could and even would have developed into the bastion of Communism and a safe haven for German Communists on its way to becoming the Socialist utopia. For that reason Müller believed that Stalingrad signalled the end of the GDR because without the murder of

10("Freedom only for the followers of the government, only for members of a party -- however great the number may be -- is not freedom. Freedom is always freedom for those who think differently"; "It is the historical task
Luxemburg, the KPD would have developed differently and Hitler would not have come to power and there would have been no Stalingrad and no GDR under Soviet control.

It is, however, easy to imagine quite different scenarios: Even if the Freikorps officers had not killed her, it is quite possible that Hitler and his Nazi thugs would have done so. There is also no guarantee that had Luxemburg lived on, she would have single-handedly been able to save the KPD from Russian domination. She might have been excluded from the party like so many others who fought for a more democratic form of Communism in the Soviet Union and in Germany, and forced into exile. When Müller claims in, *Ich bin ein Neger*, that the officers who killed her: "[. . .] haben die deutsche Revolution enthauptet und damit in Abhängigkeit gebracht von der russischen und damit eigentlich den Hitler vorbereitet" (12) he expresses the generally accepted view that had she lived, Luxemburg would have been able to prevent Hitler's rise in Germany because the KPD would have developed and increased in power rather than becoming subservient to the KPdSU: It goes without saying that this is a highly subjective view. According to Müller, however, the construction of the Berlin Wall was the ultimate outcome of Luxemburg's murder and the crime perpetrated against the KPD in 1919.

b) The Berlin Wall

Although it no longer plays a major role in the twenty-first century politics of Germany or Eastern Europe, the development and eventual downfall of the Berlin Wall, specifically relating to the GDR, remains an integral historical facet of German identity. The ideological concepts for which it stood influenced the European political arena for decades. Because of the important historical, political, and economic role played by the Berlin Wall since its construction in 1961 and its intertwining relationship to Luxemburg, Thälmann, and Ulbricht, it is an essential component of my analysis. As discussed in Chapter Three, the

of the proletariat, whenever it attains power, to create a socialist democracy in place of bourgeois democracy, not to abolish every kind of democracy."
GDR was represented by its leaders as the antifascist German state and the: "antifascist protective barrier," also known as the Berlin Wall, was legitimized in this very same fashion” as Jaeger maintains (47). It is impossible even today to think of the GDR without an image of this graffiti-covered (on the Western side only), concrete edifice also directly coming to mind: the two are inseparable as memories of a forty year experiment in Socialism that ultimately failed. But what kind of memories one retains of the Wall depends upon which side the viewer had lived: the capitalistic but free state or the antifascist but confining state. Sigrid Mayer writes in, "The Graffiti of the Berlin Wall: A Semiotic Approach": "In the case of the Berlin Wall we find a curious situation of two different addressees or audiences because the Wall speaks with a Janus face. In facing East the Wall addresses a different audience than it does in facing West" (214). The respective differing attitude concerning this tangible political barrier is reflected in the manner in which it was treated by the citizens of each German state: whereas in the West bold and colorful graffiti covered the Wall making it seem almost cheerful, in the East it was forced to remain grey and foreboding which gave it a frightening appearance. Frightening indeed is the adjective to describe the so-called "death strip": the space of land between East and West where barbed wire, guard towers, guard dogs, and armed Eastern border guards ensured the impassability of the Wall, where many innocent GDR citizens lost their lives: guilty only of wanting to escape to -- what they firmly believed -- would be a better life in the West. Whereas at the beginning political ideology as well as economic considerations were primarily responsible for building the Wall, at the end economic deprivation and frustration toppled it. In her essay, "Confronting the Wall: Images of the Berlin Wall in GDR Short Prose", Carol Anne Costabile-Heming writes: "For the citizens of East Berlin the Wall was a constant reminder of the division of Germany, a barrier which all had to confront and overcome" (99). In her examination of several prose stories in which various individuals and their respective dilemmas are presented, each tale has one
element in common, namely: each demonstrates that the Wall had an effect on the citizens of
the GDR who were forced to live under its shadow. Whereas some individuals risked their
lives to get past the armed border guards in order to start a new life in the FRG, some, like
Müller, who was able to travel freely to the West anyway, chose to remain within the
confines of the Wall and the GDR.

Nevertheless, the Berlin Wall held special significance for Müller because it provided
a tangible symbol for the differing political ideologies he includes in his "Germany" and
"German identity" plays. They are reflected in his use of the confrontational brothers theme
and the closely associated theme of betrayal. It symbolizes the conflict between German
brothers while emphasizing the ideological differences that separated them. In the
introduction to his book, A Heiner Müller Reader, Carl Weber writes:

During most of his life two mutually hostile sociopolitical systems confronted each
other, a global divide that had become manifest in the Berlin Wall. Müller saw this
crude edifice also as a symbol of German history, a history marked by fraternal
warfare since the first decade of the first millennium, when the nation's legendary
forefather, Arminius, fought his brother in the ranks of the Roman invaders (xxii).

Weber is, of course, referring to the scene, "The Brothers 1" in Germania Tod which has its
origins in Die Schlacht, as already discussed in Chapter Four. The concept of brotherly strife
because of differing political ideologies continued to represent an integral component of
German identity for Müller, now during his own lifetime, solidified and exemplified by the
Wall. A further example of this political division can be seen in Müller's perception of the
Berlin Wall in relation to the murder of Luxemburg and the subsequent events which altered
the course of the KPD forever. In 1986, only a few years before its downfall, he said the
following:

prepared the way for Hitler")
Müller is referring to the "SED", the official party of the GDR and its strong ties to the 
KPdSU, which developed after Luxemburg's vicious murder. He compares the SED to the 
Nibelung bride, Kriemhild, who married Attila in order to have the strength to exact revenge 
on her husband's murderers. The KPD/SED allied herself with the Soviet Union which was 
able to defeat and punish the nationalist Germans who were responsible for Luxemburg's 
murder and the destruction of the party at the hands of the Nazis. Thus the SED was able to 
establish a communist state after all, but no very different from Luxemburg's idea of such a 
state. It seems that Müller views the fact that a communist state could be established on 
German soil at all as positive, even if this state has to surround itself by a wall. The negative 
aspect is, obviously, that it is not the state for which Luxemburg and Müller had wished.

The Wall, as a symbol of the Cold War, lost its significance after the thawing of 
relations between the world's two superpowers. Its fall, therefore, corresponds to the breakup 
of the Soviet Union which, as a result, could no longer maintain the GDR economically or 
the SED politically. The political significance of the Wall eventually was superseded by other 
aspects in the relationship between East and West. As soon as the political differences 
became less important and the economic discrepancies became more noticeable and 
inacceptable to the people of the GDR, the Wall's existence was threatened and its downfall 
inevitable. In an interview with Arthur Holmberg in, "Heiner Müller: The Political Beast: A

12("And today one can, or I see the wall, for example, really as a monument for Rosa Luxemburg, positive and negative, and also for the GDR-party, which is a problem then as now. That is a party, which never had a victory itself, it is a conquered party, as Kriemhild was a conquered party, who then just married Attila in order to get revenge on Siegfried's murderers."))
never-before-published interview with the late German writer", Müller comments about the end of the Berlin Wall:

It was clear for two years that this wall had to come down. I won some money betting on it. In January 1989, I made one bet that the wall would be down in a year. It was no surprise to me. I lived in East Germany, and I knew how this system had failed and couldn't last any longer. The economy couldn't sustain itself (64).

Even though he was a privileged writer in the GDR, Müller was aware of the difficult economic and social situations present in his chosen homeland. Having been permitted to leave the GDR to travel to the FRG as well as the USA, he could see and examine for himself the glaring differences in the living standard and especially in the extent of personal freedom in regard to political affairs and private life. In his autobiography, Müller refers specifically to the disintegration of the GDR:


Müller attributes the ultimate downfall of the GDR to its lack of any real political development -- it relied totally on its antifascist roots, which were of little relevance to the

---

13("When you see that the tree is not bearing fruit anymore, that it is starting to rot, you take a look at the roots. In the GDR this stagnation was total during these years. Then everything that was lying below, under rubble or buried, comes up. There was no more movement, only putting on the brakes and fortification. The GDR, as an alternate design to German history, tangibly existing only in the false reasoning of its leadership stratum,
newer generation -- and its friendship to the Soviet Union with its stranglehold on its
economic and political independence. New ideas were rejected and condemned, and the state
was only being held together by its close association with and dependence on the Soviet
Union, with the GDR leadership even more petrified ideologically than its Soviet
counterparts. Given the developments between Washington and Moscow during the mid-
eighties and the more open policies of Moscow's leadership, which resulted in an altered
world order, it was only a matter of time until the GDR became the next victim of these
developments since its leadership was unable to take the initiative because of its ideological
training and the economically disastrous situation of the country. The subsequent fall of the
Wall which accompanied the demise of the GDR is the opening topic of Germania 3, which
begins with the appearance of two important figures from the history of the KPD and the
GDR.

c) Thälmann and Ulbricht

The first major characters to appear in the opening scene of Germania 3 Gespenster
am Toten Mann, "NÄCHTLICHE HEERSCHAU" ("Military Parade at Night"), are Ernst
Thälmann (1886-1944) and Walter Ulbricht (1893-1973). These two figures, both
presumably ghosts, are speaking outside at a guard tower near the Berlin Wall. There is no
specific time indicated but logically it must be at some point between 13 August 1961, when
construction of the wall officially began, and 9 November 1989, when the wall finally started
to officially crumble. Schmitt's comment: "Thälmann ist aus dem Totenreich gekommen, um
zusammen mit Ulbricht das kommunistische >>Heer<< zu betrachten" (183)\textsuperscript{14} implies that
only Thälmann has returned from the land of the dead, but given that Ulbricht died in 1973, it
is highly likely that he is also represented by Müller as a ghost here, returning briefly from
the underworld to view what has become of the communist experiment. Klaus Welzel also

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{14} reached its end, also determined by foreigners, by-product of the Soviet downfall. I was not aware of that then, I
only described it, the text knows more than the author.\textsuperscript{)}
\end{center}
considers it possible to view: "[. . .] beide Protagonisten der „Nächtlichen Heerschau“ als „Geister" vorstellbar" as he writes in Utopieverlust (135). The title of the scene can be primarily attributed to the poem, "Die Nächtliche Heerschau" by Joseph Christian Freiherr von Zedlitz (1790-1862) from 1832. Contrary to the content of Zedlitz's poem, in which

---

14(Thälmann has returned from the realm of the dead to observe, together with Ulbricht, the communist "army.")

15([. . .] both protagonists of "Military Parade at Night" visualized as "ghosts") Welzel's reasoning is based on the fact that Müller originally wrote this scene, "Nächtliche Heerschau" with its Thälmann-Ulbricht dialogue for Germania Tod (as I discussed in Chapter Three), which he began in 1956 and completed in 1971. Since the wall was not yet built in 1956, however, Welzel logically maintains that Müller must have written this scene in 1971. Welzel's claim that Ulbricht's death was "voraussichtig" (135) ("foreseeable") in 1971 and that, therefore, Müller presents him as a ghost in this scene in Germania 3 is, in my opinion, a weak argument. However, Müller originally intended to present Ulbricht, given that Germania 3 was written and completed more than two decades after Ulbricht's death, one can safely assume that his character is, therefore, comparable to that of a ghost.

16The title of Müller's scene is similar to the first scene in Brecht's Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1957), which he wrote in exile between 1935 and 1939, bears the title, "Die deutsche Heerschau" (7) and is an anti-war tirade against a war-loving tyrant, obviously Hitler, who claims he was sent by God. The original title of this play was: Deutschland -- ein Greuelmärchen which indicates that Müller seems to have followed Brecht's lead and continued this tradition of depicting Germany in the glaring and brutal light of day in Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann. The style of Brecht's play, which is consistent with Müller's style in both of his Germania plays, consists primarily of short scenes, twenty-four in all, which portray various individuals in dialogue with others and some aspect of Hitler, the Nazi, and the SS destruction of everyday German lives and relationships.

Napoleon is depicted in the afterlife as "Der todte Cäsar" reviewing his troops "im eelyseischen Feld", these two "ghosts" are not reviewing soldiers, rather the living GDR populace, which is only able to be restrained by intimidation and outright force within the walls of what has become the GDR prison.

The citizens of the GDR prove to be, however, less afraid of the deadly power of bullets than their anger at having to remain in this communist prison. In fact, the GDR resembles a tomb, in Müller's sardonic opinion, which is voiced by Thälmann in the opening line of the play: "Das Mausoleum des deutschen Sozialismus. Hier liegt er begraben" (7) ("The mausoleum of German socialism. It lies buried here"). As Thälmann and Ulbricht stand at the wall discussing the situation, they are incapable of understanding why the younger generation, in particular, wants to leave. The two former leaders believe that their people had a good life in the GDR because the government provided them with the necessities of life, yet they still desire to escape to the West. Ulbricht's comments to the young man who has just been captured demonstrate the former leader's bewilderment: "Was hast du verlorn bei den Kapitalisten. Was sollen wir noch in euch hineinstopfen" (8) ("What do you want from the capitalists. What else should we stuff you with"). The young man's reply: "Das nächste Mal besser" (8) ("The next time better") literally means that he, and others of his generation, will continue trying until they either succeed or are shot dead by the guards. The young men and women of the GDR would rather face probable death than remain caged in the communist state that could not deliver on its promises: this was the situation in the late eighties in the GDR.

Although Ulbricht is a ghost from the GDR's past, his lines also express the inability of his successor, Erich Honecker (1912-1994), General Secretary from 1971 until 1989, to

troops. // The rows present / And shoulder their arms, / Then with the music blaring / The whole army marches past. // The marshalls and generals / Close their ranks around him: / The emperor says to the one next to him / A soft word in his ear. // The word makes its way around, / Reverberates near and far: / "France" is the slogan, / The password: "Saint Helena!" -- // This is the great parade / In the Elysian field, / Which at the twelfth hour / The dead Caesar holds.")
comprehend the people's dissatisfaction with their way of life and the restrictions forced upon
them. The line spoken by Ulbricht: "Er ist nicht tot. Er kanns noch lernen" (8) ("He isn't dead. 
He can still learn") provides a continuation with Germania Tod: it was spoken by the
Nibelungs and by the Activist to the Young Bricklayer. It reflects a political idea directed
specifically at the younger generation and implies that as long as they are still alive, they can
learn about Marxist reality or will learn about it without any illusions. However, this phrase
possesses no power: the youth did not learn to love the GDR and many risked their lives in
order to escape from this communist prison. The common solution by Ulbricht and the SED
leadership was to put the young man in prison in order to rehabilitate him and teach him the
lessons of correct socialist behavior which will, however, only serve to further heighten his
and the people's hatred of the government and increase their desire to escape. Forcibly trying
to teach the citizens of the GDR the presumed right path of socialism by punishing them like
children only succeeds in further alienating them. As Schmitt also maintains, given such
action by the government, it is no wonder: "das [es] bei dem Betroffenen nur zu noch mehr
Abneigung gegen den eigenen Staat führte" (184). The policy of the SED towards its own
people created an atmosphere of fear which eventually turned into the even stronger emotions
of hatred, loathing, and contempt. The placement of the line: "Im Gefängnis" ("In prison")
directly preceding Thälmann's line: "Was haben wir falsch gemacht" (8) ("What did we do
wrong") insinuates that the answer lies at least partly in the citizens', particularly the younger
generation's, feeling that they are already living in a prison and, therefore, have nothing left
to lose. In addition, the vulgar and derogatory term used by Ulbricht to describe the homes
and residences of the GDR citizens as "Fickzellen" (7) ("cells for fucking"), and the
association of the word "cell" with a prison, strengthens the reader's impression that the GDR
is nothing more than a large prison. Clauß also sees this implication when he writes about
Müller's presentation of the GDR in this scene and the implication of the term "Fickzellen":

18("that it only led to increased aversion to one's own state by those affected")
"Zum ersten Mal wird sie direkt als Gefängnis für alle dargestellt" (43). Together with their ever-increasing resentment and anger against a governmental system that exploits the citizens while permitting the leaders and a small privileged group to enjoy the benefits, the citizens were filled with the desire and even the need to break free from their jailers even at the risk or cost of their own lives. Thus Müller's presentation of Thälmann and Ulbricht as incapable of understanding "what went wrong", is thus simultaneously the best example of "what went wrong".

Müller's placement of this open-ended question in the first scene of the play suggests that his plan was perhaps to present an answer to the question or at the very least to make the reader aware of the question and, thereby, embark on a search for his own answer or answers. The omission of proper punctuation, in this case a question mark, has led to a discussion as to what purpose this question i.e., statement serves within the play and is, therefore, a salient point worthy of a brief discussion here. Clauß mentions parenthetically that due to the lack of the official punctuation for a question, namely, a question mark, this line represents a rhetorical question (43). Clauß goes on to say, however, that this line: "steht leitmotivisch über allen folgenden Bildern, die dann die sowjetische Vorgeschichte der DDR und ihre eigene Geschichte bis 1956 untersuchen (um Antworten auf die Frage zu finden oder besser zu demonstrieren)" (43). He explicitly claims, albeit partly also parenthetically, that the images Müller presents are designed to answer or at least demonstrate the answers to this question. Schmitt argues in a footnote that he disagrees with Clauß that it is a rhetorical question because Müller does not use question marks anywhere in this play (184-185).

Schmitt, whose own views about this line: "Sie steht gewissermaßen als Angabe des Untersuchungsthemas über allen Szenen dieses Stücks, in denen es um die deutsche

---

19("For the first time it is directly portrayed as a prison for everyone")
20("It stands as a leitmotiv over all the following scenes of this play, which subsequently examine the Soviet prehistory of the GDR and its own history up to 1956 (to find answers to the question or give a better demonstration).")
kommunistische Bewegung geht" (185), otherwise fundamentally correspond to those of Clauß, focuses on Clauß's reference to the lack of punctuation as decisive for the critic's overall opinion. In concentrating on the term, "rhetorical question", Schmitt neglects to fully analyze Clauß's other comments and thus misrepresents his total interpretation as to the purpose of this line in Müller's play. Müller's choice of style here is similar to the Communist's (rhetorical) question, "Wer bin ich" in *Germania Tod* at the end of scene ten, which, incidentally, does not include a question mark either. Weber explains that Müller admired and imitated the style of the Russian writer, Vladimir Mayakovsky (1893-1930), who specifically ignored the rules of grammar and punctuation in order to express various "shades of emotions" (Reader 9). An additional possible explanation for Müller's lack of using the punctuation mark is found in his text, *Mommsen's Block*: "A document from the century of letter writers / The fear of solitude is hidden in the question mark / He who writes into the void has no use for punctuation" (Reader 127). Müller associates the use of a question mark with the expectation of an answer, but he does not expect an answer to his questions since he is writing for posterity, who must find their own answers. Thus all concern relating to proper punctuation may be put aside, because it is adequately clarified by the above explanations provided indirectly by Weber and Müller. The focus may, therefore, again be turned to the relevant discussion: the purpose behind Müller's inclusion and placement of Thälmann's line, "Was haben wir falsch gemacht". A possible answer to Thälmann's i.e., Müller's question can be seen in the targeted appearance of Luxemburg, who walks past at the end of this first scene together with her fellow murdered Spartacist, Liebknecht, and the two officers, Vogel and Runge.

The line from the popular song, "Die schwarzbraune Hexe" ("The dark-haired witch"), at the end of the scene which accompanies the appearance of Luxemburg with these officers: "ES BLIES EIN JÄGER WOHL IN SEIN HORN UND ALLES WAS ER BLIES

---

21 ("It stands so to speak as a notice about the topic of the investigation over all those scenes of this play which
DAS WAR VERLORN" ("A hunter blew on his horn and all that he blew that was lost"), is taken from a 1777 ballad by Friedrich Nicolai (1733-1811), next to Lessing one of the most important writers of the German Enlightenment period. Müller combines the ballad's theme, that of a hunter chasing a "schwarzbraune Hexe", with the political witch-hunt for and subsequent killing of the dark-haired communist Luxemburg: his use of this ballad can thus be seen as a metaphor for her murder. Schmitt also recognizes the hunting theme and even uses the term "Jagdmetaphorik", but he also emphasizes the substitution of a human being in place of an animal, which is usually the object of a hunt: "Sie erscheint in der Rolle eines erjagten Tieres. Der Menschenstatus wird ihr damit von ihren politischen Gegnern abgeräumt" (186). Müller's use of animal metaphoric here does, in fact, correspond to the historical treatment of Luxemburg by her enemies. Schmitt assumes that the hunter kills the girl at the deal with the German Communist movement.

The text of the ballad, "Die schwarzbraune Hexe":

1. Es blies ein Jäger wohl in sein Horn, wohl in sein Horn, / und alles was er blies, das war verlorn, / das war verlorn. / Eidihussasa, dirallala, und alles was er blies, das war verlorn. // 2. "Soll denn mein Blasen verloren sein? / verloren sein? / Ich wollte lieber kein Jäger sein." / Eidihussasa, [..] // 3. Er zog sein Netz wohl über den Strauch, / wohl über den Strauch, / Sprang ein schwarzbraunes Mädel heraus. / Eidihussasa, [..] // 4. "Schwarzbraunes Mädel, entspringe mir nicht, / entspringe mir nicht. / hab große Hunde, die holen dich." / Eidihussasa, [..] // 5. "Deine großen Hunde, / die holen mich nicht, / die holen mich nicht, / sie wissen meine hohe weite Sprünge noch nicht." / Eidihussasa, [..] // 6. "Deine hohe Sprünge, / die wissen sie wohl, / die wissen sie wohl, / sie wissen, daß du heute noch sterben sollst." / Eidihussasa, [..] // 7. "Sterbe ich nun, so bin ich tot, / so bin ich tot, / begräbt man mich unter die Röslein rot." / Eidihussasa, [..] // 8. "Wohl unter die Röslein, wohl unter den Klee, / wohl unter den Klee, / darunter verderb ich nimmermehr." / Eidihussasa, [..] // 9. Es wuchsen drei Lilien auf ihrem Grab, / auf ihrem Grab, die wollte ein Reuter wohl brechen ab. Eidihussasa, [..] // 10. Ach Reuter, laß die drei Lilien stahn, / die Lilien stahn, es soll sie ein junger frischer Jäger han. Eidihussasa, [..] Das Volksliederbuch, ed. Heinz Rölleke, (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1993) 216-217. ("1. A hunter blew on his horn, And everything that he blew, that was lost. / 2. Should then my horn playing be in vain? I would rather not be a hunter. 3. He threw his net over a bush, there jumped out a girl with dark skin and black hair. 4. Girl with dark skin and black hair, do not run away from me! I have large dogs, they will get you. 5. Your large dogs, they cannot get me, they do not yet know my high, broad jumps. 6. Your high jumps they do know, they know that you shall die today. 7. And if I die today, then I am dead, I will be buried under roses red. 8. Under the roses, under the clover, under them I will perish forevermore. 9. Three lilies grew upon her grave, upon her grave, a woodsman wanted to break them. 9. Oh, woodsman, let the lilies stand, the lilies stand, a young, frisky hunter shall have her.")

Referring to the degrading manner in which Luxemburg's murderers spoke of her, Müller writes: "[..] Und der war Feldjäger aus einem Feldjägerregiment. Und es gibt diesen berühmten Dialog zwischen ihm und dem Offizier, der ihm den Auftrag gegeben hat. Der Offizier sagt zu ihm, es war ein Leutnant glaube ich, oder nee, Oberleutnant, der sagte zu ihm: „Die Sau muß schwimmen." Das war Rosa Luxemburg. Und dann kam er nach einer Stunde und sagte: „Die Sau schwimmt schon.” Das ist die Geschichte." (Neger 11). Their statements reflect the historical fact that her body was thrown into the Spree. ("[..] And he was an infantry soldier from a cavalry regiment. And there is this famous dialogue between him and the officer, who gave him the mission. The officer said to him, it was a lieutenant I believe, or no, first lieutenant, who said to him: "The pig must
end of the song, which is, however, not necessarily the case: the last line implies that after the hunter catches the girl he then releases her so that a younger hunter shall have her, perhaps as his wife. The whole song is rather symbolic, just like Goethe's "Heidenröslein" (little rose on the heath"): the girl acts like a doe, the actual prey of the hunter, but in this instance he is hunting not for game, but for a wife.25 Thus Müller's interest in this borrowed text is primarily for the hunting analogy which it offers. In addition, Thälmann's lines earlier in the scene, referring specifically to the "death strip" and the constant search for GDR citizens trying to escape, associate the "Jäger" or hunting theme song with Runge's title of "Feldjäger": "Mit Hunden gegen die eigne Bevölkerung. Das ist die rote Jagd" (7) ("With dogs against one's own people. That is the red hunt"). Müller employs this hunting theme in reference to the murder of Luxemburg and Liebknecht to emphasize the dire situation faced by the German Communists following the First World War, which became life threatening after Hitler assumed power in 1933. Thus the weakened, or as Müller refers to it, "decapitated" KPD was no match for the Nazis' brutality and the ruthlessness of their "red hunt". These two leaders were the first to fall among a score of others who would be hunted down and removed from the political scene by imprisonment or death.

Müller's inclusion of Luxemburg here and in this manner sets the tone for the play as he implies that her murder was the first major defeat for the KPD, from which it was never able to recover, and which led to further setbacks. Carl Weber also considers "the theme of the play established" with this scene's final image (Reader 180). Schmitt views Luxemburg's appearance here as an answer to Thälmann's question of what went wrong, namely: the future German leaders of the KPD did not follow the democratic path set out by Luxemburg, rather:

"[. . .] sich dem Sowjetkommunismus unterordneten und dann in der DDR mit von der

---

25"Rosenbrechen" was a common theme during the Middle Ages to refer to a girl's loss of innocence, which Goethe later uses in his text: see Das Volksliederbuch, 146-147.
KPdSU übernommenen stalinistisch-diktatorischen Methoden regierten" (185-186). After Luxemburg's disappearance from the political scene, events occurred within Germany, which are discussed below, to which the KPD leaders had to respond: their responses helped to shape the party's future dependence on Stalin. While Müller's overall structure of the play does not offer the reader a direct presentation of events which specifically led to the downfall of the GDR, as the end of this first scene suggests, he does include characters and events which ultimately led to first the creation and then the destruction of the GDR, including the relationship between Hitler and Stalin, the consequences of Stalingrad, and the resulting German-Soviet aggression. The main constellations which Müller depicts in the remaining scenes not only emphasize this aggression, they are designed to demonstrate that based on such a troubled and shaky foundation, there was no other course the GDR could have taken. Sybille Wirsing's assertion in her essay, "Der Augang der Geschichte", that there really is no conflict in this play, except for the first scene between Thälmann and Ulbricht and that Müller does not pursue an answer to the question: "Was haben wir falsch gemacht" (35), is not entirely accurate. Each of the subsequent scenes and their respective themes present the author's perspective on the historical course of Germany and the GDR. Of course it would be too simple to believe that the murder of Luxemburg (and Liebknecht) is solely responsible for the dilemma of German Communism: her death is only one of the events which helped shape German identity and the subsequent course of German politics. Her brief presence in this scene is only an indication of one of the problems which faced the KPD and contributed to its potential course. While it is unrealistic to expect Müller to have all of the answers to questions which occupy historians and politicians even today, such as why the GDR did not succeed, *Germania 3* (similar to *Germania Tod*, which was his attempt to discover the possible reasons for the development of post-World War II German identity) is a reflection of

26("[.] subordinated themselves to Soviet communism and then governed with the stalinistic-dictatorial methods which they had adopted from the Soviet Communist Party.")
his search for German identity in the post-reunification era. This search automatically raises
the question: what went wrong with German Communism (the KPD) in the GDR.

Although it does not fall within the scope of this dissertation to answer that question,
in the course of my analysis I will discuss various aspects from Germany's modern past which,
from Müller's perspective, relate to the origins and subsequent demise of the GDR. In any
case, the presentation of this question forces the reader or theater audience to ponder the
relationship of modern German history -- both East and West -- to current and future German
identity. In her essay, "Enlightenment or Entanglement", Fehervary asks a similar question,
also designed to shed light on the possible reasons for the developments leading to and
occurring in the GDR: "Why, contrary to Brecht's expectations, did Ernst Thälmann and the
German working class not follow in the footsteps of Lenin and the Bolsheviks?" (85). In my
opinion, Müller does not directly pursue the answer to his question in the course of his play,
but the reader who looks closely at his representations and straightforward images can reach
his own conclusions. He again turns to the past, particularly to the German and Soviet
dictators, Stalingrad, and the significant year 1956, in his attempt to present a view of the
path to the GDR, but his images are often limited to the political ideological dichotomy
which consumed his perspective of German identity. His presentation of a series of scenes
using the collage style does not offer any substantial connections or associations, as is the
case with the parallel scenes in Germania Tod, for example. Whether or not Müller offers a
direct answer to the puzzling dilemma of what happened to German Communism and what
went wrong in the GDR, his style leads the reader or audience to think for itself and to
consider possible answers while reading or observing, respectively, the subsequent scenes.

In an attempt to explain the significance of Thälmann and Ulbricht in the opening
scene of Germania 3, I now turn to a brief overview of the historical facts concerning the
KPD and these two communist leaders: one of whom was transformed into a legend to be
exploited by the SED for purely political purposes. Thälmann, besides Luxemburg and
Liebknecht, is the figure most strongly associated with the KPD during the period of the Weimar Republic, as Hermann Weber writes in his essay, "Thälmann und Stalin, die KPdSU und die KPD" (11). Contrary to the democratic form of Communism promoted by Luxemburg, Thälmann was committed to following the directives of the KPdSU and Stalin. The development of the KPD after the murders of its leaders, Luxemburg and Liebknecht, coincides with the three phases of the Weimar Republic as Weber describes them: 1) the Republic's revolutionary post-war phase which lasted until 1923, during which the KPD tried to gain power through revolts; 2) the Republic's stabilisation phase which lasted from 1924 until 1929, during which the KPD underwent the Stalinisation process and; 3) the Republic's crisis situation beginning in 1930 until its end, during which the KPD became the third strongest party while following and implementing Stalin's "ultralinke Kurs" ("ultra-left course") by which it declared Social Democracy its "Hauptfeind" ("principal enemy") (12). The ultimate downfall of the Weimer Republic and the accompanying elimination of the KPD was brought about by continuous internal differences among various factions which eventually ruined the infrastructure, a process set and kept in motion by the powerful external force of the National Socialist movement led by Hitler. Thälmann, who was Chairman of the KPD from 1925 until 1933, was arrested by the SA on 3 March 1933, placed in a concentration camp, and shot at Buchenwald on 18 August 1944. Weber states that Thälmann was Stalin's "treuer Gefolgsmann in Deutschland"; he was, however, abandoned by Stalin. This made Thälmann, in Weber's opinion: "nicht nur Hitlers, sondern indirekt auch Stalins Opfer" (12). In order to understand how this circumstance could occur and to realize the truth of Weber's claim, it is necessary to consider the events which led to Thälmann's rise within the

27 According to the Leipzig version of the encyclopedia in the appendix, Thälmann "setzte sich für die Freundschaft des dt. Volkes mit der sozialist. Sowjetunion ein" (114) ("engaged himself on behalf of the friendship of the German people with the socialist Soviet Union"), which presents him in a favorable manner in relation to the Soviet leaders.

28 ("loyal follower in Germany"; "not only Hitler's, but indirectly also Stalin's victim")
KPD and his eventual status as a political legend in the GDR, even though he had been voted out of the KPD in 1928.

Thälmann was almost expelled from the KPD in 1928 due to the "Wittorf affair". John Wittorf, the political secretary of the KPD regional division in Hamburg, had embezzled money from the organization, and his friend and associate, Thälmann, tried to keep it a secret as long as possible. This action almost cost him his position in the party, but due to the support of Stalin, who was in the process of eliminating his main rival, Bucharin, from the Kommunistische Partei der Soviet Union or KPdSU ("Communist Party of the Soviet Union"), he managed to politically survive this difficulty. The members of the Zentralkomitee ("Central Committee") or ZK of the KPD reversed their decision to remove Thälmann, something which had never happened before in the history of the German workers' movement, as Klaus Kinner writes in his essay, "Ernst Thälmann - Mythos und Realität" (37). Thälmann was thus able to retain his position and he, along with the KPD, became utterly dependent on Stalin, who continued to gain power, making a reversal of this course of action and the future independence of the KPD from the KPdSU increasingly difficult and highly unlikely. Kinner confirms the unfortunate result of these actions: "Damit war Thälmann endgültig an die nach Bucharins Niederlage von Stalin beherrschte Führung der Komintern wie der KPdSU(B) gebunden" (37).29 The fatal mistake made by the KPD in 1928 was its inability to see the long-term repercussions of its decision to reinstate Thälmann at the behest of Stalin. By reversing its own decision, it lost its autonomy and committed itself to the rule of Stalin. As Kinner explains: "Letzlich ging es um nicht mehr und nicht weniger als die Selbstbestimmung der Partei. Mit der Rücknahme ihres Beschlusses über die Amtsenthbung Thälmanns entmannte sich die KPD gegenüber der dominierenden Stalin-

29 ("With that Thälmann was, as well as the KPdSU ruled by Stalin after the defeat of Bucharin, definitively tied to the leadership of the comintern.")
Fraktion in der KPdSU" (37). In spite of or perhaps due to this affair and Thälmann's obligation towards Stalin, he and the KPD became subjugated to the political whims of Stalin and his political pawn. As a further result of this alternative path taken by the KPD, it was unprepared to face the fascist threat posed by Hitler only five years later, which claimed Thälmann as one of its first social democratic or communist victims with many more to follow.

Due to his execution by the Nazis in 1944, Thälmann was to become a martyr for the communist cause later in the GDR. In her essay, "Liturgie statt Erinnerung: Die Schaffung eines Heldenbildes am Beispiel Ernst Thälmanns", Annette Leo maintains that there were two types of Thälmann-cult which coexisted in the GDR: the official image used by the SED for its propaganda purposes; and the secret, even rebellious, hope beating in the hearts of older workers who yearned for a viable alternative to the official Socialism found in the GDR, which they believed died with "Teddy" Thälmann, as he was affectionately known (17-18). After his arrest by the Nazis, Thälmann became "vor allem im Ausland zu einem Symbol für die verfolgte deutsche Arbeiterbewegung" (Leo 22). In addition, his murder at Buchenwald, presumably by the SS-man, Wolfgang Otto (Leo 27), made him ideally suited to assume the image of a martyr, which the SED, ironically following along an established Nazi tradition demonstrated by Müller again and again in Germania Tod, quickly realized could be used for propaganda purposes. The "Wittorf Affair" of 1928 was never mentioned, however, by the SED leadership, which swept such unpleasant truths under the proverbial rug. As Bernhard H. Bayerlein writes in his essay, "Ernst Thälmann: Vom >>Fall<< zur Parabel des Stalinismus?": "In der DDR wurde der Ursprungsskandal einfach wegretuschiert" (42).

Although Thälmann became a prisoner of the Nazis early on and had less influence on the

---

30(“Ultimately it was no more and no less about the self-determination of the Party. With the withdrawal of its decision concerning Thälmann's dismissal from office, the KPD emasculated itself in the face of the dominating Stalin-fraction in the KPdSU.”)

31(“particularly in foreign countries a symbol for the persecuted German workers' movement”)

32("In the GDR the original scandal was simply retouched away")
political situation than the SED claimed, he nevertheless, as Leo writes: "wurde zum Symbol des Antifaschismus, zum Symbol der führenden Rolle der SED in der Gesellschaft" (27).

Thus Thälmann represents a significant aspect of German identity in the GDR as it relates to German Communism and its historical path.

Ironically, on the same day as Hitler departed Germany forever by committing suicide, 30 April 1945, Ulbricht, who had left in 1933 with Hitler's political ascent, was making final preparations to leave Moscow, where he had been living during the war after briefly residing first in Paris, then in Prague. On 1 May 1945, after twelve years of exile, he returned to his homeland, accompanied by Soviet officers and his so-called "Gruppe Ulbricht", to commence rebuilding Germany and the KPD under Soviet guidance. After the establishment of the GDR in October 1949 he became Deputy Premier and in 1950 he was named Secretary General of the ZK of the SED, a position he retained until he was forced to resign in 1971, supposedly for health reasons, but in fact because he had lost favor with the SED leadership. Müller's placement of Thälmann next to Ulbricht is based somewhat on historical fact, since Ulbricht had led the ZK's last meeting in 1932 at the Sporthaus Ziegenhals in Niederlehme, outside of Berlin, as Mario Frank writes in, Walter Ulbricht: Eine deutsche Biografie (94). Borrowing from the popular Thälmann persona or cult, the General Secretary used the anniversary date of 7 February 1953 not only to commemorate Thälmann's speech of that night twenty years earlier, which had been interrupted by the intrusion of the SA, but also to legitimize the current practices of his own party. Leo draws a compelling parallel to Stalin's funeral oration for Lenin in 1924 and Ulbricht's memorial speech about Thälmann in 1953 to support her claim that each leader's speech: "legitimierte die Politik und den Herrschaftsanspruch seiner Nachfolger" (26). Both leaders had looked to their popular predecessors for a means to help further their own reputations and enhance

33 ("became a symbol for antifascism, a symbol of the leading role of the SED in society")
34 ("legitimized the politics and the claim to rule of their successors")
their claim to power, whether fully legitimate or not. Only one month after Stalin's death and his subsequent fall from grace, the SED was again able to capitalize on Thälmann in his new function as the GDR's: "Ersatzobjekt für den Kult, eine eigene nationale Heldenfigur, die an die Stelle des bald darauf ins Zwielicht geratenen Stalins treten konnte (Leo 26)." 35 Ironically, the German Communist who sold out to but was later abandoned by his Soviet leader, came to symbolize the best of German Communism in the GDR and inherited the deceased Soviet leader's positive image in the GDR after Stalin's fall.

Returning to the text, while the two characters, Thälmann and Ulbricht, stand and observe the "death strip", the strip of land between East and West where people trying to escape the GDR were automatically shot, and contemplate the demise of what they believe was the communist haven, the GDR, Thälmann is reminded of a "Genosse" at Buchenwald who had survived the Battle of Teruel. 36 Having witnessed the dead Moroccans, this "Comrade" described to Thälmann the German Communists' fellow martyrs at the Battle of Teruel in 1938 during the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). This battle was viewed afterwards by most of the world as a forerunner to World War II because it represents a struggle between the socialist or communist state of the Republicans and the rival fascist forces of the Nationalists which, therefore, made it of particular interest to Müller. Benito Mussolini (1883-1945), the leader of the Partito Nazionale Fascista or PNF from 1922-1943, the self-proclaimed Il Duce, 37 together with parts of Hitler's Air Force secretly supported Francisco Franco (1892-1975) and his army of fascist rebels. Britain, France, and the USA, fearful of the communist threat, not interested in giving aid to a socialist nation, but their inability to recognize the potential threat posed by fascism would soon have disastrous repercussions for

35("substitution for the cult, its own national heroic figure, which was able to take the place of Stalin who soon afterwards was seen in an unfavorable light")
36Welzel incorrectly refers to Thälmann as "Der Spanienkämpfer"("The fighter in Spain") (135) but it is Thälmann's "Genosse" at Buchenwald who fought in and was present at the Battle of Teruel during the Spanish Civil War and told his tale to Thälmann.
37He developed his own legend of "Il Duce": a man who never slept, was always right, and had all the answers to political and economic problems.
the rest of Europe. The Battle of Teruel and the bombing of Guernica by German planes were only a foretaste of horrors yet to come. Thälmann's line: "Woher sollten sie wissen, wer ihre Feinde sind" (8) ("How should they know, who their enemies are") serves to establish a pre-World War II connection to Germany which, unfortunately, had succumbed to the fascist power. Therefore, the German Communists were not in a position to help the nacionales of Spain against Franco, who established his own dictatorship following his victory in the civil war. Meanwhile in Germany, Hitler, who had become the undisputed fascist leader in 1933, was making final preparations for his invasion of Poland in 1918; it would catapult Europe into the next world war. The repercussions of Luxemburg's murder: the alternate course chosen by the KPD's new leadership and its inability to prevent the rise of Hitler, were about to cause a collision between two distinct ideologies embodied by two powerful dictators: Hitler and Stalin. The following section focuses on Stalin: his role in European and German history, how he influenced German identity, and how Müller depicts these aspects in Gemania 3.

V.1.2 Stalin's Legacy

a) Stalinism

Josef Wissarionowitsch Dschugaschwili, known as Stalin, meaning "der Stählerne" ("the man of steel"), was born in the region of Georgia in Russia in 1879 and died in Moscow on March 5, 1953, at the age of seventy-four. His desire and ability to hold on to power at all costs meant imprisonment and most likely death for his rivals and potential adversaries. He is responsible for the deaths of millions of innocent men, women, and children in Siberian gulags or forced labor camps, where he had also spent several years. His legacy was strongly felt in the GDR as well, even three months after his death when the German leadership of the SED chose to call in Soviet tanks to help suppress the workers' strike on the now infamous date, 17 June 1953. As a young man, Stalin was often at odds with local authorities which caused him to adopt the nickname "Koba", generally credited to be the name of a famous
Georgian outlaw. Stalin ruled with an iron hand and only his policies were acceptable -- all his opponents were systematically crushed.

The term "Stalinism" denotes the specific brand of communism which was dominant in the Soviet Union during the rule of the dictator Stalin, based on his economic and political policies; primarily the introduction of the "New Economic Policy" or NEP in 1921 and forced collectivization of the peasantry from 1929-33. It is also categorized by the repression of all competing ideologies of the left and right, and by the imprisonment or murder of their adherents. Hannah Arendt's description of it as a form of totalitarianism is very apt and has become widely accepted. Stalin preferred to call his system, "Marxism- Leninism", reflecting the dictator's interpretation of the political texts of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, but his interpretation is in general considered a perversion of the ideas behind Marxism and Leninism. Contrary to Bucharin, for example, Stalin was not a theoretician and did not add any theoretical ideas to those of Marx and Lenin, rather he used their theories to build his political power base. According to Weber, Stalinism: "[. . .] ging zwar aus dem Leninismus hervor, aber er war die Negierung vieler Prinzepien des Leninismus" (Wandlungen 47).

Although Stalin built upon many of Lenin's basic theories, he manipulated the existing structures to acquire and then maintain absolute power. Stalin developed his power base in the 1920s with the help of the so-called "Apparat" which Weber describes as: "[. . .] die hauptamtlichen Angestellten in Partei, Verwaltung, Wirtschaft, Massenorganisationen und Kommunikationsmitteln, das Offizierskorps der Armee und die Geheimpolizei [. . .]" who ruled "[. . .] als politisch und materiell privilegierte Oberschicht über Arbeiter, Bauern und Intelligenz" (Wandlungen 47). Similar to the efforts of Czar Peter the Great (1672-1725) over two centuries earlier and building upon Lenin's established legacy, Stalin's goal was to improve the backward Soviet economy and modernize it so that it could compete with those

---

38 ("[. . .] it originated from Leninism, but it was the negation of many of Leninism's principles")
of the West. During the 1930s, his two five-year plans were designed to achieve this goal, which was attained, however, at the cost of millions of innocent lives through forced labor, random executions, and the mass murder of Stalin's real or perceived opponents. In his essay, "Stalinism and the Restructuring of Revolutionary Utopianism", Richard Stites compares the Soviet revolutionaries of the 1920s and their plan to slowly develop a Socialist state and those of the 1930s, in particular Stalin, who attempted to force the process of Socialism by means of propaganda, intimidation, persecution, and other means of state control and violence. Stites succinctly summarizes Stalin's regime of terror which was a result of these efforts:

Stalin's ruthless despotism and his colossal thirst for total power led him to create one of the vastest and most sophisticated political machines in history, founded on principles of information collection and retrieval, secrecy and paranoia, the cynical use of people, moral corruption, gratuitous violence, and a fantasmagoric belief in the potential treachery of everyone outside the inner circle of power (80).

By employing every dishonest and manipulative means available to him, this Georgian revolutionary developed into a ruthless dictator who maintained ultimate control at the expense of many innocent lives. Stalin wielded his empire with an iron hand from which no one was safe if his paranoid mind even suspected the slightest betrayal. Müller focuses on Stalin's paranoia and his path to power in scene two.

Stalin delivers a monologue in scene two, "PANZERSCHLACHT" ("Tank Battle"), which takes place in the Russian Kremlin. He speaks primarily in blank verse, except when he uses prose to speak to the visions of Lenin and Trotsky. There is only one line spoken by

---

39 "[. . .] the fulltime employees in the party, administration, economy, departments for organisation of the masses and communication, the officers' corps of the army and the secret police"; "as a politically and materially privileged upperclass above workers, peasants and the intelligence [. . .]")

40 In his conversation with Erich Fried, "Erich Fried -- Heiner Müller. Ein Gespräch, geführt am 16.10.1987 in Frankfurt/Main" Müller explains that, after having been unable to find a suitable way to include Stalin in a play for decades, he finally found his inspiration in the third part of a Stalingrad trilogy by the Russian author, Basilij Großmann, entitled, Leben und Schicksal (45) ("life and destiny").
another character, a Russian officer, who informs Stalin that the Germans are attacking: "Die Deutschen greifen an, Genosse Stalin (12) ("The Germans are attacking, Comrade Stalin"). This event signifies that the date must be 22 June 1941, the day Hitler's forces invaded the Soviet Union. In A History of the USSR from Lenin to Khrushchev, Louis Aragon describes Stalin's state of mind before the German attack: "Stalin had convinced himself that Hitler would not make war against the USSR. This opinion was to have tragic consequences. Stalin was certain of being right: he paid no attention to anyone else and he made his decisions alone" (356). In true dictatorial fashion, Stalin kept the reins of control tightly in his hands and refused to entertain the thought that he could be mistaken. Aragon confirms that Stalin had been amply warned that Hitler was preparing for an attack on the USSR by "Allied governmental sources", "Soviet security services, frontier guards, generals, members of the diplomatic corps, sympathizers with the USSR in the neighboring countries and in Germany herself" but: "Stalin thought he knew better" (357). Stalin's lines reflect his disbelief that Hitler actually broke their pact: "Wache. Reisst ihm die Zunge aus. Er lügt. / Ich hätt es wissen müssen, ich zuerst. / Ein Witz der Adler der dem Geier traut. / Und nackt steh ich vor seinen Divisionen / Kopflos meine Armee. Hätt ich sie nicht / Erschiessen lassen, meine Generäle. / Ich musste sie erschiessen lassen, wie. / Verdacht ist Schuld, Verräter überall / Besser ein Tod zuviel als einen Dolch / Im Rücken [. . .]" (12) ("Guards. Tear out his tongue. He is lying. / I should have known it, I first. / A joke the eagle trusting the vulture. / And I stand naked before his divisions / Headless my army. Should I not have them executed, my generals. / I had to have them shot, hmm. / Suspicion is guilt, traitors everywhere / Better one death too many than a dagger / In the back [. . .]"). During his purges in the years before Hitler's attack on Russia, Stalin had many of his generals and officers executed for fear they would try to wrest power from him and, therefore, he stood facing the enemy with few experienced generals to lead his army.
Stalin's past actions lead him to introspection as he poses the existential question, "Wer bin ich" ("Who am I") to which he offers his own negative answer: "Tot ist tot. Ich mein Gefängnis / In dem ich eingesperrt bin lebenslang / Und wer kann Stalin töten ausser Stalin" (11) (Dead is dead. In my prison / In which I am imprisoned for a lifetime / And who can kill Stalin but Stalin"). These words reflect the metaphysical aspect of identity by which an individual searches for a deeper meaning about himself and his purpose or reason in life. Müller shows Stalin expressing doubt about his own existence; an existence in which he is prisoner in a prison he has created for himself. In his monologue, Müller shows Stalin, a ghost from the modern past, as a powerful and brutal ruler who inspires fear in his comrades and subjects, yet at the same time is filled with paranoia and self-doubt. His fear that his followers and comrades actually hate him and would welcome his death is countered by his realization that he wields such power that they would not dare harm him, even if he ordered it, for fear of his duplicity and subsequent retribution: "Sie hassen mich, warten auf meinen Tod / Und keiner wagt ein Wort, feig sind sie alle. / Wenn ich mein Todesurteil unterschreibe / Stalin ist ein Verräter tötet Stalin / Stalin befehlt es, werden sie gehorchen / Weil keiner mir zu widersprechen wagt. Oder auch nicht, aus Angst vor einer Falle" (11) (They hate me, are waiting for my death / And not one dares say a word, they are all cowards. / If I were to sign my execution warrant / Stalin is a traitor kill Stalin / Stalin orders it, they will obey / Because not one dares to oppose me. Or perhaps not, for fear of a trap"). His words reveal not only a tyrant but a man in the crisis of self-doubt who, therefore, turns briefly to self-examination. Even though Stalin was not appointed supreme commander-in-chief of the armies of the USSR until August 1941 (Aragon 367), his authority was unquestioned by his subordinates. Aragon refers to the historical fact: "The unwillingness to go against the commander-in-chief's orders calls to mind a shocking remark that Stalin made to Averell Harriman: 'In our army, it needs more courage to retreat than to advance' " (Aragon 371). In spite of the

41 Harriman was an American businessman and leader of the American delegation to Moscow in September
German armies' close proximity and the dangerous threat they posed, even Stalin's newly-appointed generals were afraid to disobey one of his orders, given his brutal reactions and the recent purges which had obliterated most of his officers corps.

In his interview with Becker, Müller explains his portrayal of the Stalin character: "Bei Stalin war für mich der zentrale Satz ein Ausspruch von Stalin selbst, den der Marschall Schukov aus einem seiner letzten Gespräche mit Stalin zitiert. Er habe gesagt: <<Schukow, ich bin der unglücklichste Mensch der Welt. Ich habe Angst vor meinem eigenen Schatten.>>" (22-23). Nevertheless, for Müller the legacy left by Stalin remains that of a dictator and mass murderer. In his essay, "Väterchen Stalin und die rote Rosa oder Trotzki als Transvestit", Carlos Guimarães tries to explain Müller's ambivalent stance when writing about Stalin: on the one hand, he is the strong "Feldherr" ("commander-in-chief") who defeats the German army at Stalingrad; but on the other, he is deadly afraid so that he "vor Angst zittert" ("shakes fearfully") while the German advance troops enter the suburbs of Moscow and approach the Kremlin (114). By juxtaposing Hitler against Stalin, Müller demonstrates their similarities as dictators. As such, each is egocentric and views the world from his own standpoint, as Stalin's lines demonstrate: ",[. . .] Was für Lärm an meiner Grenze. Die Deutschen greifen an. Wer sind die Deutschen / Ein Haufen Kleinvieh am Westrand von Asien / Warum der kalte Schweiss auf meiner Stirn. / Vergessen wer ich bin. Der grosse Stalin. / Ich habe Angst vor meinem eignen Schatten" (12) ("[. . .] Such a noise at my border. The Germans are attacking. Who are the Germans / A herd of small animals at the western edge of Asia / Why the cold sweat on my brow. / Forgotten who I am. The great Stalin. / I am afraid of my own shadow").

In spite of Stalin's brief bout with fear, in which he questions his own significance and the meaning of his existence, by the end of his monologue Müller has him again in control of

---

1941 who served as Ambassador to Moscow from 1943 until 1946.
his emotions and thoughts and ready to face his enemy. Guimarães refers to Müller's dual presentation of the Stalin character: one who demonstrates his egocentricity by placing the Soviet Union at the center of the world: "[...\] wenn der Georgier die 'Peripherie' als Zentrum setzt, sein Zentrum"; yet simultaneously one who is "voller Angst (115). Müller also presents Stalin as a clever statesman, who understood the game of European politics. The following lines reflect this aspect: "Ich weiss die Träume die herumgehn, Churchill / In deinem whiskyschwabbenden Gehirn: / Den Teufel treibt man mit dem Teufel aus / Der eine bricht dem andern das Genick / Braun gegen Rot Rot gegen Braun wäscht weiss" (11-12) ("I know the dreams that are circulating, Churchill / In your whisky-soaked mind: / The devil gets exorcised by the devil / One breaks the other's neck / Brown against red red against brown washes white"). The color brown, of course, refers to the Nazis or "brown shirts" and the color red refers to the Communists. Ironically, the other European and world leaders felt that the Soviet Union was a more dangerous threat than Germany and were thus more interested in preventing Stalin's possible rise than in controlling Hitler. According to: "[...] the testimony of one of Roosevelt's sons on Churchill's state of mind" at a meeting with Stalin in August 1941: "[...] the writer wondered whether what the British Empire wanted to see were not the Germans and the Russians mutually destroying one another, while the Empire itself became stronger and stronger" (Aragon 368). Unfortunately, their miscalculation eventually led to the very result they had feared: after Stalingrad and Germany's ultimate defeat, and the formation of the GDR under Moscow's control: Stalin was in control of most of middle Europe.

In addition to Hitler, Stalin also refers specifically to Bucharin, Lenin, and Trotsky during his monologue. He describes Bucharin in the following terms: "Das war Bucharin, der Liebling der Partei. / Ich brauchte ihn zum Feind, er war der Beste" (9) ("That was Bucharin,

42 ("For me the central sentence concerning Stalin was a statement by Stalin himself, which Marshal Schukov quoted from one of his last conversations with Stalin. He said: 'Schukow, I am the most unhappy person in the world. I am afraid of my own shadow.' ")
the favorite of the Party. / I needed him as an enemy, he was the best”). Nicolai Ivanovich Bucharin, the "favorite of the whole party", as Lenin refers to him in one of his last official political writings was an extremely intelligent individual whose interests revolved around economics, philosophy, and sociology. According to Lenin, Bucharin would become Bolshevism's "biggest theoretician" as Stephen F. Cohen explains in Bucharin and the Bolshevik Revolution (14). Stalin and Bucharin first met in Vienna when Lenin instructed them to work together on an article about "Marxism and the National Question" in 1913 (Cohen 21). But on 15 March 1938, only three days after Hitler's army marched into Austria, Bucharin was executed as a result of Stalin's vicious intrigues. This talented theoretician had realized that his trial would be "his last public appearance and opportunity to give meaning to his death" and as such he accepted "the symbolic role of representative Bolshevik" (Cohen 375). His death signified the official end of Russian Bolshevism and heralded in the unimpeded advancement of Stalinism.

Stalin scorns Lenin Wladimir Iljitsch (1870-1924), "der bedeutendste Führer des Weltproletariats" (Germania 3, Appendix, East 101) ("the most significant leader of the world proletariat"), whose efforts on behalf of the German proletariat for a German revolution ended with Hitler's accession to power. In Impressions of Lenin, Angelica Balabanoff, a native of the Ukraine, Russian citizen, and fellow comrade and Bolshevik, describes her observations and views about Lenin, with whom she worked closely until she left Russia and the communist party in 1918. She believes that in his search to attain human equality for workers, Lenin deliberately excluded them from the thought process and thus "was also creating the most deadly and humiliating hierarchies: thought control from above" (Impressions 11). Stalin was able to take advantage of this method to pursue his own policies of repression and subjugation until there was no resistance left. Balabanoff explains further:

43("[. . .] when the Georgian sets the periphery as the center, his center","full of fear")
It must be conceded that without Lenin there would have been no Stalin, even if Stalin was only a monstrous caricature of the founder of Bolshevism. From the very beginning of his career as a revolutionist Stalin embraced Lenin's theory and methods; the repulsive traits he revealed as a dictator were developed under Lenin's regime. The apparatus devised by Lenin made it possible for individuals like Stalin to develop their innate wickedness. Given his intellectual insignificance and lack of initiative, Stalin could not have been an innovator like Lenin (137).

Stalin was dependent upon the intelligence and innovation of others, particularly Lenin, to aid him in achieving his own selfish goal of brutal domination. Lenin's primary interest was in improving conditions for the working masses, but rather than following in his footsteps and developing an enduring utopian state for the workers, Stalin created "the single utopia of Stalinism" (Stites 78). After Lenin's death and despite his final warnings in his political testament, Stalin was able to assume power in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Rather than continue along Lenin's path to reach a Socialist state, this self-proclaimed Russian "man of steel" proved himself an equal to the German dictator and was, in fact, able to defeat him. As an ultimate result of this defeat, Stalin was eventually able to establish his dictatorship in the Soviet Union and maintain control in the GDR until his death.

Stalin briefly turns his attention to Leo Dawidowitsch Bronstein, known as Leo Trotsky (1877-1940), the Bolschevist politician who led the October revolution of 1917 at Lenin's side. Trotsky, who had helped to form the Red Army as Kriegskommissar ("War Commissioner") from 1918-1925 and successfully put down the Kronstadt Uprising in 1921, which saved the Communist Party, was banned from the Communist Party in 1927 and exiled from the Soviet Union in 1929 by Stalin, who feared his influence in the military establishment. Trotsky lived in Mexico until he was attacked with an ice pick by Stalin's assassin, Raymónd Mercader, in a suburb outside of Mexico City on 20 August 1940 and succumbed to his injuries the following day. Stalin's lines: "Trotzki der Jude, der den Banquo
spielt / Das Beil im Schädel. Es ist ein Stuhl, sonst nichts. / Warum sich fürchten vor einem leerem Stuhl" (9) ("Trotsky, the Jew, who plays the role of Banquo / The axe in his skull. It is only a chair, nothing more. / Why be afraid of an empty chair") refer to a character in Shakespeare's and Müller's play *Macbeth*. In an obvious parallel between Macbeth and Stalin's actions and monologue, the title character sends his assassins to murder Banquo and his son because he views them as a threat to his power, which he acquired through murder, similar to Stalin. Whereas Trotsky is killed with an ice pick and not an axe, Banquo is murdered in the following manner: "Mörder 1 schneidet ihm die Gurgel durch" (Macbeth 215) ("Murderer 1 cuts his throat"), but his son manages to escape the second assassin. Macbeth has a guilt-inspired hallucination at the feast in which he sees a vision of Banquo sitting on his chair: "Banquo's ghost on Macbeth's chair") and Lady Macbeth speaks the line: "Es ist ein Stuhl, sonst nichts" (230) in one of her guilt-ridden hallucinations during the night. Both Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are having trouble sleeping because of their guilt -- Müller presents Stalin in a similar situation at the beginning of scene two: "Genosse, warum trinkst du in der Nacht. / Was fürchtest du, wo deine Macht Gesetz ist" (9) ("Comrade, why are you drinking at night. / What do you fear, since your power is law"). Feelings of fear are surfacing in Stalin which deny him sleep; he tries to combat them with alcohol. Although Müller's character may feel momentary guilt because of all the former comrades -- one cannot speak of friends -- including Trotsky and Bukharin, whom he had executed as his enemies, he expresses no sense of remorse. He briefly expresses fear of the dead, but he is more fearful of the living who could usurp his power: "Verdacht ist Schuld, Verräter überall / Besser ein Tod zuviel als einen Dolch / Im Rücken" (12) ("Suspicion is guilt, traitors everywhere / Better one death too many than a dagger / In the back"). Macbeth feared that Banquo, who had helped him to power, would be able to wrest power from him, as indicated in the following lines: "Meine Furcht heißt Banquo. / Er war zu lange neben mir, er kann / Nicht unter mir sein, über ihm nicht ich / Auf
festem Stuhl [. . .] Banquo der Königsmacher" (210) ("My fear is called Banquo. / He was too long next to me, he can / Not be under me, I not over him / On a stable chair [. . .] Banquo who makes kings"). Similarly, Stalin feared Trotsky's potential power and, therefore, had him murdered: "Trotzki, der Henker von Kronstadt. Jetzt weisst du, / wo dein Platz ist, Bronstein, mit deiner permanenten Revolution [. . .]" (13) ("Trotsky, the executioner of Kronstadt. Now you know, / where your place is, Bronstein, with your permanent revolution [. . .]"). Müller's use of the name "Bronstein" is a reference to the fact that Trotsky was the son of a Jewish farmer and may be a subtle anti-Semitic remark. The permanent revolution refers to Trotsky's ideas, based on those of Marx and Engels, about how to successfully incorporate and maintain Communism in an underdeveloped nation such as the Soviet Union. The term "executioner of Kronstadt" refers to the fact that many sailors at Kronstadt, who had previously been the pride of the Red Army, were massacred at Trotsky's orders in a political power struggle.

Guimarães writes about the relationship between Trotsky and Stalin compared to that of Banquo and Macbeth that: "Banquo ist der einzige, den Macbeth fürchtet - und diese Furcht nimmt im Wahnsinn des Banketts Form an, als das Gespenst den Königsstuhl besetzt" (120). Whereas Macbeth was fearful mostly of Banquo, in his paranoia Stalin viewed many as potential rivals or enemies whom he feared and, correspondingly, had executed. Stalin's methods were designed to help him attain and retain personal power and, contrary to those of Lenin, not to help the party's cause. Lenin may not have liked Trotsky on a personal level, as Balabanoff writes, but: "when he realized that he would be an asset to the Bolshevik cause, he assigned him to the highest posts" (Impressions 142). By doing so, Lenin demonstrated his desire to uphold the best interests of the Party. Stalin, on the contrary, was only interested in Stalin and his thirst for power made him blind to the interests of the Party. Balabanoff explains Stalin's actions concerning Trotsky:
In his implacable hatred for Trotsky, Stalin removed him from all his offices, resorted to physical violence to expel him from the country and hired an assassin to murder him. Stalin was goaded by envy for Trotsky's immeasurable superiority. He had to get rid of him, even if it meant an irreparable loss for Russia and the revolutionary movement of the world (142).

Trotsky represented a threat to Stalin and in his eyes, therefore, had to be eliminated, in the same manner as he had previously eliminated individuals, whom he viewed as dangerous to his position of power: his generals, Bucharin, party members, and countless others. In an interview with Raddatz in Lage der Nation Müller speaks about Stalin's relationship to Trotsky: "Sicherlich fühlte sich Stalin Trotzki unterlegen. Stalin war nie im Ausland gewesen, kannte keine Fremdsprachen -- Trotzki war welterfahren, sprach mehrere Sprachen" (46). In addition to feeling threatened by this powerful man, Stalin, given his troubled personality, also felt inferior to Trotsky, which would have further increased his desire to eliminate him. Müller refers to Stalin's deformed left arm, the growth of which was stunted due to blood poisoning as a child: "Stalin hatte einen zu kurzen Arm, war verkrüppelt (Lage 46) which helps to explain the following lines: "Mein Arm ist kurz, wie. Und mein Arm ist länger / Als je ein Arm gewachsen ist in Russland / Und Russland ist das Reich der langen Arme. / Es ist ein Kinderspiel: Papier schlägt Stein. / Kein Mensch wiegt mehr als seine Akte, Tinte / Säußt Blut. Die Remington ersetzt die Mauser / Und jede Akte ist die Heilige Schift" (9-10) ("My arm is short, hmm. And my arm is longer / Than any arm that ever grew in Russia / And Russia is the Empire of the long arms. / It is a child's game: paper beats stone. / No person weighs more than his file, ink / absorbs blood. The Remington replaces the Mauser / And every file is the Holy Scriptures"). In Stalin's world, the files

44(“Banquo is the only one, whom Macbeth feared -- and this fear takes shape in the madness of the banquet as the ghost sits down in the king's chair.”)
45(“Certainly Stalin felt inferior to Trotsky. Stalin had never been in a foreign country, did not speak any foreign languages -- Trotsky was cosmopolitan, spoke many languages.”)
46(“Stalin had one arm that was too short, was crippled.”)
collected by his secret police and their informants meant life or death for many of his associates and citizens and, therefore, assume the importance normally accorded to the Holy Bible. The "Remington" refers to a specific typewriter which has assumed more power than the "Mauser", a specific type of rifle, because of the machine's ultimate power to condemn a person to death or to a gulag. Müller bases his text on the fact that: "Um Stalin zu verstehen, muß man wissen, daß er ein Seminarist war, ein Klosterschüler; für ihn war der Glaube an die Schrift das Wesentliche -- was geschrieben steht, ist Wahrheit" (Lage 46). Stalin's reliance on these written files corresponds to his systematic apparatus discussed above, through which he maintained ultimate control over his people.

Stalin then turns to Hitler and their "brotherhood": "Hitler, mein Freund von gestern. Bruder Hitler" (13) ("Hitler, my friend from yesterday. Brother Hitler"). Müller's use of the brother theme here is not limited only to the Germans, rather he now includes the German-Russian relationship i.e., Hitler-Stalin as a brotherhood of dictatorship which has been broken by betrayal. The theme of betrayal also plays a prominent role for Müller concerning German identity and in this scene, he uses it to show that Stalin the dictator is afraid of being betrayed, a trait he shares with his fellow dictator, who, ironically, did betray his Soviet "brother" by breaking the German-Soviet Nichtangriffspakt ("nonaggression treaty") from 23 August 1939. As a fellow European dictator, Müller simultaneously presents Stalin as the

---

47("In order to understand Stalin, one has to know, that he was a seminar student, a pupil at the monastery; for him belief in the written was the essential element -- what stands written, is truth.")

48In an interview with Valentin Falin from 1993 entitled, "Geschichtssprünge", Müller reveals his view of the constellation between Hitler and Stalin and its importance not only for Germany and for the Soviet Union, but for all of Europe and the USA. He said: "Und im Januar 1955 hat Chruschtschow freie deutsche Wahlen angeregt. Wie das Volk entschiede, so sollte auch die soziale Ordnung sein. Die einzige Bedingung war, daß Deutschland nicht Mitglied einer militärischen Koalition gegen die Sowjetunion wird. [. . .] Das waren schon im Kern die strategischen Überlegungen von Stalin gewesen: Wenn wir geregelte Beziehungen mit Deutschland haben, wird es keinen Krieg in Europa geben. Dann sind unsere Sicherheitsinteressen gewährleistet. Denn ohne Deutschland oder gegen Deutschland ist kein westlicher Staat, inklusive der USA, in der Lage, einen Krieg in Europa gegen die UdSSR zu führen. Diese Idee war schon ein Motiv des Hitler-Stalin-Paktes von 1939. Und während und nach dem Krieg wurde diese Überlegung noch bestärkt" (GI3 212). ("And in January 1955 Chruschtschow proposed free German elections. However the people decided, that should be the social order. The only stipulation was, that Germany not become a member of a military coalition against the Soviet Union. [. . .] Basically those had been Stalin's strategic deliberations: If we have regular relations with Germany, there will not be a war in Europe. Then our security interests are guaranteed. Because without Germany or against Germany no western state, including the USA, is in the position, to lead a war in Europe against the USSR. This
rival to Hitler: the world's fear and hatred of the German fascist dictator conceals the danger presented by the Soviet tyrant. Stalin's words reflect his awareness of this perceived advantage: "Verbrennst du meine Dörfer. Das ist gut. / Weil sie dich hassen, werden sie mich lieben. Deine Blutspur wäscht meinen Namen weiss" (13) ("Are you burning my villages. That is good. / Because they hate you, they will love me. Your bloody trail washes my name white"). Stalin welcomes the Germans' arrival because the Russians are thus preoccupied with fearing and hating Hitler and are willing to overlook Stalin's brutal dictatorship. Indeed, the German armies caused much death and destruction during their march through the Soviet countryside which filled the Russian people with hatred. Aragon describes Hitler's armies as: "[. . .] burning everything, making the countryside a desert, herding the people westwards, carrying out mass executions, shootings and hangings" (380). At the town of Kaluga, the home of the Soviet space researcher: "[. . .] the Germans burnt the theatre and several buildings, and mutilated Tsiolkovsky's monument and devastated the house of the man whose researches were subsequently to open the way to the cosmos, destroying his models of space-rockets" (380). Konstantin Edvardovitch Tsiolkovsky (1857-1935), the "father of cosmonautics" and pioneer of human space travel, paved the way for the first space flight in 1961 with the first Russian cosmonaut to orbit the earth whom, ironically, Müller quotes at the end of this play.

Stalin's final lines, which he directs to Hitler: "Der letzte Sieger ist der Tod. / Im Rattenkäfig wirst du Moskau seh'n / Eh dein und meine Toten aufersteh'n" (14) ("The final victor is death. / You will see Moscow in a rat's cage / Before your and my dead rise up from the dead") demonstrates Müller's obsession with the dead, as in the opening poem, and their "Unsterblichkeit"; by which I mean their inability to stay dead as opposed to immortality. For Müller the dead represent the past and their experiences, primarily destructive ones such as wars and all of those people killed by Hitler's as well as Stalin's forces, which have shaped idea was already a motive behind the Hitler-Stalin-pact of 1939. And during and after the war this consideration
German identity for centuries and must not be forgotten. The dead and the reasons behind their deaths are not allowed to be forgotten because otherwise they lose their meaning. Referring to Stalin and the state he created Müller says: "Er bezieht seine Legitimität von den Toten, und im Namen der Toten wird getötet" (Lage 52). Müller deals with this problem in other texts, such as Der Horatier and Der Auftrag, in which murder and execution on behalf of the state are legitimate forms of maintaining order. The problem with such a policy, however, is that at some point the executioner becomes a danger to the power of the state and must himself be executed. Macbeth's line: "Das Leben ist ein Wettlauf in den Tod" (212) ("Life is a race towards death") is similar to Stalin's line mentioned above: "Der letzte Sieger ist der Tod" which imply that even those who kill and murder without regret, in particular ruthless, uncaring dictators, will one day face the ultimate defeat at the hands of death, as did Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Hitler, and finally, Stalin.

Müller closes this scene as he opened it: with the image of the returning dead. The line: "(Auftritt der Toten)" (14) ("Entrance of the dead") corresponds to Stalin's lines earlier: "Die Toten haben einen leichten Schlaf / Sie konspirieren in den Fundamenten / Und ihre Träume sind es, die uns würgen" (9) ("The dead sleep lightly / They conspire in the foundations / And their dreams are what strangle us"). These words are similar to the theme of Müller's poem which opens this chapter: the dead are always present and whoever does not heed them will suffer the consequences. The past i.e., its deeds and its victims, must not be forgotten or ignored because the present and the future are at stake. The appearance of the dead at the end also underscores his view that death, a component of Stalin's legacy among others, is omnipotent as well as omnipresent in modern society, which he demonstrates in other scenes of Germania 3 as well. The following section concludes the explanation of Stalin's legacy as presented by Müller.
b) A Dying Breed: Party Functionaries

"PARTY" ("Party"), scene eight, is the second-longest scene in the play with fourteen pages of prose. The location is an apartment in the Saxon city of Frankenberg and the timeframe is February 1956, as the radio message makes clear: the Twentieth Party Conference of the KPD took place from the fourteenth through the twenty-fifth. Müller's father had been the mayor of this town after the war, from 1947 until he emigrated to the Western sector of Berlin in 1951, as Müller explains in his autobiography in the chapter entitled, "Rückkehr nach Sachsen, Frankenberg, 1947-51" (55-76). Based on this chapter it is clear that the Mayor, the Mayor's Son, the architect who desired to escape to the West, his attractive blonde wife, and the leather phallus hanging on the wall are taken from Müller's actual experience and memory. Given this biographical fact, the character of the Mayor's Son is considered to be a self-portrayal of Müller by most critics as, for example, Schmitt (218), Welzel (176), and Norbert Otto Eke in Heiner Müller (265). The character in this scene shows more interest in the attractive wife of the architect than in the political discussion occurring around him until he quotes from Das Stadtwappen by Franz Kafka (1883-1924). The other characters represent the range of party functionaries belonging to the SED: Ebertfranz is the highest party official and Schumann-gerhard is his deputy, next in line for Ebertfranz's position, which he would not hesitate to assume. The other figures are an average party member, "Prosswimmer", the wife of the Architect, "Frau Hickel", and Schumann-gerhard's wife, "Frau Schumann". The guests are at the home of a wealthy GDR Architect, who would like nothing better than to leave the GDR for the West: "Meinen Lebensabend werde ich hier nicht verbringen, in eurem Arbeiter- und Bauernstaat. Ich bin

49 ("It obtains its legitimacy from the dead, and it kills in the name of the dead.")
50 
50 ("[. . .] denn der Architekt war schon im Westen. An diesen Mann habe ich aus einem anderen Grund eine deutliche Erinnerung. Er hatte eine blonde, sehr langbeinige Frau, die ein begehrtes Objekt war, und bei ihm sah ich zum ersten Mal eine Wohnung, wo an der Wand ein lederner Phallus hing" (69). ("[. . .] because the architect was already in the West. I have a distinct memory of this man based on another reason. He had a blonde wife with very long legs, who was an object of desire, and at his apartment I saw for the first time, a leather phallus hanging on the wall.")
Architekt. Ich will bauen. Was, ist mir egal, aber das Wie bestimme ich, oder ich gehe" (66)
("I will not spend my twilight years here, in your workers' and peasants' state. I am an
architect. I want to build. What, that does not matter, but the how is my decision, or I leave").
His derogatory tone when referring to the Communist state, implying that he does not share
their enthusiasm for the GDR and does not consider himself a citizen of said state, is
surpassed only by his mocking reference to the Plattenbauwohnungen ("concrete slab
apartment buildings") of the GDR which he says are called "Arbeiterschliessfächer"
("workers' safe deposit boxes") by the average workers, the "Volksmund" ("voice of the
teople") (66). This view by the workers is the counterpart to Ulbricht's term in scene one,
"Fickzellen": whereas the former leader's term expresses his disrespect and disregard for the
citizens, workers, of the GDR, the workers' term for their "homes" provided by the party or
government reflects their disrespect for the leaders as well as their cognizance that they are
merely there to work for the state, tools of the state, ruled and held captive by an elite group.
The use of the terms "your" or "ours" implies ownership, which is reminiscent of the ruling or
imperialist powers so detested and criticized by Marx, yet that is the situation in the GDR.
Ebertfranz's enduring belief that "Der Kommunismus kommt, so sicher wie das Amen in der
Kirche" (68) ("Communism is coming, as surely as one says Amen in the church") reflects
his childlike belief in the fairy tale of communism which he has heard for so long that he has
internalized it and, indeed, it has become his secular religion. Like the congregation in a
church, believing in and waiting for the coming of the messiah, the "faithful" in the GDR
were waiting for the Communist dream to materialize, for the promise of the Communist
utopia to be fulfilled. But as Müller himself said in his interview from 1991 with Alexander
Weigel entitled, "Was wird aus dem größeren Deutschland":

Was in Osteuropa einschließlich der DDR gescheitert ist, war ein Versuch, die Zeit
anzuhalten (die Berliner Mauer war eine Zeitmauer) im Namen einer Zukunft, die
auf sich warten ließ wie der Messias. Das Leben fand in der Warteschleife statt. Die
The most precise description of the situation is Kafka's story, "THE CITY COAT OF ARMS" about the construction of the Tower of Babel which was delayed again and again. Mâller correctly cites the complete Kafka text to represent the predicament of communism in the GDR. In a parallel to Kafka's description of the construction of the Tower of Babel which does not make any real progress over subsequent generations, communism in the GDR had come to a standstill. Mâller thus uses this text as a parable for the path to socialism in the GDR which is stagnating. Welzel views this text in similar terms: "Die Parabel wird als ein Gleichnis auf den Aufbau der DDR vorgetragen (176) and it becomes clear with time that the tower which: "[. . .] hier metaphernhaft den utopischen Endzustand Kommunismus verkörpert, nie vollendet sein wird" (Welzel 176-177). Rather than nearing its goal of completion by the efforts of future generations, the tower, similar to communism in the GDR, is torn apart by disagreement about the means and methods to achieve completion. Stalinism was not the way to achieve the desired results and after his death, the new hope which initially dawned was eventually replaced by disillusion. During the four decades of its existence, the three generations of authors in the GDR, exemplified by Anna Seghers and Christa Wolf, for example, and the developing younger generation of writers, reached its end sooner than some -- particularly party functionaries -- had anticipated. Mâller, however, writing with the advantage of hindsight in 1995, was able to tailor his scene according to Kafka's story and its apocalyptic prophecy. Recited by the Mayor's Son, the parable of the Tower of Babel is a simile for the construction of the GDR and reflects Mâller's view of Socialism which, as Eke explains, is again reduced to: "Gewalt und Zerstörung" (265).

Under Stalin, violence and brutality ruled the Soviet state, which also strongly influenced the GDR as well. Eke refers to: "Der Zukunftsgewißheit des gläubigen Altkommunisten

---

51(“What failed in Eastern Europe, including the GDR, was the attempt to make time stop (the Berlin Wall was a time wall) in the name of a future which makes one wait for it like the Messiah. Life took place in the waiting line. The most precise description of the situation is Kafka's story, "THE CITY COAT OF ARMS" about the construction of the Tower of Babel which was delayed again and again.”)

52(“[. . .] here is a metaphor for the utopian final phase of communism will never be completed”)
Ebertfranz" (265)\textsuperscript{54} who, in my opinion, possesses such faith in the future realization of communism that he can do nothing else but commit suicide after learning of Stalin's ultimate deceit and betrayal of socialism from the radio broadcast.

After Stalin's death in 1953, Stalin's successor Nikita Chruschtschow (1894-1971), who ruled as head of the Communist Party from 1953 until 1964, repudiated his policies and condemned Stalin's cult of personality in his so-called "secret speech" to the Closed Session of the Twentieth Party Congress on 25 February 1956. With his deliberate and targeted remarks, which would eventually reach the outside world, he instituted the process known as "destalinization". Chruschtschow's speech was not broadcast on the radio, as Müller depicts here, it was intended only for the members present at the congress. The following excerpts from his speech, which is too long to be completely duplicated here, are taken from: \textit{SED und Stalinismus: Dokumente aus dem Jahre 1956}, compiled by Josef Gabert. They offer a helpful overview of some of the General Secretary's main ideas in relation to the actions in Müller's scene:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{53} ("volence and destruction")

\textsuperscript{54} ("The secure certainty in the future of the faithful old Communist Ebertfranz.")
ausgehändigt. [. . .] Wenn wir die von Stalin bei der Leitung von Partei und Staat angewandte Praxis analysieren, wenn wir über alles nachdenken, was Stalin zugelassen und was er sich geleistet hat, dann überzeugen wir uns davon, daß Lenins Befürchtungen berechtigt waren. Stalins negative Eigenschaften, die zu den Zeiten Lenins erst im Keime vorhanden waren, entwickelten sich während der letzten Jahre zu einem schweren Mißbrauch der Macht, was unserer Partei unermeßlichen Schaden zufügte. [. . .] Stalin handelte nicht mit dem Mittel der Überzeugung, der Erklärung, der geduldigen Arbeit mit den Menschen, sondern durch das Aufzwingen seiner Konzeptionen, indem er die absolute Unterordnung unter seine Meinung forderte. Wer sich dem entgegenstellte oder versuchte, seinen eigenen Gesichtspunkt und die Richtigkeit seines Standpunktes zu begründen, war zum Ausschluß aus dem Leitungskollektiv und in der Folge zur moralischen und physischen Vernichtung verurteilt. [. . .] Und gerade in dieser Periode (der Jahre 1935 bis 1938) kam es zur Praxis der massenweisen Repressalien von Staats wegen, zuerst gegenüber den Gegners des Leninismus: gegenüber den Trotzkisten, Sinowjewleuten und Bucharinleuten, die schon seit langem politisch von der Partei zerschlagen waren, später auch gegenüber vielen ehrlichen Kommunisten. [. . .] Stalin führte den Begriff >>Volksfeind<< ein. Dieser Terminus befreite umgehend von der Notwendigkeit, die ideologischen Fehler eines oder mehrerer Menschen, gegen die man polemisiert hatte, nachzuweisen; er erlaubte die Anwendung schrecklichster Repressionen, wider alle Normen der revolutionären Gesetzlichkeit, gegen jeden, der in irgend etwas mit Stalin nicht übereinstimmte. [. . .] Als hauptsächlicher und im Grunde genommen einziger Schuldbeweis wurde entgegen allen Normen der heutigen Rechtslehre das >>Geständnis<< der Verurteilten betrachtet, wobei dieses >>Bekenntnis<< -- wie eine spätere Überprüfung ergab -- durch physische Mittel der Beeinflussung des Angeklagten erreicht wurde. Das

Ebertfranz, who represents the staunch yet naive supporter of communism, believed in the leadership of Stalin and cannot bear the shock of this revelation. He does not doubt the authenticity of Chruschtschow's speech, but is rather convinced by the speaker's sincerity. Because he is a man of integrity and understands the gravity of the charges, he is unable to

---

55("Comrades! The personal cult and its detrimental consequences were discussed at length in the activities' report of the central committee at the 20th Plenary Session, in a series of speeches by party delegates as well as before that at plenary sessions of the central committee. [. . .] In December 1922 Vladimir Iljitsch wrote in a letter to the party conference: "Comrade Stalin has, after he became General Secretary, concentrated immeasurable power in his hands, and I am not convinced that he will always understand to use this power judiciously." [. . .] This letter -- a political document of substantial weight, that is known in the party's history as "Lenin's testament" -- was handed out to the delegates at the 20th Plenary Session. [. . .] If we analyze Stalin's usual practices for leadership of the party and state, if we think about everything that Stalin permitted and what he allowed himself to do, then we can convince ourselves, that Lenin's fears were justified. Stalin's negative qualities, which were still in their infancy during Lenin's time, developed during the last several years to a serious misuse of power, which caused our party immeasurable damage. [. . .] Stalin did not act with the means of conviction, of enlightenment, of patient work with people, rather through the forcing of his ideas, in which he demanded absolute subordination to his opinion. Whoever went against him or tried to establish his own view and the correctness of his perspective, was condemned to expulsion from the leadership and as a result, to moral and physical destruction." [. . .] And especially during this period (1935 until 1938) the practice of massive repressions was used by the state, at first, against the opponents of Leninism: against Trotzkyists, Sinowjewists, Bucharists, who for a long time already had been destroyed by the party, later also against many honest communists. " [. . .] Stalin introduced the term "enemy of the people". This terminology directly freed one from the necessity of having to prove the ideological mistakes of one or more persons, against whom one had polemicized: it allowed the use of horrible repressions, against all the standards of revolutionary justice, against everyone who did not share the same opinion as Stalin. [. . .] The "confession" of the condemned was considered the main and in point of fact only proof of guilt against all standards of current law practice; whereby this "declaration" -- as a later investigation concluded -- was obtained by influencing the defendant through physical means. That led to a drastic rape of revolutionary justice. Added to that, many totally innocent persons, who had defended the party line in the past, became victims. [. . .] We must devote ourselves seriously to the question of the personality cult. We may not spread this question outside of the party, even less in the columns of the press. For that very reason we are discussing this in a closed session of the plenum. [ . . .] Comrades! We definitively have to eradicate the personality cult once and for all, and draw corresponding consequences in our ideological-theoretical as well as in our practical work.")
live with the shame and guilt he feels for having believed in and supported such a leader. Ebertfranz, who still believed in the communist goal "der weltrevolutionären Befreiung [. . .]" as Eke writes: " [. . .] erhängt sich aus Scham über die mitverantwortete Geschichte" (267).56 As a supporter of Stalin, he thus shares the blame for the policies and unethical actions perpetrated by Stalinism.

Immediately following the speech, the Mayor's Son quotes from yet another literary source, this time from Müller's Philoktet. In this play based on Greek mythology, the main character, Ajax, commits suicide after having murdered an innocent herd of cattle in a mad frenzy. Although the comparison is not exactly accurate, the significance lies on the aspect of guilt felt by Ajax as well as Ebertfranz in a system that has ultimately betrayed them. Schmitt refers to Ebertfranz's "Erkenntnis, das stalinistische System der DDR selber mitgetragen zu haben" (221).57 The line by the Mayor's Son: "Die Partei, die Partei, die hat immer recht" (76) ("The party, the party, it is always right") mocks the seriousness of the situation felt by Ebertfranz. The Mayor's line: "WIR WOLLEN HIER AUF ERDEN SCHON DAS HIMMELREICH ERRICHTEN" (77) ("We want to construct paradies here on earth") is taken from Heinrich Heine's Deutschland. Ein Wintermärchen. Müller uses it here to express the sense of disappointment and disillusion, now that Stalin has been exposed, facing the supporters of the SED, who had believed in and worked on behalf of a socialist state.

The role of Stalin as a father figure -- for some but not all in the GDR -- is an important element in this scene. As opposed to the customary or, in the Personenkult ("personality cult") exploited by all dictators, obligatory portrait of the leader, in this case Stalin, hanging in a place of prominence, the Architect prefers to hang his portrait in a different place of honor, as he mockingly implies (73) and instead keeps a "Lederphallus" ("leather phallus") above his couch in the living room. The symbolic significance of this

56("[. . .] of the revolutionary world liberation. [. . .] hangs himself out of shame for the shared responsibility of history")
57("realization, that he was a pillar of the Stalinistic system in the GDR")
reproduction of the male sex organ could be the decadence of the West where the Architect wants to go, and its connection to Stalin's portrait could point to the emasculation of the KPD by Stalinism, similar to the father's emasculation by fascism in Der Findling ("The Foundling"). Based on Kleist's story from 1811 of the same name, this tale comprises the last part of Müller's Wolokolamsker Chaussee cycle. The last line of the scene is spoken with a great deal of sarcasm by the Mayor's Son: "Drei Väter. Das hält kein Mensch aus. Willst du / dich daneben hängen. Ich besorg dir einen Strick. / Dich wird dein Schlips nicht halten" (79) ("Three fathers. No one can stand that. Do you want to hang yourself next to him. I'll get you a rope. Your tie won't hold you"). Schumanngerhard has no intention of committing suicide because he is not that loyal to any person or group, only to himself, as the reference to his weight implies that he is well-fed and enjoys a privileged existence. The father-son conflict represents a significant theme in this scene, as demonstrated by Schumanngerhard when he refers to the two fathers he has lost: Stalin and now Ebertfranz: "Ich habe zwei Väter verloren (79) ("I have lost two fathers"). But the Mayor reminds him of his third father, Hitler, who is also dead: "Drei, wenn ich richtig informiert bin über deinen Lebenslauf. Der erste hiess ja wohl Hitler (79) ("Three, if I am correctly informed about your biography. In that case the first one was called Hitler"). In the past, Schumanngerhard was a follower of Hitler and fascism, but this political chameleon quickly changed his color from brown to red in order to further his own interests: thus he is not a true believer in any political ideology. Müller uses this character to demonstrate the divergent background and virtues of the SED party members which have also contributed to the GDR's downfall. Increasingly, positions as party members or functionaries were "not awarded on the basis of merit, because careers became increasingly dependent on political criteria" as Ralph Jessen writes in his essay, "Mobility and Blockage During the 1970s" (349), in which he explores the reasons behind the development of social mobility within the dictatorship of the GDR. Schumanngerhard's comment that he has lost two fathers reflects the fact that in postwar Germany, controlled by the occupying forces,
many fathers never returned home, and of those who did, the traditional role of the father was no longer in existence. In her essay, "Mission to Happiness: The Cohort of 1949 and the Making of East and West Germans", Dorothee Wierling writes that: "More often the absence of the father in postwar Germany was symbolic as much as physical" (114). In other words, due to this new set of circumstances, the father's role had weakened, as his family had learned to survive without him over an extended period. In addition, the father's role had been further weakened by the "personality cult" of the dictators, first Hitler, then Stalin. In fact, Ulbricht officially referred to Stalin as "our father" upon the death of the Soviet dictator (Weber Geschichte der DDR 161).

The theme of "two fathers" in the sense of political fathers is also found in Der Findling. In this tale, Müller refers to the adoptive father, who is not the biological father of the dissident son, and the unknown biological father. As Jeannette Malkin writes about the father in "Mourning and the Body: Heiner Müllers Fathers and the Foundling Son": "[. . .] having internalized the lessons of obedience the father appears in the text as a broken but unquestioning representative of ideological dogma and historical forgetting" (495). His mistreatment by the Nazis in the concentration camp has broken his spirit and his later torture by the Communists/Stalinists completely destroyed any remaining resistance. Malkin uses the plural, "Fathers" because the theme of "two fathers" is addressed in the text: the adoptive father scathingly remarks that the biological father of the infant he found in the rubble of Hitler's war in 1945 could have been a Nazi: "Since I have pulled you from the smoking rubble / I wouldn't like to know who was your father / Perhaps the Nazi who did kick and truncheon / My genitals at roll call in the camp / No children for me Only you Who are you" (Reader 145). The father, who is a victim of both Hitler and Stalin, of both Fascism and Stalinism, was emasculated by the Nazi guard who hit him, and not only his back was broken by the Communists but also his will. He is now a follower of Stalinism and is willing to betray his own son, who is not really his own son, a dissident, fighting against the Soviet
tanks in Prague of 1968, whom he does not really know: they are on opposite sides of the political spectrum and as such, have opposing political ideologies. Thus the son has two fathers and simultaneously, no fathers: "The son, fatherless, born on the rubble of Nazism's lost war, bred under Stalin's rule, becomes the "offspring" of both fathers and both catastrophes" (Malkin 500). The father theme in scene eight of *Germania 3* reflects both dictators, Hitler and Stalin, as metaphorical political father figures, who, as evidenced by history, did more harm than good to their "children". As Schulz comments in her essay, "Something is Rotten in this Age of Hope": "Stalinismus/Fascismus -- in keinem Staat konnte diese Mischung so authentisch beobachtet werden wie in der DDR. [. . .] Eine Trennung von Fascismus und Stalinismus ist in der DDR kaum denkbar [. . .]" (475-476). Even though the GDR was dominated politically by Stalinism, the remnants of Hitler and fascism were still visible in the GDR. In the following section I discuss Müller's portrayal of Hitler and his legacy of fascism in *Germania 3*.

V.1.3 Hitler's Legacy

a) Hitler and Fascism

Hitler, who is mentioned in scene two by Stalin and in scene three by various soldiers, makes his only appearance in this play in scene four, "ES BLIES EIN JÄGER WOHL IN SEIN HORN" ("A Hunter Blew into His Horn"). We have already referred to this line at the end of scene one when Müller uses it to signify the deaths of Luxemburg and Liebknecht, it is an intertextual reference to the ballad by Nicolai. This scene is constructed primarily in blank verse but switches to prose when Hitler addresses the women. Müller's use of blank verse for the monologues of Hitler, and of Stalin earlier in scene two, endows each character with a sense of grandeur which is befitting the seriousness of their historical actions. In their essay entitled, "On Heroes and Hero-Worship. Anmerkungen zu Heiner Müllers Germania 3", Christian Rochow and Axel Schalk write: "Hitler wird, in Wallenstein-Versen redend --

58("Stalinism/fascism -- in no other state could this mixture be observed so authentically as in the GDR. [. . .] A
While they are not as noble as Schiller's Wallenstein or Goethe's Egmont, Müller's portrayal of them is in keeping with the German tradition of the Geschichtsdrama.

Living in Berlin in his "Bunker" underneath the "Reichskanzlei" ("shelter"; "Reich Chancellery"), Hitler can no longer suppress the realization that Germany is losing the war. After lamenting the turn of events, he finalizes plans for his subsequent suicide with the help of Hans Rattenhuber (1897-1957), commander of the SS guards. Loyal to the bitter end, he supplies his "Führer" with the gasoline to burn his body after Hitler commits suicide along with Eva Braun, whom he had married only a short time earlier. Hitler holds a monologue in which he offers his view of the reasons for the war and why it has been lost. He blames the Jews for his problems and failure: "Der Jude war mein Unglück er säuft mein / Benzin das mir zum Sieg fehlt Seine Asche / Beschwert die Ketten meiner Panzer" (29) ("The Jew was my misfortune he drinks my / gasoline that I need for my victory His ashes / bog down the chains of my tanks"). However, Hitler is the one who wasted gas and other valuable resources, most notably German men, in his quest to conquer his neighboring European countries and to eradicate the Jewish race. Whereas Germania Tod is more oriented towards the past, Germania 3 is more focused on the future of Germany and of Europe as demonstrated in this scene. Hitler's monologue is "weltbezogen" ("directed to the world") and future-oriented, intended for subsequent generations and, as such, it has apocalyptic and materialistic characteristics since he refers to the fact that there are not enough resources available on the planet to sustain everyone, which will lead to future violence and wars. His view that he was only trying to help prevent such a future catastrophe by reducing the world population is, however, self-serving and unbelievable. Rather than presenting Hitler as a comical or grotesque caricature of himself as he did in Germania Tod, "Die Heilige Familie", Müller presents him here as a defeated tyrannical leader who coherently explains his separation of fascism from Stalinism is hardly imaginable in the GDR [. . .].")
reasoning behind his destructive actions: he did it not only for Germany and future
generations of Germans, but for the amelioration of the world. During his brief vision of
Stalin, his fellow dictator, Hitler explains: "Sie werden wissen was sie an uns hatten / Wenn
überall der Mensch den Menschen frisst / Weil ihm der Platz nicht langt und nicht das Futter /
Volk ohne Raum [. . .]") (29) ("They will know what they had with us / When people
everywhere are eating people / Because there is not enough room and not enough food /
People without space [. . .]"). The popular Nazi slogan, "Volk ohne Raum" is also the title of
a novel by Hans Grimm (1875-1959), published in 1926, in which the author shows that the
economic and political problems of the Germans could best be solved by expanding their
living space. Not only was this novel popular with the Weimar Republic, it could also be
found on the list of required reading material during the Third Reich. Hitler claims that later
generations will understand what he was trying to accomplish: "Die Enkel werden mich
verstehn (32) ("The grandchildren will understand me"). His extermination of the Jews was
based on his own psychotic mind and had nothing to do with helping the world, but he is
trying to make it appear so in order to seem less despotic and evil. Müller, following a major
theme of the play, has him relate a pessimistic vision of the future here, similar to Die
Ahnfrau at the end of the fifth scene and the Soviet cosmonaut's line at the end of the play, to
which Müller gives a pessimistic interpretation.

Just as Hitler appears in a vision to his archenemy in scene two, Stalin appears here to
his German enemy, which serves to underscore the parallels between the two dictators. At
Stalin's appearance, Hitler commences with a tirade about dire events which can be expected
in the future: this play is definitely oriented towards the future of Germany and German
identity but not in a positive way. From scene two when Stalin says to Hitler's apparition: "Im
Rattenkäfig wirst du Moskau seh'n / Eh dein und meine Toten auferstehn" (14) Hitler now

59 ("Hitler becomes, while speaking in Wallenstein-verses -- like Stalin -- a tragic figure.")
uses the term: "Der Rattenkönig" (29) ("king of the rats") to scathingly describe Stalin. As a consequence of Germany's defeat, Stalin will exercise control over the GDR: thus the Soviet dictator has usurped Hitler's position as the most dreaded dictator in Europe. In their respective scenes, each dictator demonstrates signs of paranoia, for example when Hitler says: "[. . .] Verrat und Feigheit überall und an allen Fronten" (31) ("[. . .] betrayal and cowardice everywhere and on all fronts"). Müller shows that even at the end, Hitler still fears betrayal. Describing Hitler's paranoia specifically and in comparison to that of Stalin, Bullock explains:

Hitler's paranoid tendencies are obvious enough in his earlier days and in Mein Kampf. But the enemies against whom he saw himself battling remained impersonal and collective (the Jews and the Marxists), not personalized and individual as in Stalin's case. By comparison with Stalin's innate suspicion of his own party and those who worked with him, Hitler showed a surprising degree of trust and loyalty [. . .] The paranoid symptoms only reappeared when success turned to the struggle to avoid defeat after Stalingrad (January 1943) and when he came to see the German generals and the officer corps as traitors. By 1944-5 he had convinced himself that every setback was further proof of betrayal, and that there was no one he could any longer trust, in the end not even his closest associates (406).

Thus Müller's depiction of Hitler in this scene, while decidedly different from that in Germania Tod, is appropriate for the dictator's paranoid, schizophrenic, and unstable personality. In spite of his disdain for the German people, whom he refers to in derogatory terms as German dogs, Hitler thanks the women who have performed a great service for him: "Meine Damen. Ich danke Ihnen allen für die Arbeit, die Sie geleistet haben in Treue, was wäre das Leben ohne die Treue der Frau, ich schweige vom Tod, in meinem Dienst an

60"Mir hat jemand erzählt, daß Hitler in der Reichskanzlei immer wieder davon sprach, wovor er wirklich Angst hätte. Seine Hauptfurcht war, daß er in einem Rattenkäfig durch Moskau geführt werde" (GI3 208). ("Someone
Deutschland, das mit mir untergeht" (31) ("My ladies. I thank all of you for your work, which you performed with loyalty, what would life be without the loyalty of the woman, not to mention death, in my service to Germany, that is perishing with me"). Although he is speaking directly to the secretaries in the bunker, he is also, of course, referring to the sacrifice of the German women whose sons, husbands, fathers, and brothers have died fighting Hitler's war. The women of Germany, as is the case in any nation whenever it declares war, had no choice but to sacrifice their men to Germany's cause. Now, however, with defeat inevitable, no more German men would have to lose their lives on behalf of Hitler and the fatherland. Hitler thanks the women for their service and loyalty, but his gratitude is misplaced and sardonic because, as a typical dictator, he has no regard for the lives he wasted, whether German or of other nationalities. In fact, as a final insult and further proof of his break with reality, he blames the Germans for his defeat due to their "Verrat und Feigheit" ("betrayal and cowardice").

Because he has been defeated, Hitler tries to justify his actions, which, like Stalin's, are those of a ruthless dictator who was mainly interested in self-glorification at the expense of his country and citizens, particularly his officers and soldiers, as his valiant attempt to save the world. He compares himself to other world tyrants who have gone before him and believes his actions to be justified because he if following in the footsteps of these great men: "[. . .] und meine Hände sind blutig wie die Hände aller grossen Männer der Geschichte blutig sind, Alexander Caesar Friedrich der Grosse Napoleon (leise) Stalin. In den Dimensionen der Geschichte ist das Blut ein bessrer Treibstoff als Benzin, es führt in die Ewigkeit, und die Treue ist das Mark der Ehre" (32) ("[. . .] and my hands are bloody, just like those of all the great men of history are bloody, Alexander Caesar Fredrick the Great Napoleon (softly) Stalin. Throughout the scope of history, blood is a better fuel than gasoline, it leads to immortality, and loyalty is the essence of honor"). Hitler is referring to the belief in

told me that at the State Chancellery, Hitler talked again and again about his real concern. His major fear was
the mystic power of blood as the essence of the fatherland, as expressed in the Nazi philosophy of "Blut und Boden" ("blood and earth"). Similar to Hitler and Stalin, all of these historic despotic leaders are responsible for the deaths of millions of their own officers and soldiers who fought their wars for them and shed their blood for them, while their leaders claimed that they died with honor for their country. Müller again shows the skillful propaganda typically promulgated by tyrants who believe that they are gods sent to earth to save the world. Hitler thus admits to being a follower of Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), the German philosopher whose proclamation that "God is dead" reflects the philosopher's preachings that traditional values had lost their meaning and every man creates his own laws and purpose in his life. The influence of Nietzsche's writings can be seen clearly in the Nazi propaganda, which was strongly based on the writings of this German philosopher. Steven E. Aschheim confirms this fact in Nietzsche und die Deutschen: "In zahllosen Veröffentlichungen wurde der Nationalsozialismus als die Verwirklichung der Visionen Nietzsches, als entscheidend von ihm inspiriert oder in seinen Themen ganz ähnlich gelagert dargestellt" (258). Müller's text reflects this characteristic Nazi perversion of Nietzsche's concepts: while speaking to the "Damen" ("ladies"), he uses the terms: Untermensch and Übermensch which can be translated as "superman" and "slave", respectively. These are Nietzschean terms which were used or rather misused by the Nazis in their justification of mass murder and trying to propagate the perfect Aryan race. Hitler continues: "Sie hören den Triumph des

---


62 ("In a spate of publications, Nazism was variously depicted as the realization of the Nietzschean vision, as crucially inspired by it, or as thematically parallel.") This translation is taken from the English version of Aschheim's book entitled, The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany: 1890-1990 (Berkeley, California: U of California P, 1992) 239.
Untermenschen, der seine Herrschaft antritt. Der Untermensch hat sich als der Stärkere erwiesen. Der Mensch mag zugrunde gehn. Ich bin, Sie wissen es, der Übermensch. Ich habe das Meinige getan, die Menschheit auszurotten, die den Planeten überschwemmt. Nach mir werden andere kommen, die meine Arbeit fortsetzen" (31) ("You are hearing the triumph of the slave, who is beginning to rule. The slave has proven to be the stronger one. Mankind may go down. I am, you know it, the Übermensch. I did what I could, to eradicate mankind, who are drowning the planet. After me, others will come, who will continue my work").

Hitler prophecies that others will come after him who will perform similar evil deeds. Müller may have been referring to the Bosnian War and the ethnic cleansing occurring there, such as in Sebreniza where in July 1995 at least seven to eight thousand victims were murdered.

Müller is also demonstrating here the dictator's belief in the superiority of the German race over all other races, which Hitler himself proclaims as early as 1925 in Mein Kampf.

However, there is another important aspect to Müller's portrayal of Hitler in this scene which belies the dictator's belief in the Germans as the Übermensch: his view of the Germans as animals, specifically, German shepherd dogs. With his line: "Der deutsche Schäferhund wird es mir danken" (30) ("The German shepherd dog will be grateful to me"), Hitler is using an animal metaphor to describe the Germans, his own people; thereby demonstrating his utter disregard and disdain for the Germans now that all is over. At the end of this scene he uses the same terminology again: "Es lebe der deutsche Schäferhund" (33) ("Long live the German shepherd dog") and then shoots his female dog, 63 which can be seen as a perverted symbol for Germany, which has replaced the allegorical character "Germania" of Germania Tod. Thus in spite of his earlier praise and declarations of the Germans as the superior race, in the end Hitler betrayed them and blamed them for the failure of his aggrandizing plans. In Der Mythos vom Übermenschen, Giorgio Penzo writes:

---

63 Hitler did, in fact, have a German shepherd dog named "Blondi" which he killed using cyanide pills one day prior to his own suicide. "Hitlers Höllenfahrt." Der Spiegel. 15/1995: 174.
Sich als einzigen Schöpfer aller Werte anzusehen, kann zur Rechtfertigung der
Tyrannei selbst führen. Dieser Schritt erscheint ziemlich logisch. Dem Bewußtsein, 
das sich selbst als einziger Schöpfer aller Werte fühlt, folgt notwen[d]ig das Bew
ußtsein, sich nur sich selbst gegenüber verantwortlich zu fühlen. Ein solches
Bewußtsein aber ist gerade typisch für Tyrannen (4-5).  

Hitler's behavior is typical for tyrannical rulers, such as Caesar and Napoleon, who
knowingly change the political and social rules to suit their desires and goals. Such men
shape the world in order to pursue their political ambitions, with no concern for the death and
destruction resulting from their egotistical plans and actions.

In Müller's presentation, although Hitler is now leaving the world stage, as have other
despotic rulers before him, he can do so assured that in the future there will be other dictators
to follow in his footsteps. In other words, the process of history provides the world with
dictators who never cease to convince their soldiers to fight their wars for them. With his
lines: "Ich gehe zurück zu den Toten, die mich geboren haben. Jesus Christus war ein
Menschensohn, ich bin der Sohn der Toten" ("I am going back to the dead, who gave birth to
me. Jesus christ was a human's son, I am the son of the dead"), Hitler transforms himself into
a religious type of figure or demigod, comparable to but better than Jesus, who is considered
the "son of God" in the Christian faith. In conjunction with his view of himself as a god, he
refers to the Edda: "Denn ewig lebt des Toten Tatenruhm, wie schon die Edda sagt, das
Heilige Buch, die Bibel des Nordens" (33) ("Because the heroic deeds of the dead live on
forever, as is already written in the Edda, the holy book, the Bible of the North"). A

collection of thirty-four heroic poems collected by an unknown author, The Poetic Edda,
contains the tales of Norse mythology, the Germanic heroes and warriors as well as those of
other nationalities and even contains a saga, based on the history of the Nibelungs. Müller's

64(“To see oneself as the only creator of all values, can lead to the justification of tyranny. This step seems fairly
logical. The consciousness that feels himself as the creator of all values, follows necessarily the consciousness
only to feel responsible for one's self. Such a consciousness, however, is typical for tyrants.”)

65
inclusion of the women and Hitler's attention to them reflects the fact that women play a
significant role in the Edda. The Grimm brothers translated the Edda into German, and their
translation influenced art and literature of the nineteenth century, including the composer
Richard Wagner (1813-1883) and his, Der Ring der Nibelungen, as well as other of his
operas. Müller chose to include elements from Wagner and his famous opera because Hitler,
as well as Nietzsche, enjoyed the works of this composer, and because it corresponds to his
inclusion of the Nibelung theme in this play. At the end of Wagner's opera, the home of the
gods and heroes, Valhalla, is destroyed by fire along with the gods. Müller harks back to
this opera when earlier in the scene, Rattenhuber asks Hitler: "Wohin, mein Führer, geht die
Reise" ("Where, my leader, will your journey take you") and Hitler responds, appropriately,
with: "Nach / Walhall" (30) ("To / Valhalla"). Hitler, who views himself as comparable to the
great and noble Germanic warriors and gods of old, thus chooses to have his body burned
after he shoots himself and his wife, Eva Braun, in a parallel to the final scene in Wagner's
opera: "ein nibelungisches Finale" (Welzel 163). Hitler mistakenly sees himself as worthy of being told in the same manner and of being remembered with honor by future
generations. He is, however, deluding himself since future generations will curse his name
and remember only how he destroyed Germany and German identity, just as Valhalla and the
gods are destroyed by fire at the end of Wagner's opera. Hitler refers to his marriage in the
following line: "Ich werde diese Welt verlassen, weil sie für mich zu klein geworden ist,
zusammen mit Fräulein Eva Braun, die ich vor einer Stunde geheiratet habe, hier ist der
standesamtliche Beleg, unterzeichnet von Herrn Richard Wagner, bitte prüfen Sie seine
Unterschrift [. . .]" (31) (" I will leave this world because it has become too small for me,

65I have used the English translation by Ursula Dronke as a reference.
66Referring to Hitler's final act Müller says: "Der wäre lieber als Stichflamme verglüht, denn er liebte seinen
Körper ganz und gar nicht. Mit seinen fetten Hüften und den weichen Schultern entsprach er so gar nicht dem
von ihm propagierten Körperideal; er hatte wohl keine Wahl, als auch seinen Körper zu vernichten" (Lage 51).
("He would rather have burnt up as a jet of flame, because he did not love his body at all. With his fat hips and
soft shoulders he did not correspond to the ideal body which he propagated; he had no choice, but to destroy his
body.")
together with Miss Eva Braun, whom I married an hour ago, here is the official document, signed by Mr. Richard Wagner, please verify his signature [...]). The official who performed the marriage ceremony for Hitler and Braun did, in fact, share the same surname with this famous composer, but his first name was Walter.\footnote{Am späten Abend hat Goebbels den Volkssturmmann Walter Wagner aufgetan, der in Pankow Müllabfuhr und Schulen verwaltet und als Standesbeamter fungieren kann: Hitler will Eva Braun heiraten, mit Goebbels und Bormann als Trauzeugen (Der Spiegel 15/1995: 173). ("Late in the evening Goebbels located the national reserve guardsman, who had been the administrator for garbage disposal and schools in Pankow and, who could function as a registrar of marriages: Hitler wants to marry Eva Braun, with Goebbels and Bormann as witnesses.") Schmitt is the first critic to make this connection in his analysis of Germania 3.} At the end of this scene, Müller includes the music of the Götterdämmerung from Der Ring des Nibelungen. The women dance as Hitler's corpse burns, which is similar to Goebbels' Veitstanz in Germania Tod as Germania is being tortured and killed.

In the middle of scene four, Goebbels talks about his children who would have been his future but whom he killed instead: "Das waren meine Kinder Meine Zukunft / Ich habe sie geschlachtet Sie sind dein / wir lassen hinter uns was nach uns kommt / Die Zukunft unser Feind Der Sieg ist unser" (31) ("Those were my children My future / I slaughtered them They are yours / we leave behind us whatever comes after us / The future our enemy The victory is ours"). Historically, Goebbels and his wife Magda did, in fact, poison their six children before they committed suicide. Although Goebbels only speaks these four lines in Germania 3, his words, which correspond to one of the major themes in this play, the dismal future, have a strong impact. Rather than helping to improve the future of Germany and of the German race, Goebbels, Hitler and the Nazis have lost any claim to their future which is demonstrated by Goebbels' dead children: no children, no future. Because children are the traditional symbol for the future, Goebbels' dead children signify the bleak future of Germany following World War II and underscore Müller's pessimistic view of Germany's future following reunification. Welzel also maintains that: "[...] in übertragenem Sinn handelt es sich bei den Leichen der Kinder um die zerstörte Zukunft Deutschlands" (162).\footnote{[... in the figurative sense the childrens' corpses represent the devastated future of Germany}
of Germany's defeat in 1945, the extent of the nation's physical destruction, accompanied by
the millions of Germans who were killed, left little hope for the future. Following the
reunification of the GDR, considered the anti-fascist state, with the FRG, which was long
viewed as the continuation of fascism, as Müller clearly depicts in Germania Tod, perhaps
fascism would again have the opportunity to rise to power. With the failure of the GDR and
communism, Müller was concerned that there would be no power strong enough to compete
with fascism. Schmitt refers to Müller's fear concerning: "][. . .] gerade nach Ende der
kommunistischen Epoche eine Fortsetzung von Faschismus und Gewalt (202). Müller's
fears were not totally unfounded as, ironically and contrary to the official GDR perspective,
the hidden fascist force within the GDR, which had been surpressed during the four decades
of communist rule, unveiled itself after reunification in the form of Neonazism. Thus, despite
his death forty-five years earlier, Hitler's legacy has been able to survive into the nineties and
beyond, and confirms Schmitt's observation that: "Sein Geist schwebt drohend über der
deutschen und internationalen Zukunft" (202). In fact, the Nationaldemokratische Partei
Deutschlands ("National Democratic Party of Germany") or NPD attained over nine percent of
the votes in parliamentary elections in September 2004 in the former GDR region of Saxony
under the leadership of Holger Apfel. These results have, understandably, resurrected fears
concerning the rise of fascism. Disguised in the form of Bürgerinitiative ("citizen initiatives"),
which proclaim a better life for German citizens who support such movements, the Nazi
threat has not been completely eradicated. Thus over a decade following reunification, the
threat of fascism again colors the landscape of Germany.

Initially, however, although Germania's death in Germania Tod meant the end of the
former German nation, Hitler's subsequent suicide provided the opportunity for the country to

69("[. . .] a resumption of fascism and violence especially after the end of the communist epoch")
70("His spirit hovers menacingly over the German and international future."))
about Hitler: "[. . .] He was safely dead. Hitler may have done a great deal of harm to Germany while he was alive. But he made up for it by his final sacrifice in the Bunker [. . .] With Hitler guilty, every other German could claim innocence [. . .]" (12). Taylor offers this viewpoint sceptically, because he fears the tendency to view Hitler as merely a scapegoat in order to free the remaining Germans population from any sense of guilt. His fear, however, is not entirely justified: Hitler is generally blamed for World War II and its atrocities, which is absolutely correct, but thousands of German soldiers suffered and were killed or imprisoned for their part in the war. In addition, their families and millions of other families, not only German, were torn apart or destroyed as a result of Hitler's actions. Many German civilians suffered only because they were German, in particular immediately after the war, in the Eastern regions and especially the Sudetenland, for example, which was brutally reclaimed by Czechoslovakian partisans at the end of the war. But Hitler's suicide neither renders him free from sin, nor does it serve to free the German people from this Nazi stigma. Nevertheless, the German people and, accordingly, German identity, deserves the opportunity to start anew: a tabula rasa. The chance for a new beginning is reflected in Müller's desire to get to the bare bones of German history: to remove all the flesh and expose its bareness leaving nothing left to hide and no more guilt. The next segment is a reflection of the legacy left by Hitler and the Nazis as it relates to three deceased Nazi officers, their widows, a Croatian SS-man, and their respective descendants.

b) The Nazi Stigma

In scene five entitled, "DER GASTARBEITER" ("The Guest Worker") and composed in prose, Müller juxtaposes the years 1945 and 1990 to make a strong statement about German identity. The scene opens at a palace in Mecklenburg near Parchim where the widows of three German officers are discussing their options: how they can kill themselves before the Soviet troops arrive. In his autobiography, Müller claims that the storyline of this scene in which three German widows ask a fleeing Croatian SS-Mann to execute them is
based on a true story. The three women would rather be dead than have to endure rape by the Russian liberators, who act more like invaders and conquerors. This is a realistic aspect of the aftermath of WW II, when German girls and women of all ages were in immediate danger from the Russian i.e., Asian conquerors. Here the image of the Russians, whom Müller portrays as Asians due to the close proximity, is not a positive one, just as he does not always present the Germans in a positive light. He deals with the violent and horrid aspects of war as well as with its aftermath: the brutal acts perpetrated against the civilian population afterwards and how they suffered. He also, at least briefly, mentions the Jews and what was happening in the German gas chambers and presents the Nazi atrocities in such a way, however, that the civilian population supposedly did not know what was going on in the concentration camps. The Young woman believes the rumors she has heard, but the old woman refuses to believe them; thus showing a generational discrepancy. Although the old woman is realistic about rapes and other brutal acts against women after the war, she is still blind to what atrocities the Nazis performed during the war and prefers to continue believing in the Nazi propaganda. The Young Woman's line to the Old Woman: "Frag deinen Mann, wie ihm der Tod in Plötzensee geschmeckt hat, in der Drahtschlinge" (35) ("Ask your husband, how he liked his death in Plötzensee, in the wire-noose") is a reference to Plötzen-

71 Müller explains: "[. . .] Da waren drei Freifrauen, drei Generationen, Großmutter, Mutter und Tochter, allein in ihrem Zwanzig-Zimmer-Schloß, und warteten auf die Russen. Die Männer waren tot, zwei in Rußland gefallen, einer war nach dem 20. Juli hingerichtet worden. Vor den Russen kam flüchtende SS vorbei, in Unterhosen, nur noch mit Resten von Uniformen. Einer von ihnen, ein kroatischer SS-Leutnant, ein 'Gastarbeiter', wollte einen Zivilanzug. Die Frauen sagten ja, aber dafür müßte er sie umbringen. Der Kroate hatte keine Waffen mehr. Er hat dann in einem Schuppen eine Axt gefunden. Die drei Frauen verteilten sich auf ihre zwanzig Zimmer, und er hat sie einzeln mit der Axt erschlagen. Dann zog er den Anzug an und ging weiter" (KoS 49). (. . .) There were three free women, three generations, grandmother, mother and daughter, alone in their twenty-room-palace, and waiting for the Russians. Their men were dead, two fell in Russia, one was executed after July 20th. Before the Russians came, fleeing SS came by, in their underwear, wearing only remnants of their uniforms. One of them, a Croatian SS-Lieutenant, a 'guest worker', wanted a civilian's suit. The women said yes, but he would have to kill them for it. The Croatian did not have weapons any more. He found an axe in a shed. The three women spread out in the twenty rooms, and he killed each one of them with the axe. Then he put on the suit and went on his way.")

72 In an interview in November 1993 Müller said: "Adenauer hat mal gesagt, immer, wenn er nach Berlin fährt, und der Zug überquert eine Elbbrücke, dann wird ihm kalt, und dann wußte er: Jetzt bin ich in Asien. Hinter Magdeburg begann für ihn die Steppe" (GI3 210). ("Adenauer said once, always, whenever he drove to Berlin, and the train passed the bridge over the Elbe, then he got a chill, and then he knew: Now I am in Asia. For him the Steppe began outside Magdeburg.")
see, the prison outside of Berlin where the conspirators, primarily German officers, were hanged after the failed assassination attempt against the Führer, enacted by Stauffenberg on 20 July 1944.73

The three widows are alone and faced with a difficult situation and decision: remain alive and face torment or commit suicide. The Young Girl says: "Im alten Rom hatten sie dafür ihre Sklaven. Unsre Sklaven waren schlauer als wir. Sie sind schon weg" (36) ("In ancient Rome they had their slaves for that. Our slaves were more clever than we. They are already gone"). The three Widows represent the wealthy class, the bourgeois, who, similar to the wealthy Romans, are used to having servants or slaves to do their dirty work and cleaning for them: "Aber Sie müssen uns eine Arbeit abnehmen, die getan werden muss. Haben Sie eine Waffe" (37) ("But you must take over a chore for us, that has to be done. Do you have a weapon"). Because she equates their execution with a chore which she can command another person to do, she is, in effect, no better than the Nazi commanders who have ordered their soldiers to kill millions of innocent victims in prison camps and in firing squads. The Old Woman orders the Croatian: "Dann suchen Sie sich eine Waffe. Für den Liebesdienst, um den wir Sie gebeten haben. Sie sind Soldaten. Töten Sie uns. Das sagt Ihnen die Witwe eines deutschen Generals" (Then find a weapon. For the duty of love, for which we have asked you. You are a soldier. Kill us. The widow of a German general tells you to"). As the wife of a General, she is used to giving orders; the Croatian SS man is used to taking them. He has come to their door looking for civilian clothes in order to avoid being arrested or killed by the

73 Hitler's revenge was swift: after a mock trial, the men were hung up from meathooks on wire nooses so that their deaths were long and agonizing. The room where the men were hung has become a memorial center and place of honor since the early fifties. Stauffenberg, along with three of his accomplices, were executed by gunfire shortly after midnight outside of the Bendlerblock building and were thus spared the mock trial and cruel manner of death. Stauffenberg's final words, as heard by an eyewitness, Stauffenberg's chauffeur, Karl Schweizer, reflect the true meaning and nobility behind their assassination attempt, which was to salvage German identity from Hitler and the Nazis: "Es lebe das heilige Deutschland!" ("Long live sacred Germany!") Kurt Finker, Stauffenberg und der 20. Juli 1944 (Cologne: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1977) 341. See also Peter Hoffmann, Widerstand - Staatsstreich - Attentat: Der Kampf der Opposition gegen Hitler (Munich: Piper, 1969) 603. Although Schweizer's version is generally accepted as the truth, Hoffmann includes variations to Stauffenberg's final words based on other eyewitness accounts (861).
invading Russian forces. He has removed his SS-uniform because the Soviet troops are marching in and he does not want to be recognized as fighting for the German army: this would result in his becoming a prisoner or being killed. An interesting aspect of his behavior is his politeness, similar to the German officers in scene three who use napkins, when he asks the women to excuse his behavior before he asks for their aid: "Ich brauche Zivil. Entschuldigen Sie, wenn ich so hereinplatze, aber ich bin in Eile. Waffen-SS, wenn die Russen meine Uniform sehn, seh ich meine Heimat nicht wieder. Meine Heimat ist Kroatien" (37) ("I need civilian clothes. Excuse me, that I am barging in like this, but I am in a hurry. Weapons-SS, if the Russians see my uniform, I won't see my homeland again. My homeland is Croatia"). In fact, there was a large number of Croatians who were recruited as members of the SS. His politeness presents a direct contrast to the bestial behavior he will soon demonstrate: killing or murder as a normal occurrence, one of a soldier's usual activities, but the SS-elite were infamous for their cruelty and brutal actions. In return for the clothes, the Old Woman demands that he kill them: it is ironic that the widow of the German general should give this command since usually it is the general who gives the command to kill. The Croatian boasts that he learned to kill while still a small child and could kill them with his bare hands if need be; killing is second nature to him and part of his identity. He knew how to kill long before he learned the alphabet or "ABC", which implies that he learned to kill as a small child, even before he learned to read and write. The association could be made between Müller's text, "ABC", which can be read as a metaphor for the Nazi dictatorship (Welzel

74Scene five of Die Schlacht, "Das Laken oder Die unbefleckte Empfängnis" ("The bedsheet or the Immaculate Conception"), which takes place in a Berlin basement in 1945, has similarities to the first part of guest worker scene here. A German soldier, a deserter, who tears off his uniform, asks for help from civilians in the form of a white flag to hang out in order to avoid being arrested or killed by the Russian invaders. Two SS-men enter the basement and accuse all of them of being traitors. The three civilians, a man, an old woman, and a young woman blame the soldier and he is taken away and killed by the SS. Then, ironically, two Russian soldiers and the commander of the Red Army come in with the body of the German soldier and ask if that is their son, which the old couple confirms and they receive bread from the Russians. These events reflect the element of betrayal and the Germans' struggle for survival at the end of WWII; whereas in Germania 3 the focus here is on the Croatian's struggle for survival and the German widows' desire for death in order to avoid harm from the Russians. The title has a religious connotation, like the proceeding scene six in this play, "Die zweite Epiphanie". 
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and would signify that the Croatian did not learn how to kill from the Nazis. One could also think of Bukharin's *The ABC of Communism* because an essential element of the communist program was based on the animosity between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the use of violence whenever necessary to settle this dispute. The Croatian, who represents the simple working man, is hired to do this "dirty work" by the wealthy widows and thus functions as their slave. The Croatian represents the modern "Gastarbeiter", as the title of the scene indicates, who perform menial labor for the Germans as well as other western European countries, and which Müller refers to as a form of "modernen Sklavenhalterei" ("modern slavery") ([124]). After killing the three women, the Croatian dons a suit and tie: thus his civilized appearance serves to hide his true inner brutality. Müller's character also exemplifies the fact that human nature is violent and not only Germans commit acts of violence against humanity, as demonstrated by the Croatian soldiers whom the Nazis have hired to help them commit murder. However, the Nazis, particularly the SS-divisions, bear the main responsibility for and are guilty of coordinating and ordering the deaths of millions. Müller's use of the uniform in this scene is strongly associated with identity here and throughout the play: it represents a character's specific identity based on a given ideology.

After a momentary blackout, the scene turns to the ghosts of the three dead husbands and German officers sitting together at the kitchen table discussing the repercussions of the Stauffenberg assassination attempt. The Captain and Lieutenant have gun wounds meaning they were killed in action and the General still has the noose from Plötzensee around his neck. The Captain rebukes the General: "Du bist mein Vater, aber mit einem Verräter kann ich nicht an einem Tisch sitzen" (39) ("You are my father, but I cannot sit at the same table with a traitor") because he took part in the assassination attempt on Hitler in July 1944 and is thus considered a traitor by the followers of Hitler. The General's reply: "Die Fahne ist mehr als der Tod, wie (39) ("The flag is worth more than death, hmm") shows his disillusion with
the oath which has led to the deaths of many innocent people. Hitler included this oath as a means of ensuring the loyalty of his Generals, whom he had already feared would not otherwise fully support him. The Lieutenant's desire to know: "Warum habt ihr den Fahneneid gebrochen" (39) ("Why did you break your oath of allegiance") is answered by the General with: "Weil wir verhindern wollten, was jetzt kommt" (39) ("Because we wanted to prevent, what is now happening"). The tradition of the Fahneneid or "oath of allegiance" represents a troubling aspect of Nazi Germany because Hitler misused its authority to further his dictatorial powers.

The "Fahneneid" is an oath of allegiance to the German flag and fatherland which every soldier and officer must swear to upon joining the military and whenever there is a change in the power structure or government. In Der Fahneneid: Die Geschichte der Schwurverpflichtung im deutschen Militär, Sven Lange offers a thorough as well as extremely interesting historical look at this military and political tradition and its development within the German states and in Germany since Germanic times and including specific sections which focus on its misuse by Hitler and the Nazis during the Third Reich, its usage in the FRG and in the GDR. The Croatian members of the SS even had their own special oath of allegiance. As opposed to the traditional oath which emphasizes the soldier's loyalty to his fatherland, Hitler secretly prepared a new oath which included his name but without having informed the German officers corps prior to the swearing-in ceremony.

---

75 The oath of allegiance for the Croatian soldiers of the Waffen-SS: "Ich schwöre dem Führer, Adolf Hitler, als Oberstem Befehlshaber der deutschen Wehrmacht Treue und Tapferkeit. Ich gelobe dem Führer und den von ihm bestimmten Vorgesetzten Gehorsam bis in den Tod. Ich schwöre zu Gott dem Allmächtigen, daß ich dem kroatischen Staat und dessen bevollmächtigtem Vertreter, dem Poglavnik, stets treu sein, die Interessen des kroatischen Volkes stets hüten und die Verfassung und die Gesetze des kroatischen Volkes immer achten werde" (Lange 424). ("I swear to the leader, Adolf Hitler, as the supreme commander of the German armed forces, loyalty and bravery. I pledge the leader and those superiors appointed by him, obedience until death. I swear to God the Almighty, that I will remain loyal to the Croatian state and its authorized representative Poglavnik, to protect the interests of the Croatian people and will always respect the constitution and the laws of the Croatian people.")

76 Compare the Fahneneid from 2 December 1933: "Ich schwöre bei Gott diesen heiligen Eid, daß ich meinem Volk und Vaterland allzeit treu und redlich dienen und als tapferer und gehorsamer Soldat bereit sein will, jederzeit für diesen Eid mein Leben einzusetzen" ("I swear this holy oath to God, that I will remain loyal to my people and fatherland at all times and will serve honestly and as a brave and obedient soldier, will be ready at any time to sacrifice my life for this oath.") to that of the Wehrmacht from 20 August 1934: "Ich schwöre bei
In this way, the developing dictator Hitler was able to ensure their support, which was otherwise not guaranteed, and prevented a possible struggle for authority against the military, which he may not have been able to win. It is interesting to compare Stalin's method for dealing with this similar problem: he eliminated his generals and officers through execution or imprisonment at a gulag before they could act against him, as he had feared. By Hitler's preparations and immediate quick action upon the death of Reichspräsident Hindenburg on 2 August 1934, the German generals were prevented from attempting any action against Hitler at that time. Paradoxically, they never gave up their assassination attempts which culminated in Stauffenberg's unsuccessful move in 1944 and ultimately cost him and many of his accomplices their lives. Müller's General explains that they broke the Fahneneid in order to help Germany and save what was left of her reputation and to prevent their wives, children, the rest of their fellow countrymen and, most importantly, future generations of Germans from having to pay for the sins of the fathers after Germany's defeat. Although the Captain, along with other German military and citizens at that time, are not able to understand or appreciate the danger and ultimate sacrifice these men took upon themselves, subsequent generations of Germans and their own descendants will appreciate their sacrifice and will honor them. Sixty years after their valiant attempt, the conspirators are honored internationally for their efforts to salvage the remnants of German identity. Their actions and inspiration to action were on behalf of future generations of Germans, within their own families and on a broader, general scale: their and all of the German descendants. The General and others like him undertook their actions because they did not want their descendants to be hated and reviled for being German based on Hitler and the Nazis' evil acts.

Gott diesen heiligen Eid, daß ich dem Führer des Deutschen Reiches und Volkes Adolf Hitler, dem Obersten Befehlshaber der Wehrmacht, unbedingten Gehorsam leisten und als tapferer Soldat bereit sein will, jederzeit für diesen Eid mein Leben einzusetzen" (Lange 423). ("I swear this sacred oath to God, that I will give unconditional obedience to the leader of the German Empire and people Adolf Hitler, the supreme commander of the armed forces, and as a brave soldier, want to be ready at any time, to sacrifice my life for this oath.")

Die Enkel vom 20. Juli by Felicitas von Aretin (Leipzig: Faber & Faber, 2004) is the most recent book which serves to acknowledge the efforts and meaning of the conspirators' efforts. On the sixtieth anniversary of the
Because their assassination attempt failed, they became martyrs through the cruel manner of death chosen by Hitler at Plötzensee. As the General laments, however, for his wife and immediate family members, there is no future. In the last part of the scene, Müller depicts his view of German identity after reunification.

c) The Violence Spreads

The last part of this scene is also the inspiration for its title: a Croatian Guest Worker narrates his recent past which reflects the strong influence Germany has had on his actions.

The term Geisterschloss ("ghost castle") is first used by the young widow earlier in the scene and implies ghosts from the past which also threaten the future of Germany. There is in fact a palace named Frauenmark located ten kilometers north of Parchim which belongs to Mecklenburg, one of what are still referred to, over a decade after reunification, as: die neuen Bundesländer ("the new federal states"). The "Beil" or "axe" is the tool of the peasants and Müller uses it to connect events from 1945 to those of 1990. The SS-man used it to kill the three women and the Guest Worker uses it to kill his wife and children before he returns to Germany. He no longer subordinate to the Germans, rather he is able to benefit from their prosperous economy and pleasant way of life: "Ich bin ein Bauer aus Kroatien. Ich arbeite in Deutschland. [. . .] Ich fahre mit meinem Auto, das ich in Deutschland gekauft habe, ich trage

Stauffenberg assassination attempt, he and his conspirators were honored in a special ceremony at the Bendlerblock and as a special tribute, the members of the military recited their Fahneneid.

Today these brave men are recognized by the rest of the world as heroes who gave their lives so that German identity and the German people could have a future. The SS-Reichsführer, Heinrich Himmler (1900-1945), "der mächtigste Mann nächst Hitler" (357) ("the most powerful man next to Hitler") had planned to eliminate the blood lineage of all conspirators in a vicious act of revenge, as he stated in a speech on 3 August 1944 at a Gauleitertagung or "conference of the area commanders" in Posen: "[. . .] Sie brauchen bloß die germanischen Sagas nachzulesen. Wenn sie eine Familie in die Acht taten und für vogelfrei erklären oder wenn eine Blutrache in einer Familie war, dann war man maßlos konsequent. Wenn die Familie vogelfrei erklärt wird und in Acht und Dann getan wird, sagten sie: Dieser Mann hat Verrat geübt, das Blut ist schlecht, da ist Verräterblut drin, das wird ausgerottet. Und bei der Blutrache wurde ausgerottet bis zum letzten Glied in der ganzen Sippe. Die Familie Graf Stauffenberg wird ausgelöscht werden bis ins letzte Glied [. . .]") (Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte 385). ("[. . .] One only has to look at the Germanic sagas. Whenever they banished a family and outlawed it or whenever a vendetta was in a family,then they were boundlessly consistent. Whenever the family was outlawed and was banished, they said: This man has committed treason, his blood is bad, there is a traitor's blood in it, that will be exterminated. And with the vendetta it was eradicated all the way down to the last member in the whole clan. The family of Count Stauffenberg will be annihilated down to the last member [. . .]) Fortunately, his plan was not carried out and Staffenberg's children survived. The Nazis did, however, take children under the age of fourteen away from their parents and put them into a special town and home where
einen Anzug, den ich in Deutschland gekauft habe, von der Stange, wie man in Deutschland sagt, mit Hemd und Schlips, weil ich aussehen muss wie ein Deutscher [. . .] Ich lege meinen Anzug in ordentliche Falten, wie ich es in Deutschland gelernt habe, ebenso das Hemd" (40) ("I am a farmer from Croatia. I work in Germany. [. . .] I drive with my car, that I bought in Germany, with shirt and tie, because I must look like a German [. . .] I fold my suit in an orderly fashion, as I learned in Germany, the same with the shirt"). The relation to German identity is unmistakable: the Guest Worker from Croatia wants to associate himself with being a German and believes clothing and his outer appearance will achieve this goal. The omniscient reader, however, is able to see the similarities between the Croatian SS-man from 1945 earlier in the scene and the modern Croatian Guest Worker of 1990: both hold a servile position in relation to the Germans. Thus whether SS-man or "schlechtbezahlte Fließbandarbeiter", to borrow Schmitt's terminology, each retains a certain "Sklavenstatus" in relation to the Germans, whose "Ausbeutung" of the Croatians continues (205). The major difference between the two men lies solely in the desire of the SS-man to leave war-ravaged Germany quickly and return to his peaceful homeland of Croatia; whereas the Guest Worker wants nothing more than to leave his backward peasant homeland and return to Germany in order to become a part of the affluent modern German society. Both men exhibit violent tendencies through their willingness to kill and the ease with which each does so. The SS-man has killed on behalf of the Nazis during the war and he agrees to kill the three women in exchange for civilian or "civilized" clothes which will guarantee him safety to reach his homeland. The Guest Worker, ironically, eradicates his own Croatian family in order to realize his goal of returning to Germany and a more pleasant i.e., civilized life than he would have as a farmer in Croatia. Müller provides a connection from the present to the past with the Guest Worker's line: "Ich sehe die Sterne meiner Heimat, sie sind heller als die deutschen,

[79] their names were changed in an attempt to alter German identity. Children over fourteen, along with the surviving adult relatives, were sent to concentration camps.

[79] ("poorly paid assembly-line worker"; "slave status"; "exploitation")
zwischen mir und dem Himmel kein Rauch" (41) ("I see the stars of my homeland, they are brighter than the German ones, between me and the heavens there is no smoke"). The implication is that he can see the stars more clearly in his home of Croatia not only because there is less pollution than in Germany, a highly industrialized country with high levels of pollution, but because of the German past. The word "Rauch" presents an image of the smoke coming from the concentration camps and thus provides a strong connection to the Nazi period when the bodies of those killed in the gas chambers were cremated by the Croatian SS-men who were working for the Germans: their hired killers who perform the "dirty work" for them: then as now. Here again we see the theme of the stars and the heavens which is prevalent throughout the play. One more element connects the past to the present: the "Beil" or "axe" which the Croatian SS-man uses to kill the three German women and the Guest Worker now employs to murder his wife and two children. Although the Croatian learned to kill while still a child in his homeland, the Germans took advantage of this "skill" which he was able to develop in Germany during the war. Similarly, the Croatian Guest Worker is able to fit into German society easily in spite of his violent tendencies, which he can hide in Germany by wearing his suit and tie. Müller paints a picture not only of German identity which is characterized by violence and brutality, but of such a tendency in Eastern Europe as well: first felt in Russia under Stalin, which has spread and can be evidenced in Croatia and the Bosnian War.

---

80 In his prose piece from 1956, "The Iron Cross", which Müller later altered and developed into scene three of Die Schlacht, "Kleinbürgerhochzeit", Müller presents a story of a German man and his family which in some ways parallels the tale of the guest worker here. In April 1945 in Mecklenburg, after hearing about Hitler's marriage and suicide in his bunker, a German husband and father, a World War I veteran and recipient of the Iron Cross, decides to kill his wife, daughter, and himself out of loyalty to Hitler and in order to give his daughter "an honorable death from her father's hand to a life without honor" (Explosion 18). A major difference between the German man and the Croatian man is that the former expresses fear and hopes his wife and daughter run away before he can kill them; whereas the latter performs a cold-blooded act of violence against his own family without any sense of fear or remorse. Both men move to the west where they can live and work anonymously.

81 Referring to the Bosnian War Müller says: "Dieses ganze Balkanmassaker ist nicht anderes als Sinnsuche. In Bosnien wird jetzt bis zum bitteren Ende weitergemacht, weil sich die Nachbarn von gestern nicht mehr in die Augen gucken können. Obwohl niemand in Europa ein Interesse hat, den Konflikt am Laufen zu halten, wird trotzdem weitergemacht. Das ist eine neue Qualität. Krieg wird zur reinen Sinnsuche. Es ist so gesehen eher ein Religionskrieg als ein nationalistischer. Es ist ein metaphysischer Krieg" (GI3 217). ("This whole Balkan
The final part of this scene shows the young men from the FRG who have come to claim their inherited castle, the "Geisterschloss". Following reunification, the heirs of those families who had lost their property through the GDR's policy of expropriation were reinstated as the official owners, as the line by Young Man 1 demonstrates: "Das gehört uns also. Rückgabe vor Entschädigung. (lacht) Eine Ruine" (43) ("So that belongs to us. Restitution for damages. (laughs) A ruin"). His description of it as a "ruin" shows his lack of awareness for the tragedy that occurred here in 1945 and the German legacy that also belongs to him and his generation brought on by the actions of his German ancestors. Young Man 2 sees in the castle merely a piece of real estate and, therefore, a potential source of income, which reflects a very capitalist viewpoint. They could transform it into a "Golfplatz" ("golf course") or a "Reiterhof" ("riding stable") (43) for the wealthy citizens of Hamburg: "Vom Blutadel zum Geldadel. Das ist der Fortschritt" (41) ("From blood aristocracy to money aristocracy. That is progress"). The class system still exists as it did a generation ago, and the only progress is that now the privilege is based on how much money one has: the capitalist system. The fact that the three widows died here provides only another option for earning money: "Eine zusätzliche Einnahmequelle. Eine Touristenattraktion. Das Geisterschloss bei Parchim" (43) ("An additional source of income. A tourist attraction. The ghosts' castle near Parchim"). Far from demonstrating any understanding of the tragic events which occurred here and their effect on the present, Young Man 2 only shows an interest in earning money from the past, from their inheritance. Symbolically brushing off the dust of the past from their "Massanzügen (43) ("tailored suits"), they do not appreciate the true depth of their legacy from the past, or the danger it implies. Their disregard and disrespect for the tribulations of their ancestors is indicated by Young Man 1's quote from Franz Grillparzer's Die Ahnfrau ("the ancestress") from 1817, in which a mirror image of a deceased ancestress warns the

massacre is nothing other than a search for meaning. In Bosnia they will keep going now until the bitter end, because they cannot look their neighbors from yesterday in the eye. even though no one in Europe is interested
narrator of some as yet unknown threat. In this scene, the threat can be perceived not only as the evils relating to capitalism, but in conjunction with the Croatian SS-man and the Croatian Guest Worker, it also serves as a warning against Germany's continued use of hiring foreign nationals to perform menial tasks or slave duty on behalf of the Germans. The increase in immigrant workers and refugees, particularly from Eastern European and African nations, threatens the stability of the Western industrialized nations, including Germany. The privileged members of advanced capitalistic societies, exemplified by these two young capitalists from the West, have their "slaves" in the form of guest workers to perform their menial labor for them, just as the previous generation of aristocratic Germans had their hired workers, as the Young Woman's earlier reference to the slaves of Rome indicates. Müller perceives a threat to the stability of Germany and of the industrialized nations of the world by the influx of workers and refugees from less developed countries, who, like the Guest Worker in this scene, are willing to work for the Germans and other Western Europeans in exchange for an improved lifestyle. The problem is, however, that these immigrants are considered second-class citizens and do not share fully in all of the rights and privileges as the Germans which, as in ancient Rome, will eventually lead to dissatisfaction and uprisings and the end of the status quo in Germany. Thus the excerpt from Die Ahnfrau can be understood as a warning to the current generation, represented specifically by Young Man 1 and Young Man 2, that their exploitative behavior could eventually result in the: "Untergang dieses Landes in keeping the conflict going, it keeps going anyway. That is a new quality. War has become purely a search for meaning. Seen like this, it is more a religious war than a nationalistic one. It is a metaphysical war.") In Zur Lage der Nation, Müller expresses his view of the connection between the slaveholders of ancient Rome and the capitalistic societies of Western Europe and the USA: "[. . .] Westeuropa wird von innen aufgefressen; die Flutwelle der Dritten Welt schlägt über Europa zusammen. [. . .] Diese innere Aushöhlung Westeuropas hat ihre Analogie im Untergang des Römischen Reiches, das schließlich schrittweise von den Sklaven übernommen wurde. Heute haben die Gastarbeiter und Immigranten in den Metropolen denselben Status wie die Sklaven im alten Rom -- bis hin zur Gesetzgebung. Die Sklaven genossen keinerlei Menschenrechte -- Aristoteles definiert sie als >>sprechende Werkzeuge<< --, und auch für die Gastarbeiter<< gelten keine Menschenrechte [. . .]" (27). ("[. . .] Western Europe will be eaten from the inside; the tidal wave of the Third World will crash over Europe. [. . .] This inner West European erosion has its analogy in the downfall of the Roman Empire, that was eventually taken over by the slaves little by little. Today the guest workers and immigrants in the metropolises have the same status as the slaves in Rome -- not including legislation. The slaves did not enjoy any kind of human rights -- Aristoteles defined them as "talking tools" --, and also for the "guest workers" there are no human rights [. . .]")
und seiner priviligierten Bevölkerungsschichten" (Schmitt 207). Similarly, their female companion Kitty, whose name reflects: "die Amerikanisierung der jungen westdeutschen Generation" (Schmitt 207), also shows no respect or appreciation for the past and the traditions handed down through the inheritance, as demonstrated by her comment in the final line of the scene: "Das ist also euer Schloss. Igitt" (44) ("So that is your castle. Yuck"). The scene thus ends on a note of arrogance and disrespect by the younger generation for their ancestors, in particular the General, who risked and sacrificed his life in order to save the future for his heirs through the assassination attempt, but who are unable to appreciate his sacrifice and so learn nothing from the recent Nazi past. By not learning from these brutal lessons of the past, these descendants will continue to create conditions optimal for the exploitation of other races which will lead to further problems.

Welzel sees another possible interpretation of the warning by the ancestress, namely: that Germany will have peace only after all of the Nazi descendants have been eliminated. He draws a parallel to the story of Die Ahnfrau with the descendants of the "Geisterschloss" as specifically portrayed by Müller. He writes:

Erst nachdem die gesamte Familie samt Kindern ausgelöscht ist, findet auch der Geist der „Ahnfrau“ -- Jahre später -- seine Ruhe (auch hier böte sich eine gewagte Parallele an: Deutschland gibt erst Ruhe, nachdem der Verlust des Zweiten Weltkrieges wieder aufgehoben ist) (168).

The two young men in this scene thus represent the descendants of those officers who served Hitler and committed crimes against humanity. In the Biblical sense, these descendants -- ignorant of their past as well as of their fate -- will eventually pay the ultimate price for the crimes of their fathers: with their lives. Given such an interpretation of Müller's text, it

---

83 ("downfall of this country and its privileged sections of the population")
84 ("the Americanization of the young West German generation")
85 ("Only after the entire family including the children has been exterminated, is the soul of the ancestress able -- years later -- to find peace (here also a daring parallel presents itself: Germany will only then find peace, after the damage from the Second World War has been rectified.")
follows that the execution of the three widows would symbolize the first step in the retribution process. Welzel explains that their deaths represent the: "Vergeltung für die Nazi-Greuel in Rußland und Polen" (168). He neglects the fact, however, that the General tried to assassinate Hitler and is thus considered a traitor to his fellow officers. The General's execution at Plötzensee, therefore, would have to be considered the first step in this retribution process, if that is, indeed, what Müller intended. Although there is a grain of truth in Welzel's idea, it is more likely that Müller's primary interest is in warning the German descendants, who are living in a reunified, industrialized, capitalist country, about the dangers of exploiting those who are weaker and poorer than themselves.

There is, however, yet another danger that still exists within Germany and is based on the Germans' desire to reclaim their losses following their defeat in 1945. Because Germany lost the war, it was forced to endure grave humiliation, such as the loss of territory and its own division. Should the Neonazis continue to gain power, the possibility could not be excluded that they would try to avenge this past. The situation in 1945 was even more detrimental than that of 1918, after Germany's defeat in World War I and the harsh conditions of the Treaty of Versailles, by which the Germans felt they were being unfairly punished. Hitler was able to rise to power on these flames of anger and vengeance, which helped fuel the fire leading to World War II. Despite the fact that Hitler started this war and committed immeasurable atrocities against mankind, Germany's ultimate defeat at the hands of the Russians, who also committed horrible brutalities against the civilian population, has left a smoldering spark of hostility which cannot be easily extinguished. In the following section, the focus is on the antagonisms between the Germans and the Russians, which increased during World War II and in particular at Stalingrad: this aggression plays a major role throughout the play until culminating in the final scene.

86("retribution for the Nazi atrocities in Russia and Poland")
V.1.4 The Legacy of the German-Russian Rivalry

In scene three, "SIEGFRIED EINE JÜDIN AUS POLEN" ("Siegfried A Jewess from Poland"), the most complex as well as most interesting scene of the entire play, Müller presents German identity as a product of the dichotomy between the dictators, Stalin and Hitler. Situated between Stalin's scene and Hitler's scene, it is divided into three parts, each of which occurs at Stalingrad and is composed in blank verse. The scene is devoted to presenting the perspectives of the war and both dictators on German and Russian soldiers and officers. In the broader view, Müller deals with the question of guilt and responsibility as inherited from the fathers as the ancestors or forefathers of a nation on the future generations, the children and grandchildren. In a national vein, all of the three text excerpts he uses here reflect this aspect of German identity and its continuation from one generation to the next. Müller believed that Stalingrad was the end of the GDR as his quote indicates: "Das Ende der DDR war eigentlich Stalingrad" (GI3 204). By this cryptic remark he means that the German-Russian conflict which began and escalated in the Kessel also meant that the German-Russian cooperation i.e., GDR was thus also doomed before it even began. After the disintegration of the GDR, Müller still considered World War II and Stalingrad important aspects from the recent German past which had a great impact on German identity as he demonstrates here.

a) The Nightmare of Stalingrad

Part one does not contain any character names, rather only numbers which refer to two Russian soldiers in Stalingrad. Müller presents Stalingrad as a focal point, but also as a connecting point between Stalin and Hitler i.e., Russia and Germany: as such, this scene is situated between Stalin in scene two and Hitler in scene four. The soldiers of both dictators are caught in the middle between two dictators who have blood on their hands, that is, they are responsible for and guilty of the deaths of countless soldiers as well as civilians. Soldier
I's question: "Wer ist dir lieber, Hitler oder Stalin" (15) ("Whom do you prefer, Hitler or Stalin") is answered cynically but truthfully by Soldier 2: "Blut an den Händen haben beide, unsers" ("Both of them have blood on their hands, ours"). In addition to the Russian-German aggression, Müller also presents a father-son conflict in the sense of the relationship between the ruler of a fatherland and his own soldiers. This father theme is present throughout the play, such as in the "Party" scene mentioned earlier. During his purges of 1937/1938, Stalin had sent this former officer, "Soldier 2" to a gulag as punishment, but due to the need for experienced men, he has allowed such former officers to fight as soldiers in the war that Hitler started. Despite the non-aggression pact of 1939, Hitler's troops invaded Russia only two years later, on 22 June 1941 and the Battle of Stalingrad began during the fall of 1942 and ended on 2 February 1943 with the capitulation by General Paulus. Soldier 2 shoots and kills a young German soldier who approaches them, but cannot bear to see the dead man's eyes because they remind him of the eyes of the living dead at the gulag: a sign of inhumanity and of human suffering: "Er ist ganz jung, ein Kind noch. / Ich kann die Augen nicht mehr sehn. Begrab ihn. Schnee haben wir genug" (16) ("He is very young, still a child. I cannot stand to see the eyes any more. Bury him. We have enough snow"). Soldier 1 finds a book in the dead soldier's boot: Der Tod des Empedokles (1797-1800) and reads a passage from it (16-17). Müller is quoting from Friedrich Hölderlin's third version of the fragment, act one, scene three, verses 412-427 written in blank verse. In this particular excerpt, Empedokles tells the story of a revolt that occurred while he was a young man. The resulting strife and division among the family members eventually destroyed the family lineage and thus its future. The broken relationship between the father, sons, and brothers along with the idea of a dire future in this excerpt, which he slightly alters, corresponds to Müller's theme of the brother and father-son conflicts and his presentation of an uncertain and even dire
future for Germany. The line: "Mit eigner Hand sein eignes Haus zerbrach" ("With his own hand he destroys his own house") implies that the dictators Hitler and Stalin are destroying their own "homes" i.e., countries or fatherland through their violent actions: battles, concentration camps, and gulags, respectively. There can be no victor and in the end only the people of each nation will continue to suffer and any apparent victory will be in effect an empty one because of the great number of lives lost on both sides. Müller shows the lack of humanity on both sides brought about by the uncaring, ruthless "fathers" or dictators; for Soldier 2 this inhumanity is reflected by the unhuman conditions at the gulag: "Vergessen wer du bist was war was wird" (17) ("Forgotten who you are what was what will be") which clearly show the loss of one's own personal humanity. Schmitt writes: "Das Bild vom Untergang eines Volkes wird hier wohl zitiert, weil es auf den Zustand Deutschlands und des deutschen Volkes während des Nationalsozialismus übertragbar ist" (194). In addition to reflecting the German situation due to the Nazis' actions, it can also be applied to the Russian situation and the father-son conflict i.e., ruler and subject. Soldier 1's line: "Die Väter schlagen anders als der Fremde" (16) ("Fathers hit differently than the stranger") and Soldier 2's response: "Und bittret schmeckt das Blut" ("And the blood tastes more bitter") are a reflection of Stalin's cruel acts against his own people and their despair at his treatment. Soldier 2's line: ". . . Mein Glück sind die Deutschen / Weil Russland ist mehr als der Gulag [. . .]" (18) ("[. . .] My chance lies with the Germans / Because Russia is more than the gulag [. . .]") shows that he is fighting on behalf of his fatherland and not necessarily for Stalin, who had sent him to the gulag. Schmitt also believes that: "Er tut es aber nicht für Stalin, sondern für seine russische Heimat, aus Patriotismus also" (193). Soldier 1 expresses no pity or sense of remorse for the young German soldier when he finds a photograph of him laughing in front of seven dead partisans, whom the German soldiers had apparently just hanged: "Ein Foto. Sieben Partisanen, / Am Galgen. Und er steht davor und lacht. / Die

89 ("The image of a people's demise is probably quoted here because it can be applied to the situation in
Wölfe sollen seine Augen fressen (spuckt auf den Toten)" (17) ("A photograph. Seven partisans, / At the gallows. And he is standing in front of it and laughing. / May the wolves devour his eyes (spits on the dead man")). Soldier 2, on the contrary, continues to feel pity and a sense of remorse, not only for the young dead soldier, but for all of the German and Russian soldiers who are being forced to fight this battle for the tyrants: "Vielleicht hat er geglaubt an ihre Lügen / Der Deutsche ist ein Mensch wir sind die Tiere" (17) ("Maybe he believed their lies / The German is human and we are the animals"). As a former officer, he is aware of the propaganda which is told to soldiers to make them eager to fight the enemy. In the German situation, the Nazis spread their lies, based on Nietzsche's writings, that only the Germans belonged to the superior, Aryan race and all others deserved death. The Nazi propaganda was based on asserting the superiority of the German race over all others with the desired result that the soldiers believe it and act accordingly. Soldier 2 understands that the German soldier was following orders and believed the lies of his superiors because he had been an officer and knows what they tell their troops to make them obey. Müller presents the Russians as less than human, but only because they have been treated as such by their own "father", the ruthless dictator Stalin. He betrayed his own people by sending them to gulags where they suffered inhumane treatment as Soldier 2 explains. Thus in this sense they have been reduced to being at least treated like animals. On the other hand, Müller shows that Germans have become less than human in their struggle to stay alive under inhuman conditions at Stalingrad, where they suffered greatly from hunger and were forced to resort to cannibalism in order to survive. This scene at Stalingrad shows the senseless battle as viewed by the men who had to fight it, whether German or Russian, they were dehumaned by the war. There is no more "menschliches Gesetz" (17) as the laws of humanity have been obliterated. Civil behavior has been replaced by animalistic behavior: they have become like

Germany and of the German people during National Socialism.")
dogs or wolves, i.e., Germans and Russians, respectively. Soldier 1 ironically ends the scene with "Amen": a prayer that no one, no God is there to hear.

In the second part of this scene, Müller depicts two German officers at Stalingrad who are referred to only as "1" and "2", respectively. There are two major themes here: 1) the dehumanization of the two officers and; 2) the lesson of military obedience and honor in relation to guilt and responsibility. The German officers are dehumanized by succumbing to their hunger: rather than share the food from the care package with the rest of their company consisting of five soldiers, they react with the basic animalistic instinct for survival and eat everything themselves. At the same time, these two officers also lose their honor because they do not act according to the military codex which requires that they act with dignity and on behalf of the men under their command. The officers, however, are only human themselves and, as such, are not immune to the pangs of hunger which, in the words of the first officer, has turned them into animals: "Der Hunger macht noch Tiere aus uns allen (19) ("Hunger will turn us all into animals yet"). The second officer reiterates this aspect of dehumanization when he says: "Wir sind Schweine" (21) ("We are pigs"). A very important action follows this last line which vividly contrasts with their behavior, namely: they shave themselves or get shaved, "(Gehn jeder in seinen Bunker rasieren sich bzw. lassen sich rasieren sie erschiessen sich)" (21). The act of shaving is a civilized, humanizing custom which is accompanied by another symbol of refined society, their use of napkins: "Serviette, Hauptmann" (20) ("Napkin, Captain"). By juxtaposing these symbolic acts of civilized behavior against the primitive yet very human struggle for survival, Müller is deliberately debunking the myth of the heroic battle of Stalingrad which was propagated by Göring on behalf of Hitler and the Nazis: one thinks of Göring's radio address from 30 January 1943, which was discussed in Chapter Four. Instead, the author focuses on the result of a battle which was fought at the expense of German blood by men who were forced to endure inhumane, catastrophic conditions and who, at the direct command of their own leadership,
would be shot if they tried to surrender or retreat. Therefore, the only means of escape which remained for many of them, including Müller's officers in this scene, was suicide. One answer to the question as to why they decide to kill themselves has thus been answered: they realize that their choice not to share the food with their comrades has dehumanized them and, although it is a human reaction, it also reflects a human weakness which, according to first Prussian and later Nazi propaganda, is beneath the honor of a German officer. As German officers who have been indoctrinated to believe the Nazi propaganda, neither could go on living after his perceived less than honorable behavior and so decide to end their lives. In addition, since the Nazi leadership has eliminated both surrender and retreat as options, these two officers realize that there is no way out of the Kessel other than suicide. If they were to stay alive, their struggle to survive would require that they continue to demonstrate animalistic behavior against the other men and finally, against each other; thereby becoming even more inhuman.

Throughout this scene, Müller employs animal imagery and metaphor: hunger transforms the men into animals by which they lose part of their humanity. The word "Prussian" is not used directly, but because Müller juxtaposes a quote from Der Prinz von Homburg, who was a Prussian officer, the connection can be made that Müller wants to first display and then dispel the myth of the Prussian officer, who is supposed to be obedient and even infallible. The excerpt, taken from act five, scene ten, consists of a specific combination of lines from this scene and the elimination or exclusion of others, which Müller chose in order to underscore his ideas. Homburg is feeling the intoxication of immortality as he believes he is about to be executed. Sitting next to an oak tree, the symbolic tree of Germany and representative of German strength, he is blindfolded and awaits his death.90 The

90There are two other scenes which help to understand why Müller chose this particular Geschichtsdrama and this excerpt. Homburg's refusal to accept the Elector's clemency and his resolve to go through with the execution is shown in act five, scene seven: "Ich will das heilige Gesetz des Kriegs, / Das ich verletzt', im Angesicht des Heers, / Durch einen freuen Tod verherrlichen!" The young Prussian officer has learned to conform and to subject himself to the laws of war and the dictum that his leader is to be obeyed no matter what
canon fire which awakens him symbolizes the reality of war. Homburg's question: "Ist es ein Traum?" ("Is it a dream?") and Kottwitz's response: "Ein Traum, was sonst?" (21) ("A dream, what else?") signify Müller's perception of the Prussian military heritage, which would have men dying in order to save or reinstate their honor, as a myth and not based in reality: a dream. The Prussian legacy has infiltrated so much of German history and life -- it has been turned into a myth -- how an officer in the German army is supposed to behave or is expected to act. In World War II there were many Prussian officers, some who took part in the assassination attempts as well. Müller's choice of lines -- let the sound of canon fire awaken him -- sounds like Müller's call to let the modern day officers be awakened and to snap out of their foolish dream about honor and fighting - it was unrealistic in Kleist's day and it still is. This idea about Prussian honor is just a dream, nothing else, as the line signifies, and is not based on reality. Hitler and the Nazis used the idea of the glorified German soldier and furthered the myth of dying for the fatherland in the same way that the Prussian leaders had furthered their myth about honor. It is military propaganda to compel and convince the soldiers and officers to obey and to willingly or gladly die for the fatherland. Their brief discussion while eating has other implications for German identity. Officer two says:

"Europa. Was geht mich Europa an. / Es geht um Deutschland. Schiller und Goethe" (20)

("Europe. What do I care about Europe. It is about Germany. Schiller and Goethe"). An interesting reference to the classical legacy of Germany and also implies that Germany does not belong to Europe. Go back to quote by Müller about the country being between East and West and fearful of losing its identity. "So hab ichs gelernt" (20) -- he did learn something -- until now Müller has used the sentence: "Er kanns noch lernen" - he or they can still learn it -

the cost. In act five, scene nine, right before the excerpt Müller uses from act five, scene ten, Kottwitz explains to the Elector that Homburg has been tamed: "Du könntest an Verderbens Abgrund stehn, / Daß er, um dir zu helfen, dich zu retten, / Auch nicht das Schwert mehr zückte, ungerufen!" ("You could stand before the abyss of destruction, / So that he, in order to help you, to save you, / Would no longer even draw his sword, uncalled for!") Obedience in the military, a trait of the Prussian military, is of the utmost importance and urgency and has developed into a German trait which has endured into the twentieth century and which Müller condemns in *Germania Tod* and again here in this scene in *Germania 3*. 
scene one, for example. But now, Officer 2 asks why they marched into Russia and then answers his own question saying that he learned the reason is to protect Europe from the Bolshevists. Officer 1 declares narrow-mindedly that only Germany is important and refers to the great classic writers, Goethe and Schiller. But what these officers really learned is not to question the war and the reasons and their leaders. Kleist wrote these lines and this ending as a tribute to the noble and honorable Prussian officers and particularly for Homburg, but Müller uses these words ironically. Blind obedience does not result in immortality, only in death. The dream of which Homburg speaks is for Müller a nightmare: the concept of a noble death for the fatherland and for the officer's honor is only a dream, it is not real, rather the reality is a nightmare and there is nothing noble about it.

The third and climactic part of this scene begins with three starving German soldiers at Stalingrad who are gnawing on a bone, like dogs. Müller uses the technique of Zeitraffer here as he blends aspects of Stalingrad with a Russian prison camp after the war. Soldier one makes a reference to the "Kessel" of ten or thirteen years ago; he cannot keep track of time anymore; and now he does not believe in Communism anymore, since he has been a prisoner in the Soviet Union to which he refers sarcastically as the "Sowjetparadies" (22) ("Soviet paradise"). Soldier 3's belief and claim that Hitler will save them is a reference to Stalingrad: "Und ich sag er holt uns heraus" (22). "Heil Hitler" from soldier 2. The term "Gefrierpunkt" applies equally well to Siberia and Stalingrad: a prisoner of war camp or the battle in 1942-1943. Also the reference to work: "Jetzt hast du Arbeit" (22) implies they are working in such a camp or gulag somewhere in the Soviet Union after the war. Here is another reference to cannibalism, the same euphemism as in Germania Tod, scene six, in the line: "ob er vom Pferd war oder ICH HATT EINEN KAMERADEN" (24). Schmitt continually refers to Müller's use of cannibalism as his expression of "die extreme Brutalität und Unmenschlichkeit im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland" (196) but he fails to acknowledge that cannibalism is a major component of war itself and its aftermath and, therefore, cannot only
be viewed as a reflection of Nazi Germany or the remnants of Nazism in post-war Germany.

In an ongoing theme throughout this play, Müller again uses references to the German soldiers as dogs: they are chewing on bones when Soldier 2 says: "Jedem Hund sein Knochen" (22) ("To every dog his bone"). Soldier 1 then tells the tale of his experience in 1928 in the Eastern German town of Leuna, when the Communists turned traitor against one of their own in order to achieve a political advantage (22-23). The seventeen year old boy had committed the crimes of theft and murder and the oppositional political forces were using him as an example to make Communism look bad. The ranks of the Communists are broken as they hunt down the young man: particularly shocking is that the father plays the leading role in capturing his own son. This is a political allegory based on the religious story of Jesus and his Father, who let His son suffer and die on the cross. The symbolism of the three days they spent looking for the boy parallels the three days Jesus had hung on the cross. Müller's use of religious symbolism for communist aspect is a continuing element in this play and in other works by Müller. The Communists thus received their seats in the parlament because they betrayed one of their own. This tale of treachery told by Soldier 1 serves as a prelude for the ensuing dialogue between the two Nibelung characters, Kriemhild and Hagen, and Müller's theme of political betrayal as an integral component of past German identity.

German Communism in the form of the GDR is or was trapped between Stalinism and Fascism, between Stalin and Hitler. Two dictators fighting for dominance in Europe which eventually resulted in the Cold War and fascism was replaced by capitalism and the struggle became based more on economic factor which decided military strength and dominant political ideology. Jost Hermand asserts in his essay, "Looking Back at Heiner Müller", that: "[. . .] the fundamental constellations of the Cold War remained largely unaltered in most of his works" (157). Indeed, while Müller's texts, including Germania Tod, are a reflection of the Cold War and the resultant relations among European nations, particularly the FRG and the GDR, the central issue in Germania 3 focuses on a German
versus Russian dichotomy even more than on the now outdated Cold War constellation. The rivalry between the world's two superpowers was no longer a major political reality by the time Müller had completed this play, following the fall of the wall and reunification, but it had been during the forty year existence of the GDR. Each part of scene three has an excerpt from German literature which is fitting to Müller's particular expression of German identity.

b) **A Prisoner of Ideology**

"DIE ZWEITE EPIPHANIE" ("The Second Epiphany") is the title of scene six which is divided into two parts: "Heimkehr" ("The Homecoming") and "Willkommen in Workuta" ("Welcome to Vorkuta"), respectively, both of which take place in 1945 and are composed in prose. In the first part, a German man, a Communist, has just returned after twelve years in a political prison, to which his clothing testifies, to find a Russian soldier i.e., liberator raping his wife. Clothing, in particular the uniform, plays an important role in helping to determine a character's identity, as is also evidenced by the characters Kriemhild and Hagen. He is exhausted and disillusioned both with German Communism, which has failed, and with the Russian liberators, who act more like a conquering army enjoying the spoils of war. After he kills the Russian soldier, i.e., Bolshevist, he speaks to the corpse as a fellow Communist in which he relates his experiences during his twelve-year imprisonment, due to Hitler's policies, in the Nazi concentration camp. Mario Frank writes that after Thälmann's arrest on 3 March 1933:

\[
\text{Tausende von KPD-Funktionären wurden in den nächsten Tagen verhaftet. Was von der Organisation der KPD im Reich blieb, waren führungslose, machtlose Idealisten, die sich unter Lebensgefahr im Geheimen weiter für die KPD einsetzten. [. . .] Ihr mutiger Einsatz änderte nichts daran, dass der KPD -- der vor kurzem noch zweitgrößten kommunistischen Partei der Welt -- politisch das Rückgrat gebrochen}
\]
In a relatively short period of time, the Nazis had managed to eradicate the KPD either by arresting its members and sending them to concentration camps, such as Thälmann, or many, such as Ulbricht, fled the country to live in exile. Even though Müller's character is a German Communist, as their prisoner, he was forced to help the Nazis with the murder and incineration of the Jews; thus in a sense he is guilty of the crime. In his brief explanation to the dead Russian, he also describes what he saw on his way back home: "Vier Tage Fussmarch durch zerstampfte Gegend, mit Jubel in den Eingeweiden über jedes zerschossene Haus. Sie haben es, was sie gewollt haben, wie" (46) ("Four days' march through the trampled area, with delight in the intestines over every house riddled with bullets. They got what they wanted, hmm"). He saw firsthand the destruction Hitler's war brought to the German soil and the German population: houses that had been the targets of enemy bullets and German soil that was trampled underfoot by foreign soldiers' boots. He expresses pleasure in this destruction because he feels it is the just reward for the Nazi perpetrators and their followers. He continues: "Die Pferde haben mir leid getan in der Elbe bei Magdeburg, wo sie einen Flüchtlingstreck zusammengeschossen hatten. Ein weisser Arm, der aus dem Wasser greift nach einem toten Kind, das vorbeitreibt mit der Strömung" (46) ("I felt sorry for the horses in the Elbe near Magdeburg, where they had shot down a group of refugees. A white arm, that reaches out of the water for a dead child, that is floating by with the current"). He saw the remains of German refugees who had been killed while fleeing from the Russian conquerors i.e., invaders yet his words express no sympathy for these people, because he mistakenly believes that all Germans became Nazi followers. While being forced to perform

91("Thousands of KPD-functionaries were arrested over the next several days. Whoever remained in the Empire from the KPD's organization, were leaderless, powerless idealists, who engaged themselves secretly on behalf of the KPD at the risk of their own lives. [...] Their daring engagement, however, did not change the fact that the KPD -- which only recently had still been the world's second-largest communist party -- politically had had its back broken. Thousands of KPD-members were thrown into prisons and concentration camps each year.")
the evil Nazi crimes in the concentration camp: "[. . .] hat sich bei ihm offenbar eine
Identifikation aller Deutschen mit dem Hitlerfaschismus entwickelt" (Schmitt 208). He feels no pity or regret for the German refugees who were killed by enemy gunfire, not even for the innocent child, rather only for the horses who had to suffer and die. His insensitivity and indifference concerning these refugees reflect the fact that he has become isolated from his fellow Germans during his twelve years of imprisonment. He has also become isolated from his wife as demonstrated by his indifference to her; he treats her as merely a possession and kills her Russian rapist not out of love or jealousy, rather only to protect his rights of ownership. His occasional comments directed at the Russian soldier imply that he has become so insensitized to life and death that he does not realize at first how hard he had hit the Russian and that the man is dead: "Wie lange hast du keine Frau gehabt. [. . .] Ich hätte nicht so hart zuschlagen sollen, wie. Das Blut. [. . .] Hörst du mir noch zu [. . .] Er ist tot, wie" (45-46) ("How long have you been without a woman. [. . .] I shouldn't have hit so hard, hmm. [. . .] The blood. [. . .] Are you still listening to me. [. . .] He is dead, hmm"). His last line, in which he uses the third person singular instead of the second person singular which he had been using, indicates that he finally has become aware that he has killed the Russian soldier.

The term "epiphany" refers to the first or original epiphany: a Christian celebration which takes place on 6 January and commemorates the coming of the Magi as the first manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, but it can also refer to an illuminating discovery, such as a revealing scene or moment. In keeping with Müller's use of religious themes and the meaning of the title, the dead child can be interpreted as a parallel to the baby Jesus, whom the Christians believe to be the savior of the human race, but here it is not the Magi who are underway, rather the refugees. Whereas children signify a positive future and sense of hope in Germania Tod, here this vivid image of the dead child offers absolutely no hope for the future, rather signifies that the future is bleak. Similar to the death of Kriemhild and Etzel's

92("[. . .] apparently there developed within him an identification of all Germans with Hitler's fascism")
son, Ortlieb, Müller uses the theme of the dead child to demonstrate his disillusion and sense of despair for the future of German Communism. In this scenario, the representative German Communist is trapped between two ideologies and nationalities: German Fascism and Russian Bolshevism (i.e., Stalinism). The epiphany, in the sense of an illuminating discovery or revealing moment, is the German Communist's realization that he is trapped between the proverbial "rock and a hard place": in the middle of a hopeless situation with no chance of escape because there is nowhere left for him to go. Schmitt succinctly states: "So sitzt der Deutsche hier zwischen allen Stühlen" (208).\(^93\) Stalin is a dictator and the GDR, under the influence of Stalinism, is not a safe haven for German Communists. Schmitt confirms the parallel between the Soviet leader and the former Nazi leader: "Ihr Führer Stalin ist ebenso zunächst Befreier, dann aber ein neuer Unterdrücker, der Terror verbreitet und an die Stelle von Hitlers Konzentrationslager seinen Gulag setzt (207).\(^94\) Having spent the twelve years of Nazi domination in one of Hitler's concentration camps based on his political ideology, he has now become, ironically, a victim of the very political ideology which originally caused his imprisonment under the Nazis.

In the second part of this scene, after the Russian soldiers have seen their dead comrade and correctly assume that the German has killed him, they take the former concentration camp prisoner away: now he is a prisoner in the Soviet gulag, Vorkuta.\(^95\)

Located in the polar region just north of the Arctic Circle, the winter there can last up to eight months with frigid temperatures reaching to minus sixty degrees celsius so that the prisoners, usually sentenced to twenty-five years or life, lived and worked under the harshest and most brutal conditions. Originally established in 1932, it became a city in 1942 but was dissolved after Stalin's death. It was a labor camp for political prisoners, both men and women, who,

---

\(^{93}\)("So the German sits here between all chairs.")

\(^{94}\)("Likewise, their leader Stalin is in the first place liberator, then, however, a new oppressor, spreads terror and in place of Hitler's concentration camps puts his gulag.")
after the war, rejected the communist dictatorship of Stalin first in the SBZ and then in the
GDR. Even though the German is a Communist, as he mentions to the dead Russian soldier:
"Wir sind Kommunisten [. . .]" (45), the other political prisoners in Vorkuta assume that
because he is German, he must be a fascist and follower of Hitler, just as he assumes that all
Germans, such as the refugees, are Nazis. Thus his German identity and the Nazi legacy
associated with it has condemned him to another prison sentence. Welzel explains that: "[. . .]
das Stalingrad-Syndrom wiederholt sich im Gulag -- das Opfer wird einmal von Hitler, dann
von Stalin verraten" (169). 96 Just as Hitler betrayed his men -- fascists -- and left them to their
own fate in the bitter cold at Stalingrad, Stalin sends his men -- communists -- to endure their
fate in the arctic cold. There is a major difference, however, which Welzel ignores, namely:
that Hitler's men were soldiers and officers fighting a war in Stalingrad; whereas Stalin sent
his men (and women) to the gulags as a punishment and had nothing to do with fighting a
war on behalf of the fatherland. The disparaging comments by the Kapo, the prisoner put in
charge of other prisoners, reflect the Communist's impossible situation: "He. Deutscher.
Warum habt ihr nicht gesiegt. [. . .]" Faschist, leck mir die Stiefel. [. . .] Sag Heil Hitler.
(Pause. Häftling hebt eine Faust zum kommunistischen Gruß. Häftlinge schlagen ihn nieder.)
Willkommen in der Heimat, Bolschewik" (47) ("Hey. German. Why didn't you win? [. . .]
Fascist, lick my boot. [. . .] Say Heil Hitler. (Pause. Prisoner raises his fist in the communist
greeting. Prisoners knock him to the ground.) Welcome home, Bolschevik"). The final
comments and actions in this scene demonstrate the difficult situation in which the German
Communist finds himself following World War II: accused of being a follower of Hitler, he
is condemned for being a fascist by the occupiers, such as Russia, a Communist country; yet
when he shows solidarity with communism he is attacked by his fellow inmates: thus he

95 According to Horst Schüler, a former political prisoner at Vorkuta, the term "gulag" stems from the Russian
name for the main administrative authority: "GULag: Glawnoje Uprawlenije Lagerej". Source: Workuta
Lagergemeinschaft Workuta/ GULag Sowjetunion (www.workuta.de).
96 ("[. . .] the Stalingrad-syndrome is repeated in the gulag -- the victim is betrayed once by Hitler, then by
Stalin.")
cannot escape persecution. Similar to the prison scene in *Germania Tod*, in *Germania 3*, Müller again demonstrates that the situation after 1945 has not improved for the German Communist. The author's image of German identity remains largely based on that of post-World War II as the author continues to focus on that time period. One can, therefore, conclude that Müller's perspective of German identity even after reunification is still centered on events from the early and mid-twentieth century, which left the German Communist without a safe haven, not even in the GDR.

c) The Nibelung Myth Lives On

This scene continues with excerpts from the third part of Hebbel's *Die Nibelungen* (1855-1860), "Kriemhilds Rache" ("Kriemhild's revenge"), in the form of a conversation between Kriemhild and Hagen. Müller combines various excerpts and inserts them into this scene to vividly represent his view of the historical path of German Communism and the KPD. An explanation of the scene's title is essential for understanding why Müller includes this particular dialogue between these two characters and who or what each represents in relation to the other and to German identity. The term "Eine Jüdin aus Polen" is a direct reference to Brecht's poem entitled: "GRABSCHRIFT FÜR ROSA LUXEMBURG" from 1948 in which he commemorates the thirtieth anniversary of her death. Further, the unveiling of each character's true identity at the end of the scene is the key to understanding the title in relationship to the dialogue and the significance of the scene. Underneath his outer clothes Hagen is wearing a German general's uniform; whereas Kriemhild is dressed in the uniform of the Red Army. Based on these hidden uniforms revealed at the end of the scene, Hagen represents the German military, the officers of the Freikorpssoldaten who are responsible for Luxemburg's murder, and Kriemhild represents the remnants of the KPD.

---

which had been overtaken by the KPdSU under Stalin and which, after the formation of the GDR, became known as the SED. The name "Siegfried" in the title represents Luxemburg, who was in fact a Jewish woman born in Zamosc, Poland in 1871. Through the betrayal and murder of Luxemburg, represented by Siegfried, the KPD ultimately joined forces with Stalin, whose silhouette is projected behind Kriemhild. Her second marriage to the King of the Huns, Etzel (Attila), represents the union of the KPD with the Soviet KPdSU. Etzel's court represents Stalingrad and the battle in the "Kessel". Stalingrad played an important role in shaping the course of German history and in the formation of the GDR. The child produced as the result of Etzel's and Kriemhild's union, Ortlieb, is unwanted and unloved, as Kriemhild explains, and does not survive; he is also killed by Hagen. Through this further act of violence, the future lineage of this marriage is abruptly obliterated. Pursuing Müller's symbolism, as the offspring of Kriemhild and Etzel, Ortlieb thus directly represents the SED, the party of the GDR, founded in 1946 in the Soviet-occupied zone and East Berlin through the merger of the KPD and the SPD, and heavily influenced and controlled by the Soviet leadership. In this manner, by equating the GDR Party with the murdered Ortlieb, Müller denies any future for the SED.

Müller's main interest is in portraying the struggle between the KPD and the KPdSU under Stalin, which the latter was able to win following Luxemburg's murder. After Hitler came to power, this struggle developed into the German-Russian aggression, characterized by the underlying fascist-communist hostilities. Finally, the rivalry between these two European dictators developed into the battle at Stalingrad, with each was determined to win, no matter what the cost to their own people. Ultimately, this ideological power struggle extended into the newly-formed GDR, where both former Nazis and members of the KPD had to subjugate themselves to the will of Stalin and the KPdSU in the form of the omnipotent SED. By incorporating the Nibelung characters and their tale into this scene, the author uses them to symbolize the historical figures and their bitter struggle for power and domination of Europe.
Schmitt shares this view: "Müller bezieht dieses mythologische Geschehen nun auf die
deutsch-sowjetische Geschichte. Er setzt mythologische Figuren mit historischen Gestalten
gleich" (197). Müller's focus is on the murdered revolutionary, even though the battle of
Stalingrad was not an act of revenge against her murderers, as Kriemhild's bloodbath in
Etzel's hall is solely her revenge against the men responsible for her first husband's death. In
this sense, Müller's Nibelung analogy is not entirely historically accurate. By equating
Luxemburg with the murdered Nibelung, Müller elevates her status to a mythical level, or, as
Schmitt explains: "Die ermordete Kommunistin wird dadurch aber als symbolische
Lichtgestalt verherrlicht" (197). The loss of this strong and persuasive leader prevented the
KPD from developing its full potential and, in fact, stunted its growth, which Müller never
ceased to lament. He pays tribute to her memory in this play, as he did in the final scene of
Germania Tod. His view that the Berlin Wall was a monument to Luxemburg and to the
GDR-party, in the quote mentioned earlier, thus corresponds to his presentation of her and
the German-Russian situation in this scene. The Wall signified the division of a country and,
specifically, of an ideology, German Communism, that was forced to merge with its Soviet
counterpart. In the same quote, Müller compares Kriemhild to the GDR-party; but whereas
she was intent on revenge for the death of her first husband, the SED was not intent on
revenge for Luxemburg's murder. Her anger is directed at the murderer of Siegfried, Hagen,
the representative of the German Wehrmacht, which called for and carried out Luxemburg's
murder.

A somewhat different view concerning the true identities of Kriemhild, Hagen, and
Siegfried is propagated by Welzel. In his opinion: "[…] steht Kriemhild für Stalin, oder den
asiatischen Despotismus, Hagen für Hitler und das staatliche Prinzip, Siegfried wiederum,
der ermordete Gatte Kriemhilds, repräsentiert das jüdisch-polnische Volk; verraten von

98 ("Müller now relates this mythological event to German-Soviet history. He equates mythological figures with
historical characters.")
99 ("The murdered communist woman is exalted by that as a symbolic luminous figure.")
However, according to Müller's exact description when Kriemhild uncovers her uniform: "wirft ihren Mantel ab, darunter, ohne Rangabzeichen, die Uniform der Roten Armee, hinter ihr der Schatten Stalins" (27) ("throws her coat off, under it, without insignia, the uniform of the Red Army, behind her the shadow of Stalin"), it is clear that Stalin's influence is present, but not the dictator himself. The fact that his shadow is behind her implies that the Soviet dictator supports this individual or group that she represents, namely: the KPD, which later became the SED. Müller's own words support this interpretation:

Das ist eine Partei, die selbst nie gesiegt hat, es ist eine besiegte Partei, wie Kriemhild eine besiegte Partei war, die eben dann Attila geheiratet hat, um sich zu rächen an den Mördern von Siegfried. Das ist sehr abstrus vielleicht, aber ich glaube, es gibt da eine Möglichkeit, das so zu sehen ("Ich bin ein Neger" 12). Based on this quote, it can be Müller directly associates Kriemhild with the KPD, Attila with Stalin, and Siegfried with Luxemburg. Given this interpretation, Kriemhild's marriage to Attila thus represents the KPD's close affiliation with the KPD, and the murdered Siegfried, "a Jewess from Poland", as the title calls him, can only be referring to Luxemburg. Schmitt confirms this interpretation that Kriemhild represents: "[. . .] die deutschen Kommunisten, die nach der Ermordung Rosa Luxemburgs eine neue >>Ehe<< mit Stalin eingingen (197). Welzel's interpretation ignores the other elements contained in the scene, such as the line from the song, "Die schwarzbraune Hexe". Müller uses this line in the first scene to symbolize Luxemburg's murder and by including it at the end of this scene, following the unveiling of the characters' respective uniforms, he is obviously making a direct connection to Luxemburg. Turning to the figure of Hagen, he throws off his coat to

---

100 ("[. . .] represents Stalin, or Asian despotism, Hagen represents Hitler and the national principle, Siegfried, however, the murdered spouse of Kriemhild, represents the Jewish-Polish people; betrayed by both sides.")
101 ("That is a party, that never won, it is a conquered party, as Kriemhild was a conquered party, who then married Attila, in order to get revenge on Siegfried's murderers. That is perhaps very abstruse, but I believe, the possibility exists, to see it that way.")
reveal: "eine deutsche Generals- uniform" (27) ("a German General's uniform"), but there is no mention of Nazi insignia, such as the infamous swastika. Welzel assumes it is a Nazi uniform, but this assumption is not proven based on Müller's text. Additionally, whereas Müller includes Stalin's shadow in Kriemhild's description, no such shadow of Hitler is provided. Given Müller's preoccupation with Luxemburg's murder by Runge and Vogel, members of the Freikorps and supported by the German army at that time -- not Hitler's army -- it cannot be assumed that Hagen represents Hitler or the Nazis, as Welzel claims.

In the last section of Kriemhild's speech, Müller uses religious metaphors with the effect that her character parallels Jesus, the Messiah: "Ihr habt mein Fleisch gegessen und mein Blut / Getrunken durch zehn Länder mich gejagt / In diese Hochzeit meinen andern Tod / Und meine Haut gespannt auf eure Trommel / Seid meine Gäste jetzt zur letzten Mahlzeit " (27) ("You ate my body and drank my blood / chased me through ten countries / To this marriage my other death / And my skin stretched on your drum / Be my guest now for the last supper"). The religious connotations are clear: at the "last supper", Jesus declares his body and blood to be sacred and his willingness to accept his crucifixion for the sake of his followers. Similarly, Kriemhild, as representative of the German Communists, refers to their sacrifices: in Germany they were "hunted" or persecuted by Hitler and sent to their deaths at the Nazi concentration camps; later in the GDR they were dominated by Stalin and banished to his gulags. She refers to her "marriage" and "death": the dependence of the KPD on the KPdSU meant the death or end of Luxemburg's form of democratic communism; and the formation of the SED meant total subjugation to Stalin. Eke associates this "other death" with Luxemburg: "In der Zwangshochzeit von Kriemhild und Etzel erscheint die Stalinisierung der deutschen kommunistischen Partei als der >andre Tod< Rosa Luxemburgs" (Heiner Müller 260).103 Luxemburg, as representative of the KPD, which had already lost its soul to

102 ("[. . .] the German Communists, who entered into a "marriage" with Stalin after Rosa Luxemburg's murder")
103 ("Through the forced marriage of Kriemhild with Etzel, the Stalinisation of the German Communist Party is presented as the 'other death' of Rosa Luxemburg.")
the KPdSU, has symbolically died again. In addition, the terms "meine Haut" and "eure Trommel" signify for Eke the misuse of the deceased Luxemburg by the Stalinists as a "Propagandainstrument" which led to deadly consequences (260). However, since Kriemhild represents the German Communists and Siegfried the deceased Luxemburg, as I discuss above, I disagree with Eke's interpretation on this point. It is more likely that since Hitler was often referred to as the "Trommler", the word "Trommel" is a reference to the Nazis and their persecution of the Communists. Schmitt also sees a correlation between the:

"Propagandamaßnahmen zu Lasten der deutschen Kommunisten" and: "der auf die NS-Werbe-Trommel gespannten kommunistischen Haut" (198). Müller's use of the word "skin", therefore, symbolizes the physical abuse and political persecution enacted against the Communists.

Kriemhild's act of revenge for these past humiliations finds its expression in Stalingrad, the battle for European domination between two dictatorial giants: Hitler and Stalin. In her final lines Kriemhild heralds her revenge against her persecutors:

"Esst eure Toten und löscht euren Durst / Mit ihrem Blut Der Tisch wird reich gedeckt sein / Und feiert eure Hochzeit mit dem Nichts / Das eure Wohnung ist im Reich der Toten" (27) ("Eat your dead and quench your thirst / With your blood the table will be richly covered / And celebrate your marriage with emptiness / Your dwelling place is in the realm of the dead"). Her apocalyptic prophecy corresponds to the horrors of Stalingrad: German soldiers resorting to cannibalism in order to survive, while the blood of countless others is shed at the hands of the enemy. According to Müller's text, Kriemhild believes that her first husband's murder by Hagen will now be avenged in the form of the annihilation of the German army by the Russian army at Stalingrad. Historically, however, Stalingrad was Hitler's battle and has nothing to do with revenge for the KPD. In addition, Hagen represents the German military responsible for Luxemburg's murder and not Nazi Germany. Nevertheless, the last lines of

104("propaganda measures at the expense of the German Communists"; "the stretched Communist skin on
this scene confirm that the Germans' fate there is sealed because: "Die Russen greifen an. Die Wolga brennt" (28) ("The Russians are attacking. The Volga is burning"). There is no escape for the German army at Stalingrad and Kriemhild has achieved her revenge. However, "her" victory at Stalingrad is really Stalin's victory and ultimately meant even greater loss to German Communism. After Germany was divided into the zones of occupation, the groundwork was laid for the formation of the GDR and the subsequent the establishment of the SED: the death or end of German Communism. In this sense, Kriemhild's revenge reflects "emptiness" and the "realm of the dead" to which she refers is, in actuality, the GDR. Thus Kriemhild's text in this scene also helps to explain why Müller believed that Stalingrad was the end of the GDR. Finally, Kriemhild's lines: "Die blutigen Kometen sind am Himmel / Anstatt der frommen Sterne aufgezogen / Und blitzen dunkel in die Welt hinein" (26) ("The bloody comets are in the heavens / Instead of raising up pious stars / And flash darkly into the world") underscore Müller's use of this underlying theme of the galaxy or universe, the skies and the stars throughout the play. Her lines here will tie into the last line of the play in the scene entitled, "Der Rosa Riese", and Müller's cryptic message about the future of Germany and German identity. In the next section, I discuss the motives of this character who, like Kriemhild, is intent upon revenge.

d) The Revenge of the "Pink Giant"

"DER ROSA RIESE" ("The Pink Giant") is the title of the last and shortest scene of the play. The name is based on the true story of a killer in Brandenburg105 who actually committed various heinous crimes: "Ich bin der Rosa Riese, der Tod von Brandenburg. So heiss ich in der Zeitung. Und wer ich bin weiss keiner. Das ist, weil ich mit keinem rede, der nicht tot ist" (80) ("I am the Pink Giant, the death from Brandenburg. That is what they call me in the newspaper. And who I am no one knows. That is because I speak with no one, who

---

105This story understandably enjoyed considerable notoriety at the time of its occurrence and details were reported in the Bild newspaper over an extended period starting in August 1991 and ending in April 1994.
is not dead"). This character holds a monologue in which the audience learns that his mother, who was raped and killed by twelve Russian soldiers in 1945, while his father was forced to stand by and could do nothing to stop them. His line, "Heil Stalin" imply that Stalin is to blame for the murder of his mother and for the violence and terror that came from Russia. This German murderer is exacting revenge for his mother and for all the German mothers. His masturbation on the German oak tree, a traditional symbol of German strength, emphasizes this German versus Russian aggression. His words: "Zuerst glaube ich, daß vor dem größeren Deutschland niemand Angst haben muß. Es ist ein schwächeres Deutschland" (GI3 124) shows that Müller did not think of Germany as a dangerous or threatening force anymore. The violence of World War II has spread to other parts of Europe, particularly the East such as Croatia and Bosnia, which have developed their own violent tendencies and "ethnic cleansing", as demonstrated in the Bosnian War of 1992-1995. Maurice Taszman writes in "Müllers Block": "Der Terror, den er beschreibt, kommt aus Deutschland, sagte er (war es aus Scheu, daß er nicht sagte, aus Europa?) [. . .] (Kalkfell 82). The rest of the world, including the Third World, now provides a greater threat to the safety of the human population than Germany.

The last line of this play: "[DUNKEL] GENOSSEN IST DER WELTRAUM SEHR DUNKEL" (81) is from the Russian cosmonaut, Yuri Alexeyevich Gagarin (1934-1968), the first man to orbit the earth on 12 April 1961 in the spaceship, "Vostok 1". Schmitt refers to the "Pink Giant" as having "etwas typisch Deutsches" which reflects the German national character he believes Müller sees in the brutality of the Nibelungenlied (225). Müller is trying to demonstrate this aspect of brutality and violence which reflects more of a European characteristic, not only German and which can be seen in the bad influence from the East as

-------
106 ("The terror, of which he writes, comes from Germany, he said (was it due to shyness, that he did not say, from Europe?)")
107 As a child during the Second World War, he and his family, who lived only a hundred miles away from Moscow, were forced by the Nazis to leave their home and his two sisters were taken away never to return.
well. But even the last line of the play refers to the "Weltraum", which can be interpreted as the rest of the world, as a dark place full of violence.

Müller's continuous usage of fairy tales and fairy tale themes reflects that he no longer believed in what Helmut Fuhrmann refers to in, Warten auf Geschichte as: [...] seine alte Illusion, den Kinder- und Narrentraum von der sozialistischen Paradiesutopie" (55). The reliance on fairy tales expresses a view of the communist utopia which remains a dream, a tale for children or naive adults, a type of perfect world in which a happy end is attained. Unfortunately, this happy end was never attained in Müller's reality and he finally realized that it never would, neither in the GDR nor in his lifetime. As Frank Hörnigk writes in his essay, "Verlust von Illusionen - Gewinn an Realismus":


Müller's inclusion of fairy tale themes corresponds to his realization that the hope for a communist state is an illusion and is nothing more than a dream which has no substance. The GDR leadership was unable to see its shortcoming and, therefore, unable to make improvements which would have furthered the socialist cause and given it a future. In The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales, Bruno Bettelheim explains that the existential importance of fairy tales shows: "[...] that a struggle against severe difficulties in life is unavoidable, is an intrinsic part of human existence - but that if one does not shy away, but steadfastly meets unexpected and often unjust hardships, one masters all obstacles and at the end emerges victorious" (8). The preachings by the SED

108 ("[...] his old illusion, the dream of children and fools of the socialist utopian paradise")
leadership that if the citizens of the GDR, the workers, gave their all and kept believing in the communist dream, then it would one day develop into a reality. Contrary to his production plays, which exhibit his belief in this communist fairy tale, in his German identity plays, Müller saw and tried to reveal this fairy tale element as a farce. In, Deutsche Märchen: Eine Einführung, Winfried Freund writes about fairy tales and their function in society:

Das Märchen ist eine Glücksutopie, die Fiktion gewährter Wunscherfüllung jenseits geschichtlicher Räume und geschichtlicher Zeit. Im Nirgendwo und Nirgendwann wird das Mögliche wirklich, verwandelt sich die Welt zurück in das Paradies, in gelebte Harmonie von Mensch und Natur, in die Eintracht des Seienden mit dem Sein (11).  

Thus Müller's inclusion of fairy tale aspects satirizes this idea of wish fulfillment and the perfect ending which he no longer believes is possible for German Communism in the GDR. Bettelheim explains that myths and fairy tales give symbolic expression to "initiation rites or other rites de passage -- such as a metaphoric death of an old, inadequate self in order to be reborn on a higher plane of existence" (35), which is especially important given the communist desire to create the new man. Müller mocks these ideas in relation to the communist fairy tale - hope of the future - because he had become so disillusioned with events in the GDR, in particular the Soviet tanks rolling into Berlin to restore order on 17 June 1953, for example. In childhood, Bettelheim writes: "all is becoming" (39) which can be applied to the childhood stage of the communist, who wants to continue believing in the communist utopia. The fairy tale suits this stage because it "guarantees a happy ending" (39). Müller, however, stopped believing in the possibility of a "happy ending" and, therefore, employed aspects of the fairy tale to demonstrate his sense of disillusion. Fairy tales, which

109("The brief hope for a democratic renewal of society, of society in general, as an open society, which is able to learn and able to be critical of its own history, did not let itself be realized. The child's dream of a democratic society, of a society with a human face has been dreamed away.")
offer and reflect a common bond shared by all belonging to a given culture are: "the result of common conscious and unconscious content" and are handed down "generation after generation" (Bettelheim 36). As a standard cultural and historical tradition which is common to, shared by and, therefore, understood by all Germans, Müller employs aspects of the fairy tale in Germania 3 to demonstrate and reinforce his disillusion, which was shared by others in the GDR. As Freund explains about the fairy tale "Rumpelstilzchen", for example:

Insofern ist der Erzähleinsatz keineswegs absonderlich, denn das Märchen nimmt in aller Regel seinen Ausgang von dem, was nicht ist und auch nicht möglich scheint und was am Ende trotz aller Widerstände eintrifft und Gestalt annimmt. Märchenhaftes Erzählen ist die illusionäre Korrektur der Wirklichkeit aus der Wunschperspektive der Zukunft gekommenen. Der verändernde Einfall muß die verändernde Tat ersetzen. „Corriger la fortune“ ist das Ziel aller Märchenwünsche (150).

Müller recognized the fairy tale aspect of communism in the GDR and the strong but unrealistic hope that it would ever become a reality. Fairy tales represent a significant aspect of German identity because they belong to the common past and are an established German tradition. By referring to them, Müller is demonstrating his disillusion with the communist dream and the inability of the GDR to achieve its socialist society.

V.1.5 Brecht's Legacy

"MASSNAHME 1956" ("The Measures Taken 1956"), the title of scene seven, is a play on words using the title of Brecht's Lehrstück, Die Maßnahme (1930/1931), but is also

---

110 ("The fairy tale is a utopia of fortune, the fiction of the granted wish fulfillment beyond historical spaces and historical time. In the nowhere and at no time that which is possible becomes reality, the world transforms itself back into paradise, in existing harmony from man and nature in the unity of the becoming with the being.")

111 ("In this respect, the narrated insertion is not at all unusual, because as a rule the fairy tale takes its starting point from that which is not and also does not seem possible and which, in the end, comes to pass despite all resistance. Fairy tale-like narration is the illusionary correction of reality from the wishful perspective of the one who has lost out. The altered notion must replace the altered act. "To correct fortune" is the goal of all fairy tale wishes.")
based on an anecdote in Müller's autobiography.\textsuperscript{112} With a little over seventeen pages, it is the longest scene of the play, devoted to explaining the legacy left by the writer and intellectual on the political, artistic, and personal levels. Fehervary summarizes the intense relationship between these two German authors and their works in her essay, "Enlightenment or Entanglement":

Heiner Müller is for the GDR -- and for progressive developments in the Federal Republic -- what Bertolt Brecht was for Germany between the end of World War One and the end of World War Two: the historical chronicler, theoretical spokesman and theater practitioner of revolution during his time. [. . .] Heiner Müller's work is unthinkable without the theory and practice of his literary predecessor -- with all his own radical innovations, his successes and failures. Many of Müller's plays are conscious thematic and dramaturgical variations of specific works by Brecht: [. . .] \textit{Mauser/The Measures Taken} (84).

Because Brecht had made a strong impact on the German theater and a lasting influence on Müller, his legacy plays an important role for German identity. Müller's reference to Brecht in this scene reflects the author's awareness of Brecht's important status in German literature while at the same time demonstrating criticism of Brecht's literary restraint regarding Stalin and the GDR leadership. Eke also recognizes that: "Nur noch ironisch bleibt der Bezug auf Brechts Lehrstück \textit{Die Maßnahme} im Titel der 'Maßnahme' von 1956 [. . .]" (Heiner Müller\textsuperscript{112})

\textsuperscript{112}Müller tells the story: "Schön ist eine Geschichte aus der Zeit nach seinem Tod: Wolfgang Harich war verhaftet worden, die Brecht-Witwen berieten mit der Frau von Harich, die Brechts letzte Geliebte gewesen war, was man tun könnte. Dann kam Fritz Cremer mit vier Arbeitern vom Stahl- und Walzwerk Hennigsdorf mit dem Stahlsarg für Brecht. Der war in Hennigsdorf nach einem Entwurf von Cremer angefertigt worden, Cremer hatte aber vergessen, Maß zu nehmen. Er hatte nun Angst -- es war der erste Abguß von dem Stahlsarg --, daß Brecht nicht hineinpaßt, wie Wallenstein, dem ja die Verschwörer die Beine brechen mußten, weil der Sarg zu klein war. Und die Weigel, die eine praktische Frau war, ersuchte einen der Werktätigen, der ungefähr die Statur von Brecht hatte, sich probeweise in den Sarg zu legen. Der Sarg paßte. Dann zogen sie mit dem Sarg wieder ab. Das war >>Die Maßnahme<< 1956" (KoS 231). ("There is a nice story from the time after his death: Wolfgang Harich had been arrested, Brecht's widows were conferring about what could be done with Harich's wife, who had been Brecht's last mistress. Then Mrs. Cremer came from the Hennigsdorf steel and rolling mill with the steel coffin for Brecht. It had been finished according to a draft from Cremer, but Cremer had forgotten to take the measurements. Now he was afraid - it was the first mold of the steel coffin -- that Brecht would not fit into it, like Wallenstein, whose legs the conspirators had to break because the coffin was too small. And Weigel,
Müller's primary concern is for the future efficacy of the German theater and, in particular, the Berliner Ensemble.

a) Berliner Ensemble

Situated at the Berliner Ensemble, or BE, the theater house established by Brecht and Helene Weigel in East Berlin in 1949, this scene is set in the crucial year of 1956, in which the following pertinent historical events occurred: Krushchev's "secret speech" took place in February, Brecht died on 14 August, in October the Hungarian Revolt was brutally suppressed by Soviet troops and tanks, and Wolfgang Harich (1921-1995), an active Communist since 1945 and an anti-Stalinist, was arrested on 29 November. Müller also

who was a practical woman, tried to convince one of the workers, who was about the same size as Brecht, to lie down in the coffin to test it. The coffin fit. Then they left with the coffin. That was "The Measurement" 1956.("

(All that remains is the ironic reference between Brecht's teaching play The Measures Taken in the title of 'measures' from 1956.)

Müller explains his early experience with Brecht and the Berliner Ensemble: "Es gab drei Meisterschülerstellen. Brecht war als Akademiemitglied in zwei Sektionen, Sektion Literatur und Sektion Darstellende Kunst. Er konnte drei Meisterschüler haben, und es gab vier Bewerber. Das Berliner Ensemble war damals eine Insel, eine umkämpfte Insel. So wurden zum Beispiel in Leipzig Studenten des Theaterinstituts relegiert, nur weil sie Aufführungen des Berliner Ensembles besucht hatten. Brecht war der Antichrist. Das Theater hatte er auch nur gekriegt, weil die Russen es befohlen hatten. Er war tief verdächtig (KoS 83). ("There were three spots for master's students. Brecht, as a member of the Academy, was in two departments, department for literature and department for theater. He could have three master's students, and there were four candidates. The Berliner Ensemble was an island at that time, a fought-after island. So students at the theater institutes in Leipzig, for example, were expelled, only because they had visited productions of the Berliner Ensemble. Brecht was the Antichrist. He had only gotten the theater, because the Russians had ordered it so. He was highly suspect.")

In his autobiography, Müller offers his version of why Wolfgang Harich was arrested and sent to prison in 1956: "Es hatte in der Frühzeit der DDR, in Berlin, einen Debattierclub gegeben, in dem ich auch ein paarmal gewesen war. Harich hatte dort die Frage vorgetragen, was man als Intellektueller tut, wenn die Panzer gegen die Arbeiter auffahren. Auf welcher Seite muß der Intellektuelle stehen? Das war 1956, der Reflex auf Ungarn. Harich hatte ein politisches Konzept, das Programm der Harich-Gruppe war ein ernsthafter Versuch, die DDR umzubauen. Er hatte einen Termin bei Ulbricht und trug sein Programm vor, partielle Reprivatisierung, Umstrukturierung der Regierung, Pressefreiheit, und so weiter. Die Diskussion war kurz. Harich sagte etwa: >>Genosse Ulbricht, Sie werden einsehen, daß Sie jetzt zurücktreten müssen.<< Und Ulbricht sagte: >>Ich glaube, wir brauchen jetzt beide was zu trinken. Kaffee oder Cola?<< Harich sagte >>Kaffee<<, und Ulbricht klingelte und sagte der Sekretärin: >>Ein Kaffee für den Genossen Harich, eine Cola für mich.<< Dann tranken sie schweigend den Kaffee und die Cola, und am nächsten Morgen wurde Harich verhaftet. Harich war Dozent an der Humboldt-Universität gewesen, mit engen Kontakten zu Brecht, zum Berliner Ensemble, und er war Theaterkritiker" (KoS 263). ("In the early period of the GDR, in Berlin, there was a debate club, which I also visited a couple of times. Harich had presented the question, what is an intellectual to do, when the tanks drive out against the workers. On which side must the intellectual stand? That was 1956, the reflex to Hungary. Harich had a political concept, the Harich group's program was a serious attempt to build up the GDR. He had an appointment with Ulbricht and presented his program, partial reprivatisation, restructuring of the government, freedom of the press, etc. The discussion was short. Harich said something like: "Comrade Ulbricht, you can see that you ahve to resign. And Ulbricht said: "I believe we both need something to drink. Coffee or cola?" Harich said: "Coffee" and Ulbricht rang for his secretary and said: "A coffee for comrade Harich, a cola for me." Then they drank their coffee and cola in silence, and the next morning Harich was arrested. Harich was a teacher at the Humboldt University, with close ties to Brecht, to the Berliner Ensemble, and he was a theater critic.")
includes references to the June strike of three years earlier which serve the purpose of describing Brecht and his attitude and actions at that time. By rearranging the order of these historical events and juxtaposing them, Müller once again, as he did in *Germania Tod*, uses the techniques of anachronism and compacting of time (Schmitt 209). Three years after Stalin's death, rather than showing an improvement in the political scene of Eastern Europe, Müller indicates that "eine Restalinisierung" (Eke Reclam 263) ("a Restalinization") is occurring. Therefore, it is no coincidence that Müller began work in this year on such pessimistic plays as *Die Schlacht* and *Germania Tod*: scene seven of *Germania 3* reflects Müller's disillusionment from this earlier period. The scene opens with a radio announcement of Harich's arrest, which serves as the impetus for the ensuing discussions concerning not only Brecht and his theater, but the relationship between politics and the intellectual.116 In

---

116 In his autobiography, Müller explains the reason for their quarrel: "Wir trafen uns, weil gerade ein WDR-Redakteur bei mir war. [. . .] Und dieser Redakteur wollte mit mir über ein Projekt reden. Er kam, wir verabredeten uns im >>Ganymed<< und trafen uns dort. Der Redakteur wollte auch mit Gisela May reden, die Harichs Frau war, sie hatte Vorstellung, und Harich kam. Wir haben uns zuerst ganz friedlich unterhalten [. . .] Ich habe dann bei diesem Treffen im >>Ganymed<< etwas Unqualifiziertes gegen den Dekadenz-Begriff bei Lukács gesagt: Die Art, wie Lukács mit dem Etikett Dekadenz umgingen, fände ich schon ziemlich faschistisch. Da sprang Harich auf, zerdrückte sein Sektglas in der Hand und schrie: >>Sie, Sie sind ein Idiot. Ich werde nie mehr im Leben ein Wort mit Ihnen reden.<< Dann lief er mit blutender Hand hinaus" (KoS 262-264). ("We met because an editor from WDR had just been visiting me. [. . .] And this editor wanted to talk about a project with me. He came, we arranged to meet at "Ganymed" and met there. The editor also wanted to speak with Gisela May, who was Harich's wife, she had a presentation, and Harich came. At first we enjoyed ourselves peacefully [. . .] then I said something unspeakable against Lukacs during this meeting at "Ganymed": the way Lukacs tosses the term decadence around, I found that to be pretty fascist. At that Harich jumped up, squeezed his champagne glass in his hand until it broke and cried: "You, you are an idiot. I will never again say another word to you for the rest of my life. Then he ran out with his bleeding hand.".) Harich referred to Müller as his "Lieblingsfeind" ("favorite enemy") (KoS 264) after their dispute in the early seventies. As a result, in 1973 Harich wrote a polemic directed against Müller entitled, "Der entlaufene Dingo, das vergessene Floss: Aus Anlass der >>Macbeth<<-Bearbeitung von Heiner Müller" which appeared in *Sinn und Form*, vol. 25, Heft 1, pp. 189-218, in which he accused the author of *Geschichtspessimismus* and of glorifying death and violence in order to promote his popularity at the expense of true literary greatness. He writes: "Nicht ist dem Geist des Sozialismus daher fremder als eine pessimistische Auffassung der Weltgeschichte. Und nichts ist daher symptomatischer als die Tatsache, daß der extrem außengeleitete Schriftsteller, der die gesamte deutschsprachige Literatur der Gegenwart an Affinität zur derzeit übelsten, ekelhaftesten westlichen Mode überbietet, gleichzeitig, in demselben, mit Verlaub gesagt, Werk, dem düstersten Geschichtspessimismus das Wort redet. Heiner Müller läßt sich nicht nur von der durch Filme wie <<The Devils>>, <<Straw Dogs>> und <<A Clockwork Orange>> inaugurierten Grausamkeitswelle mitreißen. Er geht viel weiter, indem er diesem Dreck Gelegenheit gibt, sich an Shakespeares dichterische Kraft heranzuschmarotzen und dadurch erst literarisch diskussionsfähig zu werden" (213-214). ("Nothing is more foreign to the spirit of Socialism than a pessimistic view of world history. And nothing is, therefore, more symptomatic than the fact, that the writer who, extremely guided by outside forces, currently outdoes the entire German-speaking contemporary literature with affinity to the worst, most disgusting western fashion, at the same time in the same, if I may say, work, the most ominous historical pessimism. Heiner Müller not only lets himself get swept away by such films as "The Devils", "Straw Dogs" and "A Clockwork Orange", inaugurated wave of atrocities. He goes much further by giving this garbage..."
response to learning of his arrest, the three Brecht widows, Helene Weigel (1900-1971), Elisabeth Hauptmann (1897-1973), and Isot Kilian (1924-1986) are discussing whether or not they should try and help him. They are having: "[. . .] eine grundsätzliche Auseinandersetzung über die Rolle von Brechts Theater in der Gesellschaft der DDR; unmittelbare politische Einmischung des Theaters in die Politik oder -- kritische -- Loyalität gegenüber dem antifaschistisch legitimierten Staat [. . .]" (Eke Reclam 263). They are not willing to help Harich in his hour of need due to their fear of repercussions from the Party i.e., the SED, on which the BE depends for its continued existence. Brecht's legacy in this regard, concerning his theater and politics, is at the expense of a friend; rather than offer their help and the influence of Brecht's name, they choose to save the theater as reflected in Hauptmann's line: "Wir retten das Theater oder ihn" (50) ("We save the theater or him"). The Widows' decision not to help Harich, therefore, can be described as self-preservation or, as Schmitt concludes, opportunism: "Aus Opportunismus verzichten sie daher auf Solidarität mit Harich, auf offene Kritik an politischen Mißständen und am stalinistischen Vorgehen der Partei" (211). They are so afraid of losing the theater, which, ironically, Brecht had designed to promote political awareness and action, that they ignore the return to Stalinism by the current SED leadership and deny Harich their support.

117 There was a lawsuit filed in 1996 by Brecht's heirs: Barbara Brecht-Schall, Stefan Brecht, and Hanne Hiob, to attempt to have the passages from Brecht's works removed from Germania 3, as well as the real names of the characters, the three widows: Helene Weigel, Elisabeth Hauptmann, and Isot Kilian, eliminated from the play. In his book, The Theater of Heiner Müller, Jonathan Kalb includes an extensive appendix: "Appendix A: The Case of Germania 3," pp. 233-247 which includes an abbreviated yet thorough English translation of the German high court's decision from 2000 which ruled against the Brecht heirs.

118 ("a thorough discussion concerning the role of Brecht's theater in the society of the GDR; direct political intervention of the theater in politics or -- critical -- loyalty in face of the antifascist legitimized state")

119 ("Due to opportunism they renounce solidarity with Harich, on open criticism of political misunderstandings and on the stalinistic behavior of the party.")

120 Referring to Weigel Müller believes: "[. . .] Das Berliner Ensemble hatte eine Funktion, solange es eine gesamtdeutsche politische Konzeption gab. Als die vorbei war, hatte es eigentlich keine Lebensgrundlage mehr, und man hätte es schließen sollen mit dem Tod von Brecht. Das war, glaube ich, ihre Theorie" (234). ("The Berliner Ensemble had a purpose, as long as a total German political concept existed. When that was over, it really no longer had a reason to exist and it should have been closed when Brecht died. That was, I believe, her theory.")
Harich and his associates, known as the "Harich-Gruppe" ("Harich-Group"),\textsuperscript{121} wanted to reform the SED and promote German Socialism by embarking on a "third course": a return to Marxism-Leninism in direct opposition to Stalinism, but were arrested and sentenced to various prison terms, as Hermann Weber explains in, \textit{Geschichte der DDR} (195-197). Astounding is the fact that even Harich's own wife, Kilian, is not very interested in helping her husband. Her illicit relationship with Brecht and love for him has caused her to abandon her husband whom she no longer loves, as she admits: "Ich habe ihn geliebt" (49) ("I loved him). Kilian's suicide in this scene, which is contrary to historical fact, signifies the destruction Brecht's influence ultimately had on her, as Müller expresses criticism of Brecht on this personal level. Similarly, even though Brecht's death in this scene has only occurred a few days ago and he is not even buried yet, the Widows' lack of action demonstrates the inefficacy of Brecht's legacy to positively influence politics as he had intended. Brecht's views and actions concerning Stalinism, Ulbricht, and the SED leadership during his lifetime were not completely beyond reproach. Müller presents Brecht's reaction to the strike in June 1953 and the SED's decision to send in Soviet tanks when Kilian says: "Ja, Brecht war klüger. Er hat seine Mütze / Gezogen vor den Panzern Dreiundfünfzig") (48) ("Yes, Brecht was more clever. He saluted with his hat / When the tanks came fifty-three").\textsuperscript{122} Because Brecht owed his theater to the party leadership, he was dependent on good relations with it and, therefore, was afraid to be too critical.\textsuperscript{123} Since the Hungarian revolt did not occur until October 1956, Brecht was not alive to see the Soviet tanks enter Hungary and brutally suppress it. Nevertheless, Müller speculates about what Brecht's reaction may have been with

\textsuperscript{121}Those associated with Harich and sentenced to prison terms are: Bernhard Steinberger, Manfred Hertwig, Walter Janka, Heinz Zöger, Gustav Just, and Richard Wolf (Weber \textit{Geschichte der DDR} 197).

\textsuperscript{122}There is an anecdote told by Erwin Strittmatter that on 17 June 1953 he and Brecht observed the Soviet tanks rolling down the Friedensallee and, whereas others were throwing stones at the tanks, Brecht suddenly took his cap off and shouted "Hurray!" and then the crowd started shouting "Hurray!" Ralf Schnell, \textit{Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Literatur seit 1945} (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1993) 160.

\textsuperscript{123}Müller clarifies Brecht's relationship with the GDR functionaries: "Brecht mußte ab und zu -- kleine Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft -- etwas für die Funktionäre machen. >>Das Glockenspiel<< war so ein Projekt" (\textit{KoS} 84). ("Now and then Brecht had to -- little presents preserve the friendship -- do something for the functionaries. The Chimes was such a project.")
Hauptmann's line: "Man zieht die Mütze nicht zweimal vor Panzern" (50) ("One does not salute the tanks twice"). Such a continuation of Stalinism, three years after the dictator's death and in spite of Krushchev's speech, left Müller disillusioned: a more constructive path to Socialism was again denied, unlike Brecht, who did not live long enough to face this literary and political predicament.

Brecht's main emphasis in his early works was Hitler: the works he wrote scorning him and warning about the dangers of the Nazis remain some of his best, even today: *Arturo Ui, Furcht und Elend, Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg*, for example. He did not write such scathing plays against Stalin or Ulbricht, and he was not critical of the SED as he had been of Hitler and the National Socialist Party. His play *Coriolanus*, however, can be interpreted as a criticism of Stalin, and forms the basis of the discussion between the theater directors, Manfred Wekwerth (1929-) and Peter Palitzsch (1918-).

Brecht based his play on Shakespeare's tragedy of the same name from 1623, which tells the story of the conflict between the Roman plebians and the patrician and general Gaius Marcus Coriolanus who, after becoming consul, wanted to conquer Rome and rule as a dictator during the late sixth and early fifth century B.C. In Müller's play, the continuing references to the politeness of proletarians signifies the historical fact that the proletarians have no power and since their revolts in Germany have proven unsuccessful, they are, therefore, forced to resort to politeness in order to try and enact changes in the system which would benefit their position. Speaking about the proletarians, Palitzsch says: "Sie sind höflich, Manfred. / Das haben sie gelernt. Das ist ihr Kreuz. / Es braucht viel Druck, dass sie ihr Kreuz abwerfen" (52) ("They are polite, Manfred. They have learned that. That is their cross. It takes a lot of pressure for them to throw off their cross"). There are definite parallels to the peasants throughout German history and the

124 Müller expresses his critical opinion about Brecht: "Brecht's Verhängnis war das Schweigen über Stalin. Was politisch völlig zu rechtfertigen war, denn Hitler war der Hauptfeind, deswegen wollte er über Stalin schweigen. [. . .]" ("Die Wahrheit, leise und unerträglich" 18-19). ("Brecht's undoing was his silence concerning Stalin. Which was politically totally justifiable, since Hitler was the main enemy, therefore, he wanted to keep quiet about Stalin. [. . .]")
workers in the GDR. Schmitt writes that one could: "[. . .] nach dem Volksaufstand in Ungarn und zuvor in der DDR die Plebejer mit den Proletariern, Rom mit Ost-Berlin und Coriolan mit Stalin gleichsetzen [. . .] (211).125 Whereas Palitzsch would prefer to politicize the production of Coriolanus, his colleague Wekwerth, a member of the SED, is intent on presenting a timepiece from the Roman era with no connection to the current one. Wekwerth's claim: "Wir machen hier kein Zeitstück, Peter, sondern / Eine Parabel. Stalin, wenn du das meinst / Kommt nur am Rand vor (51) ("We're not presenting contemporary history here, Peter, rather a parable. Stalin, if you feel that way, only comes into it marginally") is countered by Palitzsch's response: "Und der Rand ist blutig" (52) ("And the margin is bloody"). Wekwerth wants to remain loyal to the party line which means that he is not willing to criticize Stalin: should he do so, he fears it would jeopardize his position at the BE. It is not clear from the dialogue if Krushchev's speech with its damaging revelations about Stalin has already become publicly known, but in any case, Wekwerth steadfastly maintains his position. Palitzsch, on the contrary, is not an avid party member, as demonstrated when he refers to "Deine Partei" ("Your party") and Wekwerth counters with: "Wann wirst du sagen: unsre" (53) ("When will you say: our"). Palitzsch refuses to associate himself closely with the party, the SED, because he is willing to open his eyes and sceptically as well as critically view its policies and actions. Wekwerth, however, refuses to see the truth, as Palitzsch disparagingly remarks: "Ach Manfred, gehst du manchmal auf die Strasse" (56) ("Oh Manfred, do you ever go out on the street"). Wekwerth's response: "Verstehst du, es gibt Dinge, die ich weiss und / Nicht wissen will, nicht mehr oder noch nicht" (56) ("You see, there are things, which I know and do not want to know, no more or not yet") signifies that he is more aware of the truth than he outwardly expresses. By refusing to accept the truth about the party and remaining silent, Wekwerth avoids any trouble and, contrary to Harich, is able to retain his freedom and can even continue his work at the BE, as he comments: "Wir sässen

125 ("[. . .] equate the plebians with the proletarians, Rome with East Berlin and Coriolan with Stalin after the
sonst nicht hier, du, ich, wir alle / Und täten seine Arbeit (60) ("Otherwise we would not be sitting here, you, me, all of us / And doing his work"). Wekwerth believes -- and rightly so -- that if he expressed criticism of the party, he would lose his position at the BE and the authorities would perhaps close down the theater. Palitzsch's final remark: "Tun wir sie?" (60) ("Are we doing it?") expresses Müller's doubt that Brecht's heirs and successors are indeed performing the work which Brecht had intended. Weigel, who has been listening to their dialogue, along with Hauptmann and Kilian, cynically expresses her opinion:

"Manchmal bin ich schon froh, dass ich so alt bin. / Am Tod das Beste ist seine Ewigkeit" (57) ("Sometimes I am glad, that I am so old. The best thing about death is its perpetuity"). In other words, this problem will be inherited by the next generation and she, along with others of her generation, will not have to concern herself with it much longer. Similar to Brecht, who escaped having to continue to deal with this problem of the intellectual's role in politics by his premature death, Weigel anticipates that her death will free her from any further responsibility. Wekwerth and Palitzsch, however, represent the younger generation and thus need to take a stand concerning the role of the intellectual in politics or they risk damaging Brecht's legacy. Rather than using their energy for the creation of "lebendiges Theater" ("living theater") (Schmitt 217), these former pupils of Brecht spend too much time discussing and debating, as Kilian scorns: "Das haben sie gelernt, ja. Diskutieren" (51) ("That is what they learned, yes. To discuss"). A reference to Brecht's mode of theater in which discussion was a welcome method, Palitzsch and Wekwerth abuse their teacher's style and thus neglect to achieve the desired results.

In spite of their differing viewpoints, both men stand in direct confrontation to Harich, who, by openly expressing his views and taking a definitive stand against the remnants of Stalinism, has risked his life and, as a result, has lost his freedom. Harich thus symbolizes the inability of the intellectual to influence party politics, which the former Brecht students
recognize as the struggle between knowledge and power. Palitzsch refers to Brecht's naive belief or "Kinderglaube" (53) ("childlike belief") that the intellectual could succeed against political power and refers to: "[. . .] unsre Tragödie, die Trennung von Wissen und Macht" (53) ("[. . .] our tragedy, the separation of knowledge and power"). Wekwerth reminds his colleague that Brecht did indeed refer to this problem which he calls: "Die Macht der Dummheit, Dummheit an der Macht" (53) ("The power of stupidity, stupidity in power") in his Galilei. Their disagreement leads to a discussion concerning the intellectual's role in politics as presented by Brecht in Galilei, which Müller calls: "das persönlichste Stück Brechts" (232) ("Brecht's most personal play") in his interview with Erdmut Wizisla entitled, "Über Brecht: Gespräch mit Heiner Müller". Palitzsch expresses his opinion with an excerpt from "der kleine Mönch" ("the little monk") that perhaps it is better the people have their belief or "Kinder- glaube", because without belief and the hope which accompanies it, their lives would be meaningless. The idea expressed here is similar to the views of the Skull Salesman in Germania Tod who no longer believes in anything: whereas the Salesman has lost all faith in dreams for the future and idealistic hopes, Paliztsch believes that to rob the people of their hope in a Socialist future would be to rob them of their hopes and dreams and their very reason for living, as the Little Monk preaches in Brecht's Galilei.126 The warning of the Monk reflects the basic ideas of the Salesman, who sees no meaning in life other than death. If the people are made aware of their hopeless situation or of the failure of Socialism in the GDR, then they will end like the Skull Salesman: disillusioned, believing in nothing, awaiting only death. Although Brecht's Monk is against a revision of the world view because he believes it would destroy the average man's belief in a greater cause, the Salesman has

126 Müller has this to say about Brecht's character: "[. . .] Bei der Szene mit dem kleinen Mönch ist eine denkbare Interpretation -- neben der ersten -- die überlegene Weisheit der Kirche: Was nützt es einem Menschen, seine Lage zu erkennen, wenn er sie nicht verändern kann. Auch das gehört zum Tragischen an "Galilei" [. . .] Aber der Abgrund war mal offen, und er ist zu sehen, und dann macht er ihn wieder zu. Aber er hat ihn gezeigt, man hat ihn auch gesehen" (Wizisla 232). ("[. . .] In the scene with the little monk a possible interpretation -- besides the first one -- the superior wisdom of the church: What good does it do a person, to be aware of his situation, when he cannot change it. That also is part of the tragic aspect of Galilei [. . .] But the chasm was open, and it can be seen, and then he closes it again. But he showed it, one saw it also.")
experienced this disappointment and became disillusioned with political belief after the fall of the Third Reich, which can be compared to a religious cult. In Müller's portrayal of the GDR of 1956, which in reality he is writing about from post-reunification Germany, it can be deduced that Müller has experienced this disillusion with the SED and that German Socialism has not succeeded in the GDR. Thus what was still only potentially a failure in *Germania Tod*, has become reality in *Germania 3*, an important aspect connecting these two Geschichtsdramen and Müller's search for German identity.

Brecht, however, through his "timely" death, as Müller calls it, never faced the dilemma of dealing with the failure of Socialism in the GDR.127 Referring to Brecht's death, Hauptmann says: "[. . .] Der Tod war pünktlich. / Er ist gestorben, als für ihn die Zeit war / Um ungewaschen in den Tod zu gehn. / Gewusst wann. Immer schon war er der Klügste" (50) ("His death was timely. He died, when it was time for him to die. In order to reach death unwashed. He knew when. He always had been the smartest").128 By dying when he did, Brecht was spared the task of openly criticizing the policies of Ulbricht and the SED which were based on Stalinism. Had he lived longer, he eventually would have had to take a stand and voice his opinion concerning Stalinism and the SED leadership for which he and his BE would have encountered most likely suffered. After Brecht's death, Müller was left to carry the torch on behalf of the intellectuals but also for the workers in the GDR. In the last section of scene seven, the workers who bring in Brecht's coffin take measure not only of it but of

---

127 Müller expresses his opinion of Brecht's perspective: "Brecht ist in seinen letzten Jahren natürlich eine tragische Figur geworden. Der klassische Brecht lebte in einer Welt, oder seine Sicht auf die Welt war einfach dualistisch. Also es gab eine Welt vor der Revolution, eine Welt nach der Revolution. Und sein Problem war Hitler, das war seine letzte Fixierung. Und wegen der Fixierung auf Hitler hat er das Problem Stalin verdrängt, und das war ganz legitim in der Zeit, in der er gelebt hat, und das wurde für ihn zunehmend ein Problem in der DDR. [. . .]" ("Ich bin ein Neger" 24-27). ("Brecht of course became a tragic figure in his final years. The classical Brecht lived in a world, or his vision of the world was simply dualistic. So there was a world before the revolution, a world after the revolution. And his problem was Hitler, that was his final obsession. And because of this obsession he suppressed the problem of Stalin, and that was legitimate at the time in which he lived and became increasingly a problem for him in the GDR. [. . .]")

128 Müller almost seems envious of Brecht's premature death when he says: "[. . .] Und er ist auch rechtzeitig gestorben. [. . .] Das war eine seiner Qualitäten. Er wußte, wann man sterben muß. Das war der letzte Moment, wo er gut sterben konnte, 1956" ("Ich bin ein Neger" 24-27). ("[. . .] And he also died at the right moment. [. . .] That was one of his good qualities. He knew when it was time to die. That was the last moment that he could die well, 1956."
Brecht himself. "Arbeiter 1" ("Worker 1"), as if he were speaking directly to the late author, criticizes "Brechts Realitätsferne" (Welzel 174)\(^{129}\): "[. . .] Und vielleicht hast du dich lieb gehabt / Und deine Arbeit. Ich arbeite für Geld. / Mein Spass heisst Feierabend, Bier und Weber. / Jetzt heisst vergessen, was du ihnen wert warst / Dem oder jenem, Dichter. Der Tod zahlt bar" (61) ("[. . .] And maybe you liked yourself too much / And your work. I work for money. My fun consists of quitting time, beer and women. Now you can forget, what you were worth to them, the one or the other, Poet. Death pays in cash"). Worker 1 sums up the central point of this scene when he compares his own life experience to that of Brecht. The Worker is not ashamed to admit that he performs real although menial and physical labor in order to survive and is, nevertheless, able to enjoy his life with simple pleasures during his leisure time. By having the Worker speak in this manner on behalf of the working class, Müller is emphasizing: "[. . .] daß Brecht sich von der arbeitenden Bevölkerung zuviel erwartet hatte" (215).\(^{130}\) The average worker was primarily concerned with his own survival; contrary to Brecht who, in spite of his fame and greatness, has not been spared from death and, despite his best efforts, will most likely be forgotten by those very people who valued him and his literary genius.

In the final lines of this scene, Brecht's voice is heard as he seems to respond to the Worker and confirms that his legacy is tainted: "Aber von mir werden sie sagen Er / Hat Vorschläge gemacht Wir haben sie / Nicht angenommen Warum sollten wir / Und das soll stehn auf meinem Grabstein und / Die Vögel sollen darauf scheissen und / Das Gras soll wachsen über meinen Namen / Der auf dem Grabstein steht Vergessen sein / Will ich von allen eine Spur im Sand" (64-65) ("But about me they will say He / Made suggestions We did / Not use them Why should we / And that should be written on my gravestone and / The birds shall shit on it and / The grass shall grow over my name / Which is written on the gravestone

\(^{129}\) ("remoteness from reality")
\(^{130}\) ("[. . .] that Brecht had expected too much from the working population")
Forgotten / I want to be by everyone a footstep in the sand\textsuperscript{131}. Müller has perverted Brecht's poem so that it reflects Müller's perception of how Brecht would have reacted to the inefficacious state of his theater. His literary heirs, Palitzsch and Wekwerth, do not share the same political views and their disagreement carries over into the realm of theatrical production; thus marring the quality of Brecht's literary legacy. Disappointed by "die Wirkungslosigkeit seiner Vorschläge" (Schmitt 217),\textsuperscript{132} he wishes nothing more than to recede into oblivion. Politically, Brecht expresses his disillusion that the GDR did not fulfill its promise to German Communism; rather, the SED ruled with the iron hand from the Soviet Union. Müller's presentation of Brecht and his heirs in this scene, both political and private, paints a dismal picture of the famous author's legacy.

V.2 Summary

*Germania 3* is an expression of Müller's attempt to understand why the GDR and German Communism failed, as well as a warning to future generations not to ignore the past, rather to learn from it. He presents various legacies from the German and Soviet past which played a major role in the formation, development, and eventual demise of the GDR. His concentration is on the German-Soviet aggression and hatred and, therefore, on Hitler, Stalin, World War II, the battle at Stalingrad, and the aftermath of Germany's defeat in 1945. The Russian troops, who were not so much conquerors as invaders, pillaged, raped, and destroyed at will in Berlin and other German cities. Thus the Germans were faced with a conquering enemy who had free reign in their country, at least until the American troops arrived. Later, in the SBZ and future GDR, the situation reflects this immediate post-war aggression and confrontation. Stalin was the victor at Stalingrad and Hitler the vanquished: thus for Müller,

\textsuperscript{131} Müller is referring here to Brecht's poem entitled: "ICH BENÖTIGE KEINEN GRABSTEIN". The text of the poem is: "Ich benötige keinen Grabstein, aber / Wenn ihr einen für mich benötigt / Wünschte ich, es stünde darauf: / Er hat Vorschläge gemacht. Wir / Haben sie angenommen. / Durch eine solche Inschrift wären / Wir alle geehrt" ("I don't need a gravestone, but if you need to have one for me, I would wish, that the inscription would read: He made suggestions. We adopted them. Such an inscription would honor all of us.") *Gesammelte Werke in zwanzig Bänden, Gedichte 3*, Ed. Suhrkamp, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1967) 1029.

\textsuperscript{132} ("the ineffectiveness of his suggestions")
Stalingrad represents a harbinger of doom for the German nation and set a course of inevitable events in motion. As Aragon rightly surmises: "[. . .] it was not only Paulus' position at Stalingrad that had fallen, but the whole idea of Nazi domination" (404). Upon Germany's defeat, Soviet troops entered the fallen city of Berlin and were greeted, especially by German Communists, as the rescuers from Hitler's fascism. Unfortunately, Stalin revealed himself as a dictator in disguise who suppressed, terrorized, and murdered his own people and those of the Soviet satellite states, which, after 1945, included the SBZ and later GDR. Stalin's monologue presents the German-Russian relationship in less of a Cold War rivalry but more of a specific Hitler-Stalin rivalry, full of hatred and fear. The two dictators do not actually meet, rather each has his own monologue in which he refers to his arch enemy as if he were speaking directly to him. An actual confrontation between the two men never took place historically: Ribbentrop met with Stalin when the Hitler-Stalin-pact was officially signed. The fact that they do not confront each other personally allows each the freedom to speak candidly, expressing his innermost thoughts and fears, which would not have been possible if Müller had designed a confrontational dialogue. These monologues, similar to and modelled after those of Shakespeare's great tragic figures, are designed to reveal essential or important information about the characters and the situation. Due to their arrogance and egocentricity, along with the tendency to keep plans and secrets closely guarded, the mode Müller chose for their self-expression is in keeping with their personalities and historical actions.

Müller also expresses a strong interest in predicting a dire future for Germany and Europe because Communism failed in the GDR and in Europe. Capitalism has retained its leadership position in the world constellation and thus retains the power. The few remaining communist countries in the world are China, North Korea, Cuba, and Vietnam, whose economies are neither healthy nor productive. There is a major connection between a country's economy and its government and politics. With a closed economy, such as is
common in communist countries, each is dependent on other countries within that system, such as the GDR on the COMECON members. But without new technologies, which are able to develop in open and free economies, a country cannot advance its per capita income and is unable to compete on the global market. Without a strong, stable, and competitive market, a country is not able to improve conditions for its citizens and allow them to lead a better life.

One of the main problems in the GDR was the lack of certain items and consumer products in the everyday life of its citizens which led to their dissatisfaction and anger. As a reflection of the country's economic situation, the people were unhappy with their own personal situations, their own personal Misere, such as few or no luxuries: no vacations, no modern or fancy new cars, no luxury food items. Rather, average citizens existed in tiny "cells" with meager possessions, while those "privileged" members of the GDR society could afford to buy luxury items which they could not. Another problem with the GDR, and one that accompanies the economic deficiency factor, is that the average citizens had no real freedom. They were trapped inside and were not allowed to leave as they pleased, rather only on a limited basis, such as for a vacation trip to a fellow Soviet satellite country. Privileged persons, however, had more freedom to leave the GDR and to travel to the West and the USA, for example. The Stasi controlled the people and society and so they lived in fear in a police state, a dictatorship and not a democratic form of communism such as the kind Luxemburg and her fellow Spartacists desired. The nation was being held together by a concrete wall on its western side and an iron hand on its eastern side. The result was that the GDR leadership was dependent on the Russian nation for military, economic, and political aid. The actual practice in the GDR belied the main idea behind communism, which is that democracy should be shared by all and not just belong to an elite group of society. Thus the economic aspect and the unfairness of the distribution of wealth and luxury items within the GDR is one of the main components that went wrong and helped lead to its ultimate and perhaps inevitable downfall. Müller's primary interest, however, was to continue his search for
German identity: the path the Germans took in the past to reach their present situation, and how these actions in the present would eventually affect the future of Germany. In the next and final chapter, I discuss the reception of these two plays and offer my concluding remarks regarding Müller's search for German identity in his German identity plays, *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3*. 
VI. Conclusion: Heiner Müller's Literary Legacy

VI.1 German Identity: Müller's Search is Over

Motto:
"Irgendwo zwischen Stalingrad und Potsdam werde ich liegen, gejagt von Friedrich II., Hitler und den Nibelungen"¹

Appropriately, but much too soon for this German author who was more concerned with Germany's past, present, and future than his own, Heiner Müller's "death in Berlin" occurred on 30 December 1995. Having lived most of his life in the eastern half of a divided Germany, Müller considered himself and was viewed by critics from both the FRG and the GDR as an "East German" writer. With the obsolescence of the Berlin Wall in 1989, however, and the reunification of these two German states in 1990, his claim of being one of the most famous living GDR authors suddenly became null and void. Müller and his texts were themselves relegated to the realm of history as historical documents which mirror the era of the GDR and this very unique period of the German past. As an author and playwright, Müller serves as witness and recorder of a shared collective experience and his texts assume a new significance as Zeitdokumente. Particularly valuable are his Geschichtsdramen, Germania Tod in Berlin and Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann because they offer a unique presentation of the state and evolution of German identity during the post-World War II and post-reunification eras. Even though Müller's search ended with his death, his artistic creations remain invaluable tools for present and future generations in their own respective search for German identity, which is continuously evolving in the ongoing process of national self-realization.

¹("I will lie somewhere between Potsdam and Stalingrad, hunted by Frederick II, Hitler, and the Nibelungs.") Heiner Müller, "Wir sind ein blödes Volk", Helmut Schödel and Joseph Gallus Rittenberg, Meine Wut seid ihr! Unter Dichtern, Huren & im Wald. (Munich: Kunstmann, 1993) 83.
VI.2 Reception of *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3*

The reception of Müller's work must be viewed primarily in terms of East and West, i.e., GDR and FRG, because his texts were published and performed in both German states or, as is the case with *Germania Tod*, were forbidden and not permitted to be published or performed in the GDR until a much later date. The reception of his work in the USA is best expressed by Carl Weber in the "Preface" to his book, *Hamletmachine*: "[. . .] aside from his reputation among scholars of German literature and contemporary drama, Heiner Müller is virtually unknown in this country" (9). As late as the mid-eighties, Müller had not achieved major status as an author or playwright with American theater audiences. Compared to Brecht, Müller still remains fairly unknown among the American public, although his works have been translated and written about by the leading experts on Müller and his works: Jost Hermand, Helen Fehervary, and Marc Silberman and increasingly by authors such as: Carl Weber, Jonathan Kalb, and David Barnett, for example. Given their particular emphasis on German themes and in spite of these critics' efforts, it is not surprising that his works have not found a wider audience in the USA and that a true appreciation of Müller's works in the USA remains limited to professors, critics, and students of German literature and culture. Whereas Müller is considered by some critics, such as Hermand and Fehervary, to be the greatest modern German writer after Brecht, others, like Schneider, perceive him as an illegal heir to Brecht or, at best, a poor imitation of his literary German forefather. Nevertheless, the overall importance of Müller's texts in relation to German identity is illustrated by the fact that they found interest on both sides of the Berlin Wall. Although the German nation and German identity were forcibly divided for four decades, this schism actually dates back much further and is itself a component of German identity, as Müller demonstrates in *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3* and as I have shown in Chapters Four and Five, respectively.

An interesting facet of Müller's works is that some were actually banned in the GDR, yet at the same time were warmly received and even performed in West German theaters. In
this sense, Müller transcends the barriers between East and West and his more open reception in West Germany helped in some way to bring a degree of commonality to both countries, in literary terms at least. By the early seventies he was considered one of the leading dramatists of the younger GDR-generation in East and West Germany, as Helen Fehervary writes in her essay from 1971, "Heiner Müllers Brigadenstücke" (13). Two decades later Matias Mieth writes in his essay, "Zur Rezeption von Heiner Müller in DDR und BRD", that at the end of the 1980s Müller was: "der in der DDR am meisten gespielte Theaterautor" and he adds that by 1990, as the GDR was nearing the end of its existence: "scheint Heiner Müller auf dem besten Wege zum lebenden Klassiker" (604). Once again Müller was following in the footsteps of Brecht, but with a different set of given circumstances; whereas Brecht became famous during the 1920s and 1930s in a unified Germany but was forced to leave when Hitler and the Nazis came to power and had to continue writing in exile, Müller developed his fame during the four decades of a divided Germany from within the borders of the communist GDR but was able to reach beyond its borders to the FRG and even the USA. In his essay, "Marxist - Postmodernist - German: History and Dramatic Form in the Work of Heiner Müller", McGowan writes:

> Though Müller's work enjoys three fairly distinct receptions - in the GDR, the German-speaking West, and the wider European and North American avant-garde - he has been writing in and for the GDR since the early 1950s. His plays thus accompany the development of the GDR as a continuous critical engagement with its problems and contradictions, offering alternative histories. Frequently, they have been subjected to censorship; some, like *Germania Tod in Berlin*, were completed in the 1970s but not published or performed in the GDR till the late 1980s (125-126).

---

2 ("the most performed playwright in the GDR"; "Heiner Müller seems to be on the best path to becoming a living classical author")
Müller's texts, which date back to the early period of the GDR and literally cover the span of four decades, present the author's observations as well as criticisms of that period. The fact that some were prohibited in the GDR shows how accurately and realistically Müller depicts events and in particular the mood during that time: in this sense his works truly function as witnesses of a bygone era. In his post-reunification essay, "Family Troubles: A Generational View of Heiner Müller's Role in the GDR", Marc Silberman refers to this GDR author's access to the FRG. He writes that: [. . .] travelling back and forth across the Wall since the mid-seventies, he became the point of focus as the representative of critical potential in the GDR beyond its borders and the transmitter for critical ideas and literary traditions from the West back to the GDR" (56). Because he remained in the East but was able to operate between the two German states, he attained a certain degree of recognition in the West through his role as a GDR playwright and political critic. A necessary factor in assessing Müller's literary legacy is to understand the extent and importance of GDR literature and to define what is meant -- more than a decade after reunification -- by GDR literature. In another essay from the late nineties, "Whose Story Is This? Rewriting the Literary History of the GDR", Silberman poses several important questions relating to the significance of GDR literature in a post-GDR era:

Is a GDR text defined by political geography, that is, by the birthplace of the author, by the author's place of residence, by the place where the text is written, by the place where it is published, or by some combination of these factors? When we speak of GDR literature, do we mean literature in the GDR, from the GDR, about the GDR? for GDR readers? or affirmative socialist-realist writing? or texts written under the constraints imposed by the SED and the Stasi? (32).

These questions harken back to the main issue surrounding German literature following reunification in 1990 which are mentioned in Chapter Three. Pertaining to the unique case of Heiner Müller, whose works were published, read, and performed in both the FRG and the
GDR, these questions require their own set of specific answers. Although Müller's body of literary work has been divided into several categories, as discussed in Chapter One, which are helpful in following the development of his work, but do not suffice to answer the above questions posed by Silberman. In the case of Müller, who was born when only one Germany existed, albeit in the Eastern region, the significant fact is that he chose to live and write in the GDR. While other writers were part of an ongoing exodus to the West, both before but most notably after the expatriation of Wolf Biermann in 1976, such as Peter Huchel, Thomas Brasch, Sarah Kirsch, Reiner Kunze, and Günter Kunert, for example, Müller steadfastly remained in the East. He wrote in, for, and about the GDR; in addition, he also wrote for and about all of Germany, as demonstrated in *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3*, with their references to Germany's common past as well as its shared future. In *Über die Deutschen*, Christian Graf von Krockow emphasizes the importance of the past on a nation's perspective of its present and future: "Denn was heute ist und in die Zukunft führt, das versteht man schwerlich ohne den Rückblick" (9). This quote can be applied to clarify the significance of Müller's work viewed from the long-term historical perspective given his steadfast interest in looking to the German past for clarification of the present and hope for the future. As he writes in, "Looking Back at Heiner Müller", Hermand's admiration for Müller is clearly evident while simultaneously recognizing and acknowledging the darker side of Müller's writings: "In short, he tried -- under increasingly difficult circumstances -- to look the angel of history in the eye as closely and fearlessly as possible. The results were in part extremely gruesome, indeed even inhuman visions" (158). Unfortunately, the reality of German history - and indeed of mankind's history -- is filled with cruelty and brutal acts perpetrated by man against his fellow man. In her "Response" to Hermand's essay, "Looking Back at Heiner Müller", Fehervary agrees with Hermand that Müller: "[. . .] continued the Brechtian tradition of responding to the major political issues of his time" (164). She knowingly refers to Müller

3 ("Because what is today and what leads to the future, can hardly be understood without looking back.")
as: "this utterly political man" whose "writings, theatre work, political decisions, and social interactions" were formed by his experiences, similar to those of Gorbachov and: 

"[. . .] an entire European generation whose adolescence coincided with the terror of fascism and the Second World War, and for whom, based on the immediacy of personal and collective experience, there remained only one alternative: socialism -- or barbarism" (163). Indeed, Müller's obsession with German history is underscored by his preoccupation with political ideology and its significant as well as inevitable influence on the course of German history and, ultimately, its importance as a component of German identity. Hermand describes Müller's cynicism as a reaction to the SED and its policies which were detrimental to socialism rather than promoting it. Along the same vein, Fehervary views Müller's work as: "[. . .] an effort toward political dialogue with the SED leadership within the context of socialist traditions, and with an eye toward the future" (166). In addition to his interest in the past, the future path of German identity occupied much of Müller's time and literary efforts. In an interview session with Carl Weber entitled, "19 Answers by Heiner Müller" included in his book, Hamletmachine, Müller responds to the view that there is "a total lack of hope" in his writing by saying: "I am neither a dope-nor a hope-dealer" and about his dark portrayal of the world's future: "The future of the world is not my future" (140). In spite of these cynical and seemingly disinterested statements, Müller was very concerned with Germany's future as well as the future of the world, even though he would no longer belong to it after 1995.

---

4 Hermand writes: "Wir alles wußten, daß aus diesen Worten ein Zynismus sprach, der sich nicht gegen den Sozialismus, sondern gegen die Selbstgenügsamkeit der SED richtete. Hier wollte jemand mehr, wesentlich mehr als das >>Realexistierende". Allerdings glaue dieser jemand nicht mehr an die überlieferten Mittel der theoretischen Belehrung. Daher setzte er alles ein, was ihm als Mittel der Veränderung effektiver erschien: die Ironie, den Zynismus, den Schock, um so jener >>Trägheit des Herzens<< entgegenzuwirken, die sich nur allzu gern mit der gegebenen Situation zufrieden gibt" (Kalkfell 76). ("We all knew that these words bespoke a cynicism which was directed not against the idea of socialism but against the smugness of the SED. Here was someone who wanted more, far more than what "really existed." By the late 1970s, however, this someone had stopped believing in the traditional methods of theoretical indoctrination. He therefore made use of everything that seemed to him more effective as a means of sparking change: irony provocation, shock, all intended to counteract that "lethargy of the heart" that made it easy to accommodate to the given situation") ("Looking Back" 154).
The German past and its opposing political ideologies -- particularly the struggle between German fascism and German Communism -- are at the heart of *Germania Tod* and *Germania 3*. Political ideology, along with its course throughout German history and the role it ultimately played in determining German identity, all of which he expresses in these two Geschichsdramen, remained his primary interest throughout his lifetime. *Germania Tod*, dated 1956/71, was published in 1977, premiered in 1978 in the FRG, but not until 1989 in the GDR. Despite the drastic changes which occurred in the early seventies in the GDR under Honecker's rule, this particular play was too radical and shocking for the party functionaries to allow it to be published or performed there. Müller's critical views about the reality of Communism in the GDR expressed in this play were still subject to censorship. He writes:


The authorities were still so afraid of Müller's play that they issued the permit only for that particular performance. The play was finally performed in the GDR but the much-anticipated and much-feared first performance did not become a reality. Müller writes about this first performance:


---

5 ("Germania Death in Berlin was neither allowed to be performed, nor printed. That lasted until 1988, when Wekwerth wanted to have the play produced by Marquardt at the Berliner Ensemble. A special permit from Hager, that was only good for Wekwerth and the Berliner Ensemble, made it possible.") Müller first met Fritz Marquardt in 1963/64: Marquardt had been an editor at Theater der Zeit in 1961 (KoS 250). Later, Marquardt became a director at the Volksbühne and then at the Berliner Ensemble. Wekwerth became the Intendant or director at the Berliner Ensemble during the mid-seventies. Kurt Hager was an official and party functionary:
Verweigerung. Aber er war tief erschrocken, als Höpcke sagte, er würde gar nicht mehr verstehen, daß er das Stück damals verboten hat. Es wirkte jetzt eher affirmativ auf das Publikum, also abstoßend (KoS 256).

Based on the above quote, apparently the production was harmless in the sense that it was not as bad as the authorities had thought it would be. The play did not criticize the GDR government directly, it did not plead for an end to Communist rule, and it did not condemn any of the contemporary SED leaders directly. Thus it was not as profound a threat to the government leadership as had been previously thought and even feared. In fact, it came as a surprise that the general effect on the audience was one of disgust. The graphic images and violent actions Müller portrays shocked the audience and did not endear the play to them.

Müller continues:


The impression left upon some audience members was a most negative one: they were offended at the crude way Müller portrayed the German heritage. If the play had been performed in the early or even late seventies, it may have had the same effect on the public and, therefore, perhaps did not deserve the censorship. On the other hand, it may have been

---

6 ("With the production at the Berliner Ensemble in 1988, shortly before the end of the GDR, Marquardt dispensed with the cabaret aspect, contrary to expectations. From a play that had been banned for eighteen years, one expects something like a bomb to fall at the premiere. Marquardt's production was a denial. But he was deeply shocked, when Höpcke said he couldn't understand anymore that the play had been prohibited back then. It had more of an affirmative effect on the audience, meaning repulsive.") Höpcke was a party functionary in the Ministry for Culture, responsible for literature whom Müller describes as a "Playboy" (KoS 214).

7 ("There were a couple indignant letters from audience members, some confused letters directed against the desecration of the German honor, against the false historical picture, nevertheless anonymous. The last one was a card to the Academy of the Arts, "red pig feces in Orcus, death in Berlin for Müller's Germania." That was 1989, in the year of the turning point, nevertheless it was still anonymous.")
due to the way it was staged by Marquardt that made it seem less of a threat to the GDR leaders. In any case, even though the play was performed shortly before the Wall came down, it was still able to upset some viewers who did not appreciate the author's treatment of German history and what they perceived as his utter disregard for the German sense of honor. Müller comments on the fact that *Germania* was forbidden for so long in the GDR:


Müller's negative portrayal of the German past touched a chord on both sides of the Wall. The Communist in the GDR prison represents a negative aspect of that nation which could have proven embarrassing or even humiliating for the government. Additionally, authorities in the GDR feared reprisals from the FRG because of the revolutionary aspect of the play at a time when the Soviet leader would be in Bonn on an official visit. Müller's claim that the

---

8 ("I believe the actual impetus was the prsion scene, about which no one spoke, the Communist in the GDR-prison. When a performance was about to take place in the Federal Republic, there was a long discussion in the Ministry of the GDR, if the play shouldn't be forbidden in the Federal Republic as well. But only I could have done that. The argument was, we can't let a play be performed before the Breschnew visit in Bonn, in which the talk is of red flags over Rhine and Ruhr. That looks like exportation of the revolution, and we don't export the revolution anymore. The different reaction in the East and West was interesting. At the Munich premiere in 1978, produced by Ernst Wendt, the rejection was entirely German, the argumentation varied.")
rejection of the play was "entirely German" underscores the fact that the German historical roots shared by both the FRG and the GDR would always serve as a bond between them.

In spite of its perception as a gloomy play, Müller received the Dramatists Prize from the city of Mülheim (Ruhr) in 1979 for Germania Tod. In his essay, "Deutschland-Denkmale: Heiner Müllers Germania Tod in Berlin", Paul Gerhard Klussmann writes that the judges chose Müller and this particular play because: "[. . .] sich das Stück 'in einer schrillen und widersprüchlichen Form' mit grundlegenden Konflikten und Ereignissen' deutscher Geschichte auseinandersetze" (396). But in spite of the praise and the prize, after the first performances of the play, the general opinion was not flattering. Klussmann continues: "[. . .] das düstere Germany-Bild Müllers mit dem dominierenden Todesmotiv schockierte den Leser und das Theaterpublikum dennoch sowohl durch die inhaltliche Schärfe als auch durch die ungewohnte Form" (396) and: "[. . .] dies sei ein politisches Theater der Schwarzmalerei ohne positive Perspektive" (397)." He makes a connection between Müller's choice of unusual scene structure and his choice of death as a dominant theme in the play. Certainly the graphic images of nonchalant murders and brutal killings of Germans by Germans together with the terse and disturbing scenes jolted the audience like an electric shock. In his essay from 1991, "Heiner Müllers Geschichtsdrama -- die Beendigung einer literarischen Gattung", Heinz-Dieter Weber's comments concerning Germania Tod recall to mind the criticism endured by Goethe for his Götz, which was eventually considered the first Geschichtsdrama:

In der Tat könnte man 'Germania Tod in Berlin' gar nicht als Geschichtsdrama ansprechen, wenn man dafür die Faktizität des Stoffes reklamierte. Es gibt weder einen zusammenhängenden Handlungsgang, noch ist historische Anschaulichkeit auch nur entfernt angestrebt. Es wird zwar auf historische Fakten referiert, aber dies

9("[. . .] that the play came to terms with fundamental conflicts and events of German history in a shrill and contradictory form.")
10("[. . .] but Müller's ominous image of Germany with its dominating death theme shocked the reader and the theater audience, however, with its harshness as well as its unusual form.")
Due to its unique structure and unusual form, this play, like Goethe's, is often been perceived as an affront to the classical form of dramatic art. Although there is not a traditional storyline, the reader is, however, able to follow a certain progression, determined primarily by the characters of Hils, the Young Bricklayer, and Whore 1 or the Girl. As Weber also recognizes, the element of intertextuality constitutes an important facet of the play by providing historical antecedents as well as significant cultural continuities. Contrary to Germania Tod and its extensive reliance on the technique of intertextuality, in his later play, Germania 3, Müller opted for the use of long quotes taken from previous German literature, including his own.

The reaction to Germania 3 can best be summarized with the following quote by Franz P. Haberl: "What a depressing little book! It is depressing not only because of its contents, but also because of its quality. [. . .] On balance, I would say that anyone who does not read Germania 3 will not miss much" (586). Harsh words for Müller's final play, yet they mirror the ominous tone of the author's last dramatic text. He will never be able to defend his work against such brash critics -- not that he would ever have even considered defending himself or his work -- but the legitimacy of Haberl's claim is a good starting point for the reception of Germania 3. In his polemic or Streitschrift, "Bertolt Brecht und sein illegitimer Erbe Heiner Müller", Michael Schneider writes that as Brecht's literary heir, whether legitimate or not, Müller had a unique relationship to the greatest modern German writer and literary myth. He compares Brecht's characters to those of Müller and finds the latter's sadly lacking in depth, compared to the memorable figures of Baal, Puntila, Galilei, and Mother Courage, for example (135). He writes that:

11("In fact, one could not refer to Germania Tod in Berlin as a Geschichtsdrama, if one were to complain about the factuality of the subject matter. There is neither a coherent storyline, nor is a historical perspicuity even
Müllers Bühnenfiguren haben kaum ein Eigenleben als menschliche Charaktere, die mit unverwechselbaren Accessoires und Eigenschaften ausgestattet wären, sie sind vielmehr streng reduziert auf die Rolle von Ideenträgern des Müllerschen Geschichtsbildes und sprechen fast alle den gleichen, eben den Müllerschen Ton (135).  

Indeed, Müller's characters can be relegated to several recurring types which are doomed to continually confront each other in his chosen constellations: those who favor the old system as opposed to the new, such as Hilse and the Young Bricklayer in *Germania Tod*; or those who represent the struggle between fascism and communism, such as Brother A and Brother B in *Die Schlacht*, for example, who meet again in *Germania Tod* without ever reconciling their differences. While the bricklayers are able to put aside their differences before the older man's death, there is no real agreement between the two men: Hilse dies still believing in his illusory form of communism. The brothers, each of whom espouses an opposing political ideology, are offered no realistic opportunity to reach an understanding, and so the reader must assume that they are doomed to fight each other forever, similar to the Nibelung warriors. In *Germania 3*, the fascist and communist characters are portrayed in a similar fashion: they still represent one ideology or the other. The fascists continue to despise the Russian state, as they refer to the GDR, and consider any Germans who collaborate with it traitors to the German fatherland. The communists, although living in a communist state, are inevitably trapped in a world that will never accept their beliefs, and so they remain forever estranged. Thus Müller's characters have, overall, not evolved since *Germania Tod*. 

Referring specifically to the characters in *Germania 3*, Schneider contends that they are: 

"[. . .] vollends reduziert auf die Rolle von Kommentatoren des Müllerschen Geschichtsbildes"

---

remote attempts. Historical facts are referred to, but only insofar as they are important for certain historical discoursese. The play's purpose is exclusively constituted through its intertextuality."

12(“Müller's stage figures hardly have their own existence as human characters who are endowed with unmistakable supplements and characteristics, they are much more severely reduced to the role of representatives of ideas for Müller's image of history and almost all of them speak the same, very tone of Müller.”)
Müller's figures are designed to reflect his views relating to historical facts, and their dialogue demonstrate his perception of history and historical progress. In *Germania Tod*, Müller expresses his final hope for Socialism in the GDR but without the Russian or Stalinist influence: a German Socialism which harks back to the days of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht and the Spartacists and reflects his last remaining hope or illusion for the new German state, the GDR. By the time he wrote *Germania 3*, however, he had realized that this hope he had believed in for the GDR and its political development as a German socialist state was not going to become a reality. The experiment was not successful and Müller paints a very desolate, pessimistic picture for the future of German socialism and of German identity in his final theatrical text. In addition to the underlying themes of German history and politics and their relation to German identity in these two *Geschichtsdramen* are Müller's interest in the role of history in social progress and of man's role in history as well as the responsibility of the individual for the present and especially for the future of mankind. Müller's overall interest thus extends to the realm of mankind or humankind and the future which awaits the forthcoming generations, determined by the decisions and actions of each given generation. Each previous generation is relegated to the realm of the past by the ineluctable wheels of historical progress. Therefore, the dead play a significant role for Müller because they represent the past, both aggressors and victims. In this sense, Müller can be compared to the angel of history who is incapable of preventing the catastrophes he is able to see: Müller not only looks closely and fearlessly into these eyes, as Hermand writes, he manages to look through the eyes of this angel and report on what he sees with the hope that mankind will stop and consider the ultimate future consequences of its current actions before acting in a manner that will prove to be detrimental to future generations and the course of history and, ultimately, of mankind. As a result of Müller's concern for the future, his texts reflect his strong criticism of the current government of the GDR, the SED, and its wayward policies  

13("totally reduced to the role of commentators for Müller's image of history")
which have stunted the growth of real socialism, even though it claimed this was the "real existeriender Sozialismus". Müller's criticism took him back to the first century in \textit{Germania Tod} and down the path of German history to look for the causes of the problems facing his generation and German identity. In \textit{Germania 3} he goes so far as to extend his warning to future generations of the world based on what he has learned from the German past. The following section presents the major similarities and differences between these two \textit{Geschichtsdramen} concerning style, language, metaphors, and images, accompanied by a comparison of the author's perspective on German identity.

\textbf{VI.3 Comparisons and Contrasts of \textit{Germania Tod} and \textit{Germania 3}}

I begin this section with a comparison of Müller's style in each play, specifically the structure and form. In \textit{Germania Tod}, the author relies on the use of parallel scenes which serve to demonstrate not only any differences, but more so the similarities shared by Germany before and after the establishment of the GDR. Whereas \textit{Germania Tod} has a total of thirteen titled scenes, \textit{Germania 3} has nine titled scenes which are depicted separately and independently from one another without adhering to a strict chronological order. Müller again employs the techniques of compacting of time and anachronism, as various persons and events from the past are placed together contrary to historical fact. In \textit{Germania Tod}, Müller's extensive use of intertextuality brings a new dimension to his expression of German identity. A commonality shared by many of these excerpts and their authors is that they are related to the proletarian movement and fought for or contributed to the revolutionary cause, such as Herwegh. On a different level, the excerpts from Oswald's collection of folksongs demonstrate an interest in Berlin and its history which includes the people; in particular the lower levels of society, such as prostitutes and drunks: Müller's inclusion of such character types thus reflects a realistic aspect of daily post-war life.

There are several other significant characteristics of each play; some of which constitute similarities, some differences. The intertextual lines taken from various fairy tales
by the Grimm brothers represent yet another important component of Müller's portrayal in both of these plays because they reflect the customs, culture, and morals of the German nation. Similar to the Geschichtsdrama, the fairy tale has established itself as a German tradition and, similar to Müller's texts, also includes the darker aspects of life. A major characteristic distinguishing the author's final play from his earlier play is the decrease in the use of the technique of intertextuality; instead there are long excerpts taken from various German literary texts. Aside from the Skull Salesman's recitation of a modified quote from Vergil's fourth eclogue, Germania Tod contains far fewer such excerpts than Germania 3. In addition to his text, the Salesman's language reflects his education and former elevated social status. Overall, the language in his earlier drama corresponds to the particular characters: vulgar and lewd for the prostitutes and their customers, and simple yet revolutionary for the bricklayers, for example. The language in his later drama is more elevated, as demonstrated in the dictators' monologues as well as in the dialogue of the soldiers and officers at Stalingrad. A characteristic of Germania 3, which further distinguishes it from Germania Tod, is the great number of hunting and animal metaphors it contains. Throughout the play, for example, the line from "Die schwarzbraune Hexe" accompanies Müller's references to Luxemburg's murder and the persecution of the Communists, who had been hunted down by their political enemies. In addition, the play opens with the GDR guards chasing and shooting down their own fellow citizens like animals, by order of the GDR leadership. An underlying theme of the play compares humans to animals in certain circumstances: such as the officers at Stalingrad in scene three, who have eaten the rations, disgustedly refer to themselves as pigs; and Hitler in his monologue, who refers to the German people as German shepherd dogs and the Russians as less than human, which was a component of the Nazi propaganda. Müller's use of these metaphors contributes to the subdued mood and serious tone of his final play, which is in direct contrast to the more shocking, often grotesque, and at times absurd presentations in Germania Tod.
Essential to Müller's portrayal in both plays are the German myths which represent an exaggeration and often an abuse of actual historical events and truths: Müller's purpose is in exposing the lies and manipulations behind these myths. In both Geschichtsdramen, Müller's primary interest is on depicting those historical persons and events which he believed were decisive in the formation of German identity throughout the centuries and which ultimately led to the Second World War and the resulting division or "death" of Germany in 1949. In a century marred by two world wars, his interest lies in showing the darker elements from the German past which led to such man-made and, therefore, avoidable, contemporary catastrophes. The struggle between the German proletariat and the bourgeoisie, which is the focal point of Germania Tod, no longer takes center stage in Germania 3, rather the focus is divided among a mixture of former German politicians, Thälmann and Ulbricht, for example, as well as GDR party functionaries; the European dictators Hitler and Stalin; German and Russian soldiers and officers and their tribulations at Stalingrad, which retains its historical significance for Müller; the continuing saga of the Nibelungs; and the German Communist icon, Rosa Luxemburg.

Rosa Luxemburg is the focal point of the German past for Müller because her untimely death meant, in his opinion, the ultimate failure of German Communism. He had found hope after 1949 in the form of the GDR, but as he demonstrates in Germania Tod, there were still internal risks and dangers which could ultimately surface and destroy not only this hope, but the future of German Communism. One particular historical event had always troubled Müller and was the basis for his disillusionment: the murder of the KPD's leaders Luxemburg and Liebknecht. Without their strong influence and commitment to lead the KPD, it had little chance for survival in the Soviet-dominated party. After the formation of the GDR and its attempts to function as an independent nation, the ties to Stalin and his successors were too strong to sever. Finally, following November 1989 and the fall of the Wall, the end of the GDR was assured and the fate of German Communism was at last
sealed. In the second scene of *Germania Tod*, the image of Luxemburg on the funeral pyre is in direct contrast to that in the final scene where Müller presents her as a "reincarnation" in Hilse's last moments before his death. Unfortunately, this image is only an illusion: all that remains is the Girl, a former prostitute, who represents a different form of Communism than that of Luxemburg's own democratic vision. In *Germania 3* she appears as a type of ghost walking past with her murderers but does not speak: her image speaks for itself. Müller never presents Luxemburg with a voice, rather she remains silent in both of these *Geschichtsdramen*: it is her image that interests the author, all that she believed in and represented and, especially, that which could have been. She neither quotes from her speeches nor holds a monologue, as do Hitler and Stalin, however, because she never had the power which these two dictators enjoyed. Thus she is not able to speak in either of these two dramas because her strong, compelling voice was silenced, along with her message of hope for the future. Müller thus underscores her silence in order to emphasize the great loss that accompanied her murder for the path and future of German Communism, Germany, and German identity.

Müller depicts Hitler in both of these plays, but using decidedly different presentations. Appearing as a grotesque parody of himself in *Germania Tod*, in *Germania 3* his sober monologues correspond to Müller's serious message to subsequent generations of Germans to be wary of the future. The German autocrat retains his significant and decisive role, however, in shaping history and the path of German identity for the post-World war II era as well as for the later era of post-reunification. His legacy of fascism and his influence on German identity of the nineties and beyond can be seen in the continuing presence of the neo-Nazis within Germany's borders. Certainly Hitler remains a powerful shadow from Germany's past and continues to influence the German present and future, but he is not the only negative element from German history which has helped shape German identity of the twentieth century. Stalin is a powerful figure from the past whose actions have also greatly
affected the course of Germany and, therefore, German identity. Whereas Stalin is indirectly represented in the earlier play through the scenes' titles, "Tribute to Stalin 1" and "Tribute to Stalin 2", in the later play he, like Hitler, is depicted in a somber role with an apocalyptic warning about the future. His influence on German Communism, which gained in strength after Luxemburg's murder and Thälmann's imprisonment, was still felt in the Soviet Union and the GDR even after his death. Following Chruschtschow's speech at the Twentieth Party Congress on 25 February 1956, his authority diminished. The party functionaries represented in Germania 3, and in particular their various reactions to the announcement of Stalin's hidden atrocities, are designed to reflect these differing perspectives that existed within the GDR. Nevertheless, in the post-war era Stalin's actions helped to further the Cold War and affected events occurring within the GDR and the FRG. In comparison to Hitler's enduring influence even in post-reunification Germany, however, Stalin's legacy is dominated by Stalingrad. The battle for Stalingrad represents a power struggle between the two European dictators of the twentieth century, whose desire for victory meant more to each of them than the lives of their own men. The defeat of his armies dealt a severe blow to Hitler and the Third Reich, but it was just the beginning of ultimate defeat for Germany at the hands of the Russians under Stalin and further enflamed the German-Russian aggression. Equally importantly for Müller, however, are the scars which were left by the Führer and Nazi leaders who abandoned their men, trapped in the frozen terrain and surrounded by Stalin's army. In Germania Tod the German soldiers depicted in the Kessel, who turn to cannibalism in order to have a chance at survival, represent the inhumanity of a war which has been forced upon them by their tyrannical ruler. Their actions are no different than those of the soldiers who served under Napoleon, Caesar, or Stalin, and is the reason Müller includes these tyrants in this scene aptly entitled, "Tribute to Stalin 1". The presence of the Nibelung warriors here and their willingness to fight until the death -- even against each other -- is testament to the
misuse by the Nazis of this famous tale for their own propaganda purposes. Müller uses the Nibelung characters to demonstrate the mythical aspect which does not represent reality.

Similarly, the historical Prussian monarch, Frederick II, who has a significant role in Germania Tod, represents a mythical force which helped to shape German identity and the course of German history. Although he is not directly present in Germania 3, his influence is seen in the Homburg excerpts. In addition, at the "Geisterschloss" two of the deceased officers express anger at the deceased General because he broke his oath to the Führer, thereby tarnishing the military honor. The General's actions, however, demonstrate that German identity was slowly breaking free from this old Prussian tradition, this exaggerated sense of honor which the Nazis praised. The modern heirs of the castle show little honor: their primary interest is in making a monetary profit, even at the expense of their ancestors who had greatly suffered in order to redeem the reputation of "Germania".

"Germania" appears as an allegorical figure in Germania Tod: portrayed as not totally innocent, she helped Hitler to power and, as a result, is partly responsible for the birth of the FRG, according to Müller's portrayal of her. Her symbolic destruction by Hitler's men reflects the dictator's treachery against her and her people: his orders to destroy the infrastructure of German cities, in particular that of Berlin, would have been catastrophic for the surviving Germans. Nevertheless, he managed to seriously damage Germany and German identity through his war; the bombs which were dropped onto German cities by Germany's enemies did the rest. Following German reunification Germania has returned to the world stage and, although she is not represented as a character in Germania 3, she is mentioned in the title and thus indirectly present. It remains to be seen if the neo-Nazis or other forces again diminish and destroy her or if the post-reunification German leadership is able to elevate her status.

Müller depicts the battle of Stalingrad in Germania 3 despite the elapsed timespan of over fifty years, because this event affected the subsequent development of Germany and,
therefore, had a lasting effect on German identity. The desire for revenge is reflected in the characters of Kriemhild, who exposes a German general's uniform, confronting Hagen, who exposes a Soviet uniform. Müller is thus showing that the German-Russian rivalry has a long history, which will not end in the near future, if ever, in his opinion. In *Germania 3* Müller continues to portray the German-Russian hatred and aggression which is to be expected after the war, as in *Germania Tod*, but fifty years after the end of the war and following reunification, it does not seem to represent a major threat. Germany has developed good relations with its former enemy, the Soviet Union, along with its former satellite states, as well as with the USA, England, and France: thus the picture does not appear so black and white anymore as it used to be or as Müller portrays it. Nevertheless, anyone who survived Stalingrad or the Soviet invasion and the inhumane treatment of the civilians, especially women and children, such as at Königsberg in East Prussia, will never feel anything less than hatred for their conquerors from Russia. The "Pink Giant", a former soldier who survived Germany's defeat under the Soviet army, seeks revenge for his mother's torment by Soviet soldiers. Although historically the motives of the Pink Giant had nothing to do with the German-Russian hatred, Müller's depiction of him as a revenge-seeking child can be understood within the context of these other historical atrocities. There are many critics who will argue that after all of the horrible crimes the Nazis perpetrated on the Russians and the rest of Europe and other areas of the world, the Germans deserve nothing less than what they received at the hands of the Soviet conquerors or from the Allied bombs. Since World War II German identity has been associated with fascism and the Nazis, but that is exactly the prejudice against which Müller struggled in his "Germania" plays: that the Germans, who were betrayed and abandoned to their fate by their Führer and the Nazi leadership, had to endure the harsh and inhumane price for his war, whether suffering soldiers at Stalingrad, wives and mothers, or innocent children. Rather than trying to encourage a halt to the
hostility between these two former enemies, in his final text Müller once again chose to stoke the flames of their mutual hatred.

In *Germania Tod* Goebbels, like Hitler, is represented as a grotesque parody of himself, who gives birth to a *Conterganwolf*, the FRG. In *Germania 3*, Goebbels makes a single appearance in scene four when he refers to his children, the symbol of the future. Because he and his wife have killed their children, however, he recognizes that the future holds no hope for him. In his earlier dramatic text, Müller also uses the imagery of children: in scene one, the children are not playing, rather struggling to survive: their existence is not a game but reality. In the final scene it is not reality, rather an illusion that no child wants to be the capitalist in their game. By 1990, Hilse's greatest fear had become reality: no one wanted to be the communist and his dream of the communist flag flying over "Rhine and Ruhr" had been extinguished by the success of capitalism from the West. Hilse and the other bricklayers from the post-war era GDR are not included in Müller's later play: they belong to an extinct breed of workers which has been replaced by guest workers, such as the Croatian in *Germania 3*. The Young Bricklayer and the Girl have been replaced in more recent times by young couples, who, disillusioned with the GDR, wanted only to escape to the West and so helped cause the fall of the Wall. Any hope for the success of German Communism had been replaced by the desire for capitalism and consumer goods in the age of globalization and in their quest to be like their "brothers and sisters" from the West, the former FRG. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has been disbanded and the individual countries are enjoying their sovereignty: the weapons of capitalism have conquered Europe. Müller's pessimism in his final dramatic text concerning the future stems from the historical fact that with the dissolution of the GDR, any chance for the future existence of a Socialist German state no longer remains.

Brecht's legacy in *Germania 3* reflects the past as well as the future of the German theater, which is an expression of German identity. The Communist voice of the GDR theater
was reduced to placating the government leadership and the party functionaries. Thus Müller's concern was that Brecht's dream of educating audiences has been forgotten by those who have replaced its founder at the Berliner Ensemble. Müller remained a political writer throughout his lifetime: political ideology and its role throughout German history and its effects on German identity remained at the center of his works and his primary focus. Müller's perspective may not have changed since the time he completed and published *Germania Tod*, but his mood certainly had. By the mid-nineties he was a mature man as well as a man suffering from an incurable illness, fully aware that he was facing a premature and imminent death. Therefore, his final play reflects the seriousness of a dying man's final message.

Because these German identity plays are all-encompassing, they incorporate various elements from Müller's entire body of work: from the production plays, the revolutionary plays, the antique plays, and, of course, the German history plays. A characteristic both "Germania" plays have in common with Müller's other literary texts is the idea of killing or being killed: whether a Nazi or a Communist, a Nibelung, a soldier, or a political prisoner, the various characters demonstrate Müller's underlying philosophy of the basic fight for survival. In his essay, "Tödliche Momente der Entscheidung", Wolfgang Storch comments that the underlying theme connecting the characters in *Die Schlacht* and which makes them kill is: "[. . .] Sie wollen leben. [. . .] Sie müssen töten, um weiter leben zu können" (132).14

The idea of "wanting to go on living" or the desire for survival is central to an understanding of Müller's philosophy: the accompanying idea of annihilating or being annihilated is

14Storch's entire quote is: "Heiner Müller schrieb fünf kurze Szenen: Momente der Entscheidung. Sie enden tödlich: Bruder tötet Bruder, drei Soldaten töten den vierten, Vater tötet Mutter und Toch[ter], die Frau tötet den Mann, als er den Selbstmord aufgeben will, drei überliefern den vierten der SS. Warum: Sie wollen leben. Ihre Entscheidungen sind ihrem Selbstbehaltungsstreben gerecht: selbst schon im Vorhof des KZ, opfern sie den anderen auf. Sie müssen töten, um weiter leben zu können" (132). ("Heiner Müller wrote five short scenes: moments of decision. They have a deadly end: brother kills brother, three soldiers kill the fourth, father kills mother and daughter, the wife kills the husband when he tries to halt his suicide attempt, three hand over the fourth to the SS. Why: they want to live. Their decisions correspond to their driving force for self-preservation: even in the outer court of the concentration camp, they victimize the others. They must kill, in order to go on living.")
reflected in many of his other texts as well, in addition to Die Schlacht including: Der Horatier, Mauser, Der Auftrag, Leben Gundlings, Prometheus, and Wolksamer Chaussee, for example. Jürgen Engler's comment about Philoktet in his essay, "Handschriften der Arbeiten und Tode. Heiner Müllers 'Stücke'": "Unerbittlich ist er eingebunden in einen Kreislauf scheußlicher Verwandlungen; Fressen oder Gefressenwerden ist das Gesetz seines Daseins" (150-151)\(^1\) could also be applied to other characters from these texts. One thinks of the executioner in Mauser who no longer kills on behalf of the revolutionary cause, rather because he has found pleasure in killing, or the Horatian who must be executed because he has killed his own sister whom he considers an enemy of the state, even though he is also hailed as a hero for destroying the enemy. In Leben Gundlings the young prince has learned through demeaning lessons from his own father that in order to survive he must become cruel himself and destroy others before they destroy him. Based on the author's experiences, it was only possible to be one or the other: the murderer or the victim; the Nazi or the Jew; the Stalinist or the Communist, respectively. In order to survive in Müller's experience, it was necessary to become the subject, the one annihilating, and is a major component of German identity, as depicted in his plays, Germania Tod and Germania 3.

VI.4 Concluding Remarks

Together these two Geschichtsdramen, which I have classified as German identity plays, cover the span of German history from its earliest period to the modern day era as none of Müller's other dramatic texts: from the first to almost the twenty-first century. Given the downfall of the GDR, they have not only gained in importance, they have retained their relevance in this modern age more than his other works, similar to Brecht's Galileo and Mutter Courage. The Thirty Years' War and the Second World War are often used as comparisons given the level of death and destruction inflicted upon the Germans and Germany: the nation had to build itself up after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, later in

\(^1\)("He is inexorably bound in a cycle of abominable transformations; to devour or to be devoured is the law of"
1945, and again, in some measure, in 1990 following reunification. Echoing the internal strife Müller depicts in the relationship between Flavus and Arminius and Brother A and Brother B, the modern German brothers, who had been alienated and isolated from each other for four decades, suddenly had to learn to cooperate with and respect each other. This was no easy task, having been divided for so long by not only a concrete wall, but by differing political ideologies as well: in this case capitalism in the FRG and communism in the GDR. Unlike the historical and literary figures of Götz and Geyer, Wallenstein and Piccolomini, who never learned to cooperate with each other for the sake of the German nation, contemporary Germans now had the opportunity to finally settle their differences and create a better, unified nation. Although it has not always been easy and there are often still disagreements, there is no more brother against brother, there are no more barricades or walls: these have been replaced by open political discussions. Germany has forged a new path and German identity has reached a new level, ready to meet the challenges of the future as one nation. Dictators, secret police, and illegal arrests have been replaced by elected officials, legal protests and, however unfortunate, egg-throwing at the incumbent Chancellor. The freedom to express one's differing viewpoints is done so without fear of brutal repercussion or foreign tanks and troops rolling in to seize the nation's weathered but proud capital. Berlin, the city Müller endows with mythical power in his epigram taken from Berlin, du deutsche deutsche Frau: "Berlin ist das Letzte. Der Rest ist Vorgeschichte. / Sollte Geschichte stattfinden, wird Berlin der Anfang sein" (213). With these words the author expresses his belief in this German city as the key to Germany's past, present, and future. Historically, it represents, as Marilyn Sibley Fries writes in her essay, "Berlin, Berlin": "the alpha and the omega" (31). Indeed, this

his existence.

16 Both Federal Chancellors, Helmut Kohl and Gerhard Schröder of the CDU and the SPD, respectively, have been the targets of egg-throwing protesters. Kohl was actually hit in 1991 in May in the city of Halle by Matthias Schipke but the unknown assailant missed his target, Schröder, on 24 August 2004 in the eastern city of Wittenberge in Brandenburg.

17 ("Berlin is the ultimate. The rest is prehistory. If history should take place, Berlin will be the beginning.") This translation is taken from Marilyn Sibley Fries, "Berlin, Berlin", The Berlin Wall: Representations and
former Prussian stronghold has survived the fascist dictator, enemy bombs, the pillaging and raping of its citizens by the "liberators", and its own division, to again become the heart of the nation. The Germans are in possession of their land and have rediscovered their own voice: they do not listen to or depend on the Americans or the British, the Russians or the French for direction. Once again living in a sovereign nation, the Germans decide the path their country will take and are no longer, as Müller once said, trapped between East and West. German identity has paid the price with its recent past, and its present is secure, whatever the future may bring.

In the twenty-first century and almost a decade after Müller's death, there are new dangers now facing Germany: externally the threat from Islamic terrorists and internally problems with the integration of foreigners as well as economic instability. Europe has undergone dramatic changes: the European Union has considerably increased its membership, including several countries previously under Russian domination. During a second war in Iraq since March 2003 carried out solely by the USA and its ally the United Kingdom, without the support of France and Germany, who have stood firm in their belief, Germany has shown that it no longer stands in the shadow of its former occupiers. In a changing world order, the current reality seems to be one of an European-American antagonism rather than that of the extinct Cold War, Soviet-American antagonism or the hatred between Germans and Russians which Müller consistently portrays in Germania Tod and Germania 3. Facing serious domestic problems such as a continuing influx of refugees from Eastern Europe and Africa, high unemployment -- especially in the former states of the GDR --, and exacerbated by an overall deteriorating social system, the German leadership has

---


18 The previous members of the EU are: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. The following countries have recently been added: Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia. Current candidate countries include: Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, and Turkey. The application for The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is pending.
a Herculean task before it. In response to the government's proposed reforms known as "Hartz IV", and in a parallel to the "Monday demonstrations" which helped lead to reunification, the German people have taken to the streets in record numbers to express their unrest and dissatisfaction. Nevertheless, these internal political and economic problems may lead to a rise in fascism within Germany and Müller's fears will be considered foresight: the aggression and hatred are certainly still present, only hidden. The relevancy of Müller's fear of fascism and interest in the events from World War II and the post-1945 German-Russian aggression is reflected in the current movie (2004) about Hitler's last days in his bunker, "Der Untergang", a film by the director, Bernd Eichinger. Daring to break with tradition as well as to break the taboo associated with a realistic portrayal of the dictator Hitler, Eichinger's film is cinematic testimony to Müller's theatrical presentations. Aside from this latest film, documentaries and films about the Stauffenberg assassination attempt currently abound as the Germans embrace their past, including both the negative and the positive aspects of their heritage. Finally, six decades later, Germans are receptive to uncovering events from that period: they want to explore this era and never seem to tire of discussing what happened and why. Thus the message for German identity is clear and one which Müller expresses in his texts: learn about the German past, do not hide from it, remove its flesh and expose its bones so that no fear or guilt is necessary. I opened my dissertation with Müller's quote about not having to fear the past as long as faith in the future remains, which seems to be occurring now in Germany. German identity has recovered from its destruction by Hitler: proof of this lies in the Germans' desire and willingness to delve into their past, into that period of German history that caused the greatest harm, and to accept what happened as belonging, finally, to the realm of the past and to openly face the present and the future with this knowledge and awareness. The revelation which Müller perhaps hoped would happen is now occurring: Germans are no longer hiding from their Nazi past, nor from their GDR past. The film from 2003 by director Wolfgang Becker, "Goodbye Lenin" is cinematic proof of the developing
acceptance of this era in "German" history, as is the continued increase in overall interest in
this period. However, internal differences and strife still reflect a major component of the
political arena: new fires are burning as Germany struggles to get through these modern
difficult economic times which, unfortunately, reflect a West-East dichotomy not seen since
the early period of reunification. The introduction and implementation of the "Hartz IV"
reforms threaten to undermine the solidarity of the German nation by driving an economic
and, not surprising, political wedge between the two halves. Confronted with this new
dilemma, German identity thus also faces new challenges to its continued development and
stability. The residual uncertainty surrounding German identity is based on the confusion
relating to various perceptions stemming from the post-reunification period. Von Krockow
expresses this dilemma:

Die Frage ist freilich: Was eigentlich macht den Deutschen aus, und was
unterscheidet ihn von anderen? Gibt es das >>typisch<< Deutsche? Und wodurch
werden wir zur Nation, was verschafft ihr Profil? Von unserer >>Identität<< ist
immerfort die Rede, wohl darum, weil niemand recht weiß, wie man sie bestimmen
soll. Seit der Wiedervereinigung, seit dem Aufeinanderprallen von Ost- und
Westdeutschen stellen sich zusätzlich dringende und offene Fragen, weil die
Erwartungen, die man aneinander stellte, zum guten oder bösen Teil bisher unerfüllt
geblieben sind. Aber schon sehen wir uns dazu aufgefordert, miteinander
Verantwortung zu übernehmen für Frieden und Krieg (Über die Deutschen 8).19

The Germans' struggle to define their identity has made great progress since reunification but,
nevertheless, the East-West dichotomy threatens its underlying stability, as evidenced in the

---

19("The question is certainly: What exactly determines the Germans, and what differentiates them from others?
Is there something "typical" German? And what makes us a nation, what constitutes its character? The
discussion is continuously about our "identity", probably because no one really knows how it should be
determined. Since reunification, since the collision of East and West Germans, urgent and open questions are
being posed additionally, because the expectations, which one poses to each other, for good or bad have until
now remained unfulfilled. However, we already see ourselves summoned to take responsibility for one another
for peace and war.")
most current internal political differences. The different factions of German leadership must come to terms with this newest era of internal strife without alienating each other or the rest of Europe.

Müller had his hand on the pulse of the times and on the most significant aspects of German identity. The current heightened interest in World War II and its instigator, Adolf Hitler, clearly shows that Müller was aware of the importance of that era from the German past and its influence on the present and future. Müller's interest in portraying the era of the GDR and, especially in criticizing it, is not merely a type of "Ostalgie", a common characteristic of the current renewed interest in the culture of the GDR era by its former citizens, rather demonstrates the author's concern at the time for the future of German Communism. However, following reunification and the assimilation of the GDR into the FRG, Müller recognized that not only was the GDR now relegated to the past, but that he himself also belonged to this bygone era. As he stated in an interview in 1993: "Ich war und bin ein Stück DDR-Geschichte" (GI3 172) ("I was and am a part of GDR-history"). Not only his Germania plays, but his other plays as well, such as Der Lohndrücker and Die Umsiedlerin (Die Bauern), and Die Korrektur, offer a view of the GDR by an author who experienced these earlier changing and uncertain times. As he writes in, "Looking Back at Heiner Müller", Hermand describes his reaction to Der Lohndrücker and how he: "[. . .] was convinced that with this drama GDR-literature had come into its own for the first time" (142). A drama that dealt with contemporary issues facing the GDR and its workers, this early drama helped establish Müller's reputation and eventual fame. The author offers neither solutions to the problems facing Germany, nor did he ever claim to have the answers. He was more interested -- and his texts attest to this -- in presenting those elements of the past which affect the present and, ultimately, the future. Although a nation's past does not contain specific answers to its future, in order for a nation to know where it is going, it must know which paths were taken to reach the present and can learn, perhaps, which paths to avoid.
Referring to the younger German generation's attitude after reunification towards Germany's Nazi past and its subsequent division in her essay, "Outing to Jurassic Park: "Germany in Post-Wall Literature. An Essay against Tiredness", Frauke Meyer-Gosau asks the important question: "Whose problem is it, anyway?" (223). She answers with:

Wondering whose problem "Germany" and its relationship with its most recent past at that particular time was, the answer is: almost nobody's -- most people could not have cared less. This fact of, so to speak, life beyond history which concerned East and West Germans equally in the late eighties, would, however, turn out to be crucial very soon: Without a past that has been integrated consciously and deliberately into the concept of the present as something alive and lasting, "future", in a meaningful sense of the word, cannot develop. [. . .] dealing with the past (and not: burying and preserving it in all sorts of memorials) is fundamental to everybody's life and thus everybody's problem (226-227).

Shortly before reunification, she notes that overall there was little interest by writers from either East or West in trying to integrate the German past into everyday life. The majority of writers had settled into a complacent routine, accepting the original arguments concerning the GDR as the antifascist German nation; whereas in the FRG the Nazi past was more or less ignored. Müller's texts are his attempt to override this complacency: by shocking his audience with graphic images from the German past -- including but not limited to the Hitler and Stalin eras -- he refused to bury it, rather chose to expose it. Müller was thus delivering a warning to future generations: the wheels of history continue to roll forward, taking Germany and German identity with them: the key is to move with the wheels and not to get caught under them. His final Geschichtsdrama reflects the dichotomy of a man who is still trying to understand the past but must learn to live in the present, yet is fearful of the future. In their monologues in Germania 3, both Hitler and Stalin refer to the world masses for whom there is not enough supply. Increasingly the headlines are filled with reports about African refugees
who would rather risk drowning in the ocean than remain in their economically impoverished countries where ethnic and political persecution are common. The streets of Western Europe, including Germany, are lined with such refugees as well as many from Eastern Europe: as has occurred so often throughout the course of history, the world landscape is in a constant state of flux. At the same time, globalization is overtaking the economic markets around the world, but often at the expense of the less developed nations. In addition, the current generation faces a new menace from Middle Eastern terrorists whose brutal actions threaten individual and especially world peace: there is no safe haven. Hopefully Müller's maxim, "to kill or be killed", will not hold any sway over events in the twenty-first century, but that remains to be seen. The angel of history is still watching and waiting to see what new catastrophes -- both natural and man-made -- will befall mankind. Müller's message at the end of Germania 3 about the world being a dark place reflects the former GDR author's reaction to change in an insecure society. Unfortunately, recent events sponsored by militant terrorists are spreading a long shadow over any ray of light or hope; thus to some extent legitimizing his dark view of the world. However, Müller's warning need not mean that the world will remain a dark place: as long as Germany and the rest of the world are able to admit the human mistakes of the past and are willing to learn from them, then there is hope that the future of mankind can and will be full of light.

Following in the footsteps of his literary forefather Brecht, Heiner Müller developed his literary style based on his personal experiences and political beliefs. As a significant "East German" playwright of the postwar period whose works had a strong impact on the German literary scene both in the FRG and the GDR, he was able to attain his own level of literary stature. After reunification, Müller lost his impetus to write and the plays he had already written, with their emphasis on the road to socialism and the path of the GDR, momentarily lost much of their significance. However, as a form of literary history and with their emphasis on the struggle between German political ideologies both Germania Tod in Berlin and
Germania 3 Gespenster am Toten Mann remain an integral part of the German literary heritage and, as such, are essential to an understanding of German identity relating to the past, present, and future. Even though Müller's search for German identity ended with his death, the heritage of German identity lives on in these two Geschichtsdramen. The opening quote of this chapter mirrors his lifelong obsession with German history: an obsession that, according to him, would continue to haunt him even in the grave. Buried in Berlin at the Dorotheenstädtischer Cemetery, alongside many famous German writers and personalities including, appropriately, Bertolt Brecht and Anna Seghers, perhaps he has finally been able to find respite from his obsession. Or -- and this scenario seems more likely -- it may be that his spirit hovers above the stage at the Berliner Ensemble, waiting for another generation of audience members to be shocked by a brazen yet daring German author. Despite the fact that this controversial German author has disappeared from the world stage, he has left behind a powerful legacy: a body of literary texts which continue to haunt their readers and audiences with unpleasant images from the German past while reflecting the various facts, myths, and misconceptions behind German identity. Although the circumstances in which his texts are viewed will continue to change with the passage of time, one thing is certain about Heiner Müller's Geschichtsdramen: they, like German identity, will survive.
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