

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR David J. Forman

TITLE "Holocaust Drama: A Study of Selected Plays"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [XX]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [☒] ) Not necessary  
2. Is restricted [ ] for \_\_\_ years. ) for Ph.D.  
3. Is restricted [ ] for \_\_\_ years. ) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. yes ☒ no

April 20, 1972  
Date

David J. Forman  
Signature of Author

Library  
Record

Microfilmed

Date

7/14/72

Maria Steiner  
Signature of Library Staff Member

HOLOCAUST DRAMA: A STUDY OF SELECTED PLAYS

David J. Forman

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters and  
Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion

1972

Referee, Dr. Stanley F. Chyet

## Digest of Thesis:

### HOLOCAUST DRAMA: A STUDY OF SELECTED PLAYS

by David J. Forman

The basic, underlying premise for this thesis is set forth in the introduction. It is that the holocaust drama provides us with insights into that modern tragedy that saw six million of our people brutally murdered. Through the insights of the plays, we are able to gain a better understanding of what happened and why it happened.

The first chapter explores two plays by Arthur Miller, After the Fall and Incident at Vichy. Through radically different techniques, Miller explores in both plays the quest of individuals to find meaning in a life that is filled with decay. Miller asserts that one can find meaning. It comes from choice. One chooses to piece together his disintegrating life and imperfect world. One should choose life as opposed to simply giving away to the desolation of what he knows to be the result of experience.

The second chapter deals with the abuses that have been hurled upon the victims of the holocaust. In The Condemned of Altona, The Man in the Glass Booth, and The Investigation, one can see strands of universalism. The playwrights, Sartre, Shaw, and Weiss respectively, attempt to teach a lesson to us about the kind of society we live in. They use the holocaust as that example in history when society reached its abyss. They want to warn us that Nazi Germany could happen to any of us, that we are all capable of being the exterminator. The distressing point here is that the playwrights hold the Jew up as an example of how we can all become like Nazis. I have tried to point out the fallacy in this argument - that the Jew in the holocaust cannot serve as a universal figure of guilt and responsibility because of all that he suffered, psychologically and physically, at the hand of the Nazis.

Chapter three analyzes the plays of Max Frisch, Andorra and When the War Was Over. Frisch shows a genuine sensitivity to the survivors of the holocaust. His

plays are psychologically bent, giving us insights into the minds and thoughts of certain imaginary characters of the holocaust.

Chapter four investigates three plays which have in them scenes from the holocaust that touch the souls of our being. In The Wall, by Millard Lampell, I present those individual scenes that tell us much of the fear under which Jews carried on their daily life behind the wall of the Warsaw ghetto. In The Diary of Anne Frank, I viewed it as an audience might view it, showing how it might react in a sentimental fashion to Anne's life without an appreciation of what this tragic chronicle was really all about - that of a young girl making a life for herself in the midst of death. The Broadway script allowed for Anne to lose its particular Jewish content, watering it down to a lame universal claim of the purity of innocence. I only briefly examine Lillian Hellman's Watch on the Rhine, using it as the only example of a play that was written during the time of the Nazi reign of terror. The play does not match the times.

In chapter five I have concentrated on two themes in Rolf Hochhuth's extraordinary work, The Deputy. I have discussed the relationship of the Pope to the murder of the Jews and of God to the murder of the Jews, applying to each relationship questions pertaining to guilt and responsibility. In this final chapter, I have indicated that we all share a responsibility for the slaughter of the Jews, but there are those institutions and individuals that hold a greater responsibility. If one is to understand the universal applicability of the holocaust, he must first hold accountable those intimately involved in the event, and then determine the degree of responsibility others had.

The Epilogue concludes the examination of the holocaust drama and serves as a brief summary.

For my parents. Their love and sensitivity to  
people and events have always been examples to me.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis on the holocaust is not an easy task. The material is oftentimes painful. Yet we must always try to understand that agony in our history that allowed the murder of six million of our brothers, solely for being our brothers. With any difficult task that one undertakes, there are people to thank. But there are those few who deserve special appreciation for their guidance. Above all, I want to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Stanley Chyet, whose commitment and help facilitated my work. I would like to thank my wife Judy, whose patience and love withstood the discomfort I brought to her as a result of the endless hours I spent on my thesis. Also I would like to thank two close friends, Mark Clarfield who provided me with insights into the holocaust, and Walter Smoke who laboriously read through this work.

## CONTENTS

	page
DIGEST OF THESIS . . . . .	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	iv
CHAPTER I . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II . . . . .	24
CHAPTER III . . . . .	48
CHAPTER IV . . . . .	64
CHAPTER V . . . . .	86
EPILOGUE . . . . .	102
FOOTNOTES . . . . .	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	117

## INTRODUCTION

"From the story of Cain and Abel to the slaughter of the innocents, the violence of the human race has been transmitted to myth and art. It is one of the ways by which mankind comes to terms with its evils, setting them apart to study and profit by. But it is doubtful if the crimes of the concentration camps can ever be successfully transmitted to myth and poetry."<sup>1</sup>

The supreme tragic event of modern times is the murder of six million European Jews. The murder of the six million cannot be wholly accounted for either in terms of passions, or of madness, or of moral failure, or of overwhelming and irresistible social forces. Some thirty years after the event, there is as much controversy as ever. What happened? How did it happen? How could it have been allowed? Who is responsible? This is an event of such magnitude that its wound can never be healed. The best we can do with the event is to keep it in mind (for its dimensions almost make it impossible to comprehend), and remember it. The capacity to assume the burden of memory is not always practical. Sometimes remembering alleviates the guilt; sometimes it makes it worse. But the

moral function of remembering is something that cuts across the different worlds of knowledge, action, and art.

A tragedy such as the holocaust does not easily lend itself to artistic treatment, but remains tied to a consciousness of historic factors. Dramatists no longer write tragedies. What we do have instead are works of art which reflect or attempt to resolve the great historical tragedies of our time.<sup>2</sup> The challenge for the epic dramatist, then, is to present history in such a way that we look at it freshly and comprehend its meaning for us. This task is particularly difficult when there exists already such widely diversified public attitudes about the event in question. Few times in history has any single event elicited such intensity of feeling as the wanton slaughter of six million Jews by the Nazis. Because to assess the magnitude of this event staggers the imagination, to write of it with the sensitivity it requires burdens the playwright with a more awesome responsibility.

The dramatist must be an historian throughout his work. He must also be a theologian, dealing with the question, "Where is God?" He must be a psychologist dealing with all facets of guilt that permeate the psyche, of those who were either intimately involved in the event or peripherally so, making distinctions between the victimizer, the victim, and the on-looker. He must be a

social-scientist, a political scientist, dealing with the problems involving responsibility, criminality, complicity. He must be a philosopher, a mystic, a religionist, but most difficult of all, being all of these, he must above all be the artist, sensitive to his own needs, to the needs of his audience, and to the needs of those he is writing about.

Among the theatrical forms which have been devised to deal with the holocaust are the political trial, personal accounts, psychoanalytic therapy and factual documentary.<sup>3</sup> How the playwrights deal with the events of the holocaust and what theatrical, and/or art, form he chooses to make use of, these are the foci of my work. Does the playwright deal with sweeping historical occurrences or does he focus on the human tragedy of a particular person or family caught in the hell of the event? Does the playwright universalize the holocaust, sharing with us some applicable lessons, or does he treat it as an event that defies comparison on any comprehensible scale? How much of the play is "drama" and how much is "factual", that is, to what extent does the author deal in abstractions to make his point? Most important, does the playwright's view of his subject matter fit the historical event he is writing about? To what extent does he place a commodity on the historicity of his work?

While the artist may claim that it is his responsibility to depict the event with the maximum amount of artistic latitude, this writer is of the opinion, particularly as a Jew, that the artist who writes of the holocaust has a greater responsibility than serving his own art; he must above all serve truth. Dealing with the holocaust, there are some objective criteria that one can utilize to reflect truth. The playwright must never lose sight of the fact that it was the Jews who were murdered at the hand of the Nazis. While one may universalize this fact, it must never become vague. How everyone in the world reacted to the holocaust is still debatable, but the basic fact of German over Jew is indisputable. Unless one assumes this most basic of facts, then any treatment of the holocaust will necessarily be of limited worth.

The question remains, how successful can the playwright interpret the holocaust? Does he have the right to interpret it at all? Perhaps it is best to just let the holocaust speak for itself. In one of the selected plays, The Wall, the story of the Warsaw ghetto, is spoken of in these terms:

Its nightmares are vivid upon the stage; the mere sight - through the smoke of gunfire - of the wall speaks volumes. But what power The Wall commands comes from the tale rather than the teller.<sup>4</sup>

Because the holocaust itself is such powerful drama, the challenge to and the responsibility of the playwright are that much greater.

## I. AFTER THE FALL AND INCIDENT AT VICHY

### AFTER THE FALL

After an absence from the New York stage of eight years, Arthur Miller contributed to the theatre in 1964 After The Fall and Incident At Vichy. The plays, similar in theme, were radically different in technique. In Incident At Vichy, Miller's approach was one of conventional realism. After The Fall, which appeared a number of months earlier, was the most introspective play Miller had written; assuming the form of an interior dialogue, a process in self-discovery without the help of an analyst.

After The Fall "is a trial; the trial of a man by his own conscience, his own values, his own needs. The 'Listener' (an unseen character addressed by Quentin, the protagonist), who to some will be the psychoanalyst, to others God, is Quentin himself turned at the edge of the abyss to look at his experience, his nature, and his time."<sup>1</sup>

After The Fall is a play that depicts the struggle of one individual to find meaning in a life that has been for him a road riddled with failure. The chief symptom

of this individual's, of Quentin's, malaise is the loss of faith in self and in others. Having held the naive belief that "underneath we are all friends", Quentin was severely shaken by the disloyalties among his friends and associates. His own affairs proved to be failures. He questions himself continually as to whether he has lived in good faith. A way in which he questions himself is through the use of the holocaust, the supreme tragic result of men not acting in good faith. The event of the holocaust indicates to Quentin the kind of disintegration that he himself is undergoing. However, that Quentin should test his good faith in light of the holocaust, or more specifically, through the experiences of the concentration camps, is an element in the play that at once seems out of place, or seems to be a cheap usage of an extreme historical experience by which one can test his own sensitivity to the experiences around him. But the use of the holocaust is very present for Miller, not only to justify Quentin's failures but to serve as a moral critique for a society which is inundated with violence. There on a rather bare stage, rising above three levels, and dominating the stage is "the blasted stone tower of a German concentration camp. Its wide lookout windows are like eyes which at the moment seem blind and dark; bent reinforcing rods stick out like broken tentacles."<sup>2</sup>

While After The Fall is auto-biographical in nature, telling much of Miller's personal life, Miller speaks of another theme which at first seems far removed from the biographical details that one encounters in the reading of the play. He is concerned with violence in 1964 and its heritage in World War II. "Primarily," Miller writes, "the play is a way of looking at man and his human nature as the only source of the violence which has come closer and closer to destroying the race."<sup>3</sup> By a further extension, Miller posits Quentin as a representative man who has lived with violence (the suicides of his friend Lou and his wife Maggie) and been surrounded by violence (the holocaust and race genocide); and is therefore someone we can learn from.

While Miller may claim that he is seeking through the use of the holocaust to universalize the experience at the concentration camp he visited, there is little evidence that he succeeds at this. Instead, any use of the holocaust has only specific references to Quentin's own life and the people in it. At different points in the play the holocaust is employed to explain Quentin's relationship with his wife Maggie, his current fiancée Holga, and his mother. While Miller may attempt to explain the irrationalities in a society at large, this attempt proves more nebulous than his attempt to explain

those irrationalities in his own family disharmony through the use of the Nazi experience.

The first time that the watch tower of the concentration camp is lit is with the entrance of Holga his fiancée, who represents to Quentin modern Germany and the past (she was related to some high officials in the Nazi regime). Miller has Holga describe the camp in some detail.

HOLGA: The door to the left leads into the chamber where their teeth were extracted for gold; the drain in the floor carried off the blood. At times instead of shooting they were strangled to death . . .<sup>4</sup>

This description is in the context of the death of Quentin's mother. If Quentin cannot grieve for the victims of the holocaust, how can he be expected to grieve for his mother who recently died? When Quentin speaks of his mother's death he states,

QUENTIN: . . . It's like my mother's funeral. I still hear her voice in the streets sometimes, loud and real, calling me. And yet she's underground. The whole cemetery - I saw it like a field of buried mirrors in which the lively merely saw themselves. I don't seem to know how to grieve her.<sup>5</sup>

This scene is juxtaposed to Holga's and Quentin's visit to the concentration camp.

HOLGA: Oh no, I feel people ought to see it (the camp), that's all and you seemed so interested.

QUENTIN: Yes, but I'm an American. I can afford to be interested . . . (glancing at the tower) I guess I thought I'd be indignant, or angry.

But it's like swallowing a lump of earth.  
It's strange.<sup>6</sup>

Quentin's indifferent attitude to the camp accents the guilt he feels for the same indifferent attitude he has toward his mother's death. Specifically at this early point in the play, his indifference sets the stage for Quentin's guilt with regard to all his relationships. For some reason, Quentin feels guilty that he should have survived. Quentin's guilt for his mother's death is stated clearly. Standing amidst the concentration camp he states:

QUENTIN: That people . . . what? Wish to die for the dead. No-no, I can understand it; survival can be hard to bear. But I - I don't think that I feel that way . . . Although I do think of my mother now, and she's dead. Yes! And maybe the dead do bother her . . . Why can't I mourn her . . . But what the hell does this have to do with the concentration camp?

Further, Miller uses the Nazis by which to measure Quentin's mother's guilt in her harsh treatment of his father, and uses the German people to measure his own complicity in his mother's mistreatment of his father. While Quentin has ambivalent feelings about his mother, "I love that nut", he always attributes some sense of criminal activity to her - "So many thoughts of my mother degenerate into some crime."<sup>8</sup>

While Quentin's hatred for his mother has real elements in it and is not offset by the rather embarrassing state-

ment, "I love that nut", it is difficult to share Quentin's powerful conviction about his mother's crime, that her guilt is attributable to a crime equal in kind to the Nazi's murder of the Jews, and that his tacit support of his mother is a sign of German complicity. Here Miller seems to be indulging in too much rationalization, that too much of his experience is translated quickly into intellectual formulations without sufficient inspection of the effective content of that experience.<sup>9</sup> For Quentin to feel that every personal failure is equal to the holocaust is a bit extreme. If his mother died, if Maggie committed suicide, if Lou broke his friendship, Quentin is to blame. Yet all these incidents are placed in the context of the holocaust as spoken by Holga - "Quentin dear - no one they didn't kill can be innocent again."<sup>10</sup> To indict himself might very well be accurate, but to do so in the name of the holocaust is stretching the point. While Quentin may be saying one thing about his own life, and lack of innocence in it, he is, by using the holocaust, saying something quite different about that event. That is that the survivor of the holocaust, like Quentin's surviving his own personal holocaust, are guilty. This type of thinking is not only an over-rationalization, but also an attempt to level part of the blame for the holocaust upon the Jews, making those who lived through it guilty. While it may have been

better for Quentin to die (he threatened to commit suicide when his mother went to Atlantic City and left him behind and at the end of the war), is it correct to think that all Jews should have died in the holocaust? Is it fair to compare Quentin's real guilt in his relationship to his mother or Maggie to an imposed guilt upon the Jew who had little to do with the destruction of his people?

Yet further, Quentin fails to promote a convincing case for his own incrimination in the slaughter of the Jews during the war. He does try to throttle Maggie, and thus could be termed murderous in a figurative sense when he selfishly disregards the feelings of others in regard to his own well-being. But can common self-interest be equated with genocide? If everyone possesses the urge to kill, is everyone guilty for actual murders? Because Miller speaks about guilt in the human condition in terms of "equal" guilt, he makes no distinctions between insults to the body and to pride, between killing in self-defense and in malice. Are not there distinctions in these? To what degree does a sense of complicity justify emotional passivity?<sup>11</sup> Quentin does not accumulate enough data to answer these questions. "His fleeting, disconnected memories of towers, congressional hearings, and suicidal ex-socialists hardly demonstrate how the will to survive operates in public life."<sup>12</sup>

Hannah Arendt has argued that the Jews were partly accomplices in their own slaughter by failing to resist. Similarly, Maggie is shown to cooperate with the people who are exploiting her in a way which will help cause her destruction. But this too seems to be an inadequate link between the two parts of the play.

If there is any realistic link to the concentration camp it is seen only in Quentin's relationship with his present fiancée, who has had some real contact with the camps. Holga is brought forth, in part, to link Quentin's family, his marriages, and his friends' fate with the Nazi horror, which was perhaps the most total manifestation of man's inhumanity in history. Quentin's relationship with Holga becomes cemented only after the visit to the concentration camp. From her own experience, unlike other women in Quentin's life, she is too realistic to have complete confidence in anyone's good faith. As she sees it, no one who survived can be innocent. And it is here that Quentin feels his guilt most intensely.

(The tower blazes into life, and he walks with eyes upon it)

QUENTIN: This is not some aberration of human nature to me. I can easily see the perfectly normal contractors and their cigars, the carpenters, plumbers, sitting at their ease over lunch pails; I can see them laying

the pipes to run the blood out of this mansion; good fathers, devoted sons, grateful that someone else will die, not they, and how can one understand that, if one is innocent . . . ?

(Maggie's difficult breathing is heard. He turns in pain from it, comes to a halt on one side of the sheets and pillow lying at the floor at Louise's feet)<sup>13</sup>

Here Miller clearly states his case for the guilt that Quentin feels for his failures with Maggie and his first wife Louise, and the realization of that guilt by Holga's introduction to the concentration camp. Quentin is the carpenter, the plumber. Indeed, just prior to this passage, he goes further in identifying himself with the accomplices of the Nazis when speaking of his own relationship with his friend Lou, and how he failed to come to his aid, destroying the only true friendship he had ever had.

QUENTIN: . . . it was dreadful because I was not his his friend either, and he knew it. I'd have stuck it out to the end but I hated the danger in it for myself, and he saw through my faithfulness; and he was not telling me what a friend I was, he was praying I would be - "please be my friend, Quentin." is what he was saying to me, "I am drowning, throw me a rope!" Because I wanted out, to be a good American again, kosher again.<sup>14</sup>

With splendid irony in this line, Miller has Quentin fail. He doesn't throw Lou the rope, but instead he opts to be a good American, i.e. German.

Although not identified as a Jew, Quentin obviously suffers guilt, or it is brought out in him through Holga.

By such wide extensions as the use of the holocaust, Miller attempts to go beyond the particular events surrounding Quentin's life in order to universalize the story of Quentin. But references to Negroes, Communist conventions in Czechoslovakia, and Lee Harvey Oswald all fail because Miller the dramatist has tied Quentin down to so many sensational events in Miller's own life. Human nature being what it is, it would seem that an audience might be inclined to put aside the high intentions implied in the title of the play which have to do with the fall of man after the collapse of Eden.<sup>15</sup>

The play ends, as it began, on a two and a half page monologue. Quentin, in effect, summarizes the theme of the play in the guise of his final insights. He owns that he had tried to kill Maggie, and he accepts - in a manner that might suggest a climax - the responsibility he shares for that deed. Within the stretching shadow of the Nazi tower, however, Quentin insists again his guilt is not an isolated thing, and that his relief at being alive is a feeling shared by the survivors of the holocaust. A good thing would seem to have emerged from Quentin's experience, it seems, for now there is knowledge on his part of good and evil.<sup>16</sup> This knowledge is revealed in his closing speech that fittingly is recited with an eye

to the play's title.

QUENTIN: To know, even happily, that we are unblessed; not in some garden of wax fruit and painted trees, that lie in Eden, but after the fall, after many deaths. Is knowing all? And the wish to kill is never killed, but with a gift of courage one may look into its face when it appears, and with a stroke of love . . . forgive it; again and again . . . forever? . . . No, it's not certainty . . . But it does seem feasible . . . not to be afraid. Perhaps it's all one has. I'll tell (Holga) that . . .<sup>17</sup>

Then striding upward toward Holga, and leaving behind him the figures from his buried life, Quentin hopefully embraces a new life as "darkness takes them all."<sup>18</sup>

#### INCIDENT AT VICHY

Incident At Vichy, written a few months after After The Fall, takes up some of the same themes. What After The Fall said at the end is that man still has choice. It is necessary to make choices. In an interview, Miller said, "What it's (After The Fall) saying is that choice is still there, necessary and implicit and that disaster is there and that you choose to hope because you are alive and don't commit suicide, which implies a certain illusionism and so forth but the only hope there is nevertheless. Incident At Vichy was written as a companion piece. Even

when one doesn't know what one has done, finally the responsibility for it can rest only with oneself."<sup>19</sup>

Centering on a Nazi round-up of Jews in occupied France, all the action of the play takes place outside an investigative room where those who have been rounded up will be called in one by one to determine if they are Jewish or not. Through the course of the dialogue that takes place in the detention room, the play ventilates the questions of the extent to which passive victims were accomplices in their own deaths and the degree of guilt in the survivors, both Jewish and non-Jewish. While in After The Fall Miller chooses to explore this theme through his own autobiographical history, here we see Miller turn to an actual historical occurrence. Yet while he is using history in a pointed way in Incident At Vichy, these historical references, like the biographical and literary references of After The Fall, augment the authenticity and objectivity of his treatment without restricting him to a political or topical scope, giving him a chance to universalize the experience of the Nazi period. Miller is not primarily interested in the reactions of specific Jews to Anti-semitism in France during World War II, just as in his socio-documentary Focus and After The Fall and The Crucible, he does more than retell stories of persecution of the Jews in New York City, the guilt of

the weak man, and witches in Salem.<sup>20</sup> "Historical facts establish a suitable context for the demonstration of a point that would have been made as well, the author believes, with evidence drawn from Harlem or Vietnam."<sup>21</sup>

Because of his attempt to universalize his theme, Miller is not very successful in making one feel guilt for the evils of the world. The reason for this failure is that he is presenting an essentially melodramatic view of history that disregards history itself.<sup>22</sup>

The exploitation of the theme that Jews were accomplices in their own slaughter is, taken out of its physical and psychological setting, a most hideous statement. It is here that Miller can shake hands with Peter Weiss who claims in his play The Investigation that if the tide were turned the Jews would have done as the Germans did, and even if they would not have done so, both the guards and the victims at Auschwitz were equally guilty because they were serving the same system. It would seem that this type of reasoning would not make an audience feel guilty for the evils of the world, but rather would absolve them of any guilt with regard to a specific event in human history, the murder of the Jews, by levelling the blame on the Jews themselves. This result is particularly evident in The Investigation and Incident At Vichy, as it was also present in After The Fall, for both playwrights use very real and very particular incidents by which to

make an universal statement about the nature of man and his inadequacies in coping with justice and violence. But because of Miller's and Weiss' dedication to the particulars, as we will see, they lose the possibility of universalizing, and what is worse, they limit the possibility of making an audience feel anything for the particular historical event they were using as a tool. As a result, The Investigation, After The Fall, and particularly Incident At Vichy, because it does not include the gross details of the camps (as does The Investigation) but rather covers the events in a small town prior to deportation, have the effect of making the audience feel dead certain that it does not have any responsibility for the Final Solution, any more than the good "radic-libs" (Miller and Weiss) who wrote them can be anything but mystically deluded to shoulder the guilt for the evils of the world.<sup>23</sup>

How frustrating that the immeasurable suffering of the victims must submit to the limits and the possibilities of art (as conceived by often self-conscious and self-righteous playwrights) or be forgotten. "Unless art keeps their memory, the tears and the trembling of all the children who walked to the terrible school of the gas chambers will be no part of our lives . . . The words that will console them have not yet been spoken."<sup>24</sup> Miller, like Weiss, has spoken the words, but the question remains - who has he consoled?

While the play uses many characters, the focus of the play centers on the harsh, realistic Jew, Leduc and the former nobleman, Von Berg, who has been mistaken for a possible Jew in the initial round-up. Included also in the group that is awaiting an apparent serious sentence unknown to them are an assortment of cardboard characters that serve as stereotypical examples of victims of the Nazi reign of terror. There is Bayard, the electrician, who says, "You begin wishing you'd committed a crime, you know, something definite."<sup>25</sup> There is the self-confident businessman who feels that it could never happen to me - "It's perfectly clear that they're making a routine identity check."<sup>26</sup> And so on: there is Lebeau, the painter, and Monceau, the actor, who, although they are not sure of what precisely will happen, feel the inquiry will not take long and they will be freed for they have done nothing. There is the professor, the expert in discerning Jews in much the same absurd way as the Jew detector in Max Frisch's Andorra.

The dialogue among the people who are waiting runs the gamut of philosophical discourses. There is the dialogue that in the face of hard facts, the people, Jews in particular, refuse to believe that anything serious is happening.

BAYARD: . . . I warn you, don't believe anything they tell you - I heard they're working the Jews to death in Polish camps.

MONCEAU: I happen to have a cousin; they sent him to Auschwitz; that's in Poland, you know. I have several letters from him saying he's fine. They've even taught him bricklaying.<sup>27</sup>

There is the universal discussion of evil being tied to all people.

MONCEAU: I beg your pardon. The Russians condemn the middle class, the English have condemned the Indians, Africans, and anybody else they could lay their hands on, the French, the Italiens . . . every nation has condemned somebody because of race, including the Americans and what they do to the Negroes. The vast majority of mankind is condemned because of its race. What do you advise all these people - suicide?

LEDUC: What do you advise?

MONCEAU: I go on the assumption that if I obey the law with dignity I will live in peace. I may not like the law, but evidently the majority does, or they would overthrow it. And I'm speaking now of the French majority, who outnumber the Germans in this town fifty to one. These French police, don't forget, are not German. And if by some miracle you did knock out that guard you would find yourself in a city where not one person in a thousand would help you. And it's got nothing to do with being Jewish or not Jewish. It is what the world is, so why don't you stop insulting others with romantic challenges.<sup>28</sup>

In the play there is talk of God, indifference to human suffering, guilt and responsibility. But all the discussion that excludes Leduc and Von Berg, the principal characters, is so restricted that the play at times becomes

nothing more than static and mere melodrama. At no time, with regard to the secondary characters, does Miller penetrate below the argumentative surface. None of the speakers support their position with the psychological data that give substance to other works by Miller or to a play like Sartre's The Victors. The Victors involves a similar situation - civilians awaiting interrogation and probable execution in Nazi-dominated France - but intimacies brought up during a frantic self-evaluation supply an experimental basis for Sartre's philosophical stand, in much the same way as did Sartre's Condemned of Altona. In Incident At Vichy, Miller, unlike Sartre, does not specify the personal impetus behind the claims and counter-claims. His characters are merely vehicles for his theatrical assertion that the blind, frozen in their respective postures, refuse to admit their "implication in the evils they oppose."<sup>29</sup> It is here, in the setting of one detention room, that Miller seems to show each awaiting person jealously defending his accustomed identity, denying the worth of his brother, and proving that "the Jews have their Jews."<sup>30</sup>

Miller has stated that what haunts him most is not only the murder of the Jews, but also the cry of the wounded, the screams of the tortured in Vietnam.<sup>31</sup> Yet, it is strange that Miller, like Weiss and Sartre (Condemned Of Altona), chooses to imply that the Jew is a guilty party in the holo-

caust. Miller seems, perhaps unwittingly, to indict the Jew in order to make his point (a la Weiss) that we all share the guilt for society's evils.

But Miller seems to rub this last point in. His hero turns out to be a gentile, not only a gentile, but one related to a Nazi official. Von Berg, this hero, coming into the detention room, sides with justice, with his pride being on the humane side, the right side. And Leduc, the Jew, discovers "his own complicity with the forces he despises."<sup>32</sup> Von Berg is even more unbelievable as an hero than Hochhuth's Father Riccardo because it is difficult to imagine that Von Berg would perform such an heroic deed. Prior to Von Berg's final dialogue with Leduc, he could only feel that the reasons the Nazis were doing what they were doing was because of bad manners.

VON BERG: Well, don't you think Nazism . . . whatever else it may be . . . is an outburst of vulgarity?

BAYARD: I'm afraid it's a lot more than that my friend . . . You make it all sound like they have bad table manners, that's all.

VON BERG: They certainly do, yes. Nothing angers them more than a sign of any . . . refinement. It is decadent, you see.

BAYARD: What kind of statement is that? You mean you left Austria because of their table manners?

VON BERG: Table manners, yes; and their adoration of dreadful art; and grocery clerks in uniform telling the orchestra what music it may not

play. Vulgarly can be enough to send a man out of his country, yes, I think so.

BAYARD: In other words, if they had good taste in art, and elegant table manners, and let the orchestra play whatever it liked, they'd be alright with you.<sup>33</sup>

The play reaches its climax in the verbal confrontation between Leduc and Von Berg. It is not subtlety that Miller has, in the context of the play, portrayed Leduc as a rather impudent hot-head, and Von Berg as well-meaning, though naive, sympathetic and soft-spoken individual. It is in this final dialogue that Miller attempts to handle once and for all the questions of guilt, survival, complicity, and responsibility.

VON BERG (With great difficulty, not looking at Leduc):  
I would like to be able to part with your friendship. Is that possible?

LEDUC: Prince, in my profession one gets the habit of looking at oneself quite impersonally. It is not you I am angry with. In one part of my mind it is not even the Nazi. I am only angry that I should have been born before the day when man accepted his own nature; that he is not reasonable, that he is full of murder, that his ideals are only the little tax he pays for the right to hate and kill with a clear conscience. I am only angry that knowing this, I still deluded myself. That there was not time to truly make part of myself what I know, and to teach others the truth.

VON BERG (Angered, above his anxiety):  
There are ideals of another kind. There are people who find it easier to die than stain one finger with this murder. They exist. I swear it to you. People for whom everything is not permitted, foolish people and ineffectual, but they do exist and will not dis-

honor their tradition. Desperately (italized); I ask your friendship.

LEDUC: I owe you the truth, Prince; you won't believe it now, but I wish you would think about it and what it means. I have never analyzed a gentile who did not have, somewhere hidden in his mind, a dislike if not a hatred for the Jews.

VON BERG (Clapping his ears shut, springing up):  
That is impossible, it is not true of me!

LEDUC: (Standing, coming to him, a wild pity in his voice):  
Until you know it is true of you you will destroy whatever truth can come of this atrocity. Part of the knowing who we are is knowing we are not someone else. And Jew is only the name we give to that stranger, that agony we cannot feel, that death we look at like a cold abstraction. Each man has his Jew; it is the other. And the Jews have their Jews. And now, above all, you must see that you have yours - the man whose death leaves you relieved that you are not him, despite your decency. And that is why there is nothing and will be nothing - until you face your own complicity with this . . . your own humanity.

VON BERG: I deny that. I deny that absolutely. I never in my life said a word against your people. Is that your implication? That I have something to do with this monstrousness! I have put a pistol to my head! To my head!

LEDUC: Prince, you asked me if I knew your cousin, Baron Kessler. Baron Kessler is a Nazi. He helped to remove all the Jewish doctors from the medical school. You were aware of that, weren't you? You must have heard that at some time or another, didn't you?

VON BERG: Yes. I heard it. I . . . had forgotten it. You see, he was . . .

LEDUC: . . . Your cousin. I understand. And in any case, it is only a small part of Baron Kessler

to you. I do understand it. When you say his name it is with love; and I'm sure he must be a man of some kindness, with whom you can see eye to eye in many things. But when I hear that name I see a knife. You see now why I say there is nothing, and will be nothing, when even you cannot truly put yourself in my place? Even you! And that is why your thoughts of suicide do not move me. It's not your guilt I want, it's your responsibility - that might have helped. Yes, if you had understood that Baron Kessler was in part, in some part, in some small and fruitful part - doing your will. You might have done something then, with your standing, and your name, and your decency, aside from shooting yourself!

VON BERG: What can ever save us?

(The door opens. The professor comes out)

PROFESSOR: Next. Come!

(The professor enters the examining room . . . The door opens and Von Berg walks out. In his hand is a white pass. The door shuts behind him. He is looking at the pass as he goes by Leduc, and suddenly turns, walks back, and thrusts the pass into Leduc's hand)

VON BERG: (In a strangely angered whisper):  
Take it! Go . . . Number nine Rue Charlot.  
Go.

LEDUC: What will happen to you?

VON BERG (Angrily waving him away):  
Go, go!

LEDUC: I wasn't asking you to do this! You don't owe me this!

VON BERG: Go!<sup>34</sup>

At this point, Leduc uses the pass to escape, and Von Berg is left behind. The professor knows that Von Berg gave away

his pass. The play ends with the professor staring bewilderedly at Von Berg as a new group of men are brought into the detention room.

So the play ends with Von Berg making a commitment, serving as the sole affirmative sacrifice for good, as does Father Riccardo in The Deputy. If Von Berg could act in good faith, then there is hope, as there was hope with Quentin. Yet, on the other hand, there is Leduc, the Jew, who serves notice on complicity, and who will obviously feel guilty because he will have survived.

Out of this play is supposed to come some sort of universal message - that in the face of Harlem and Vietnam, and oh yes, Nazi Germany, there are those among us who prefer evil to good, knowing it to be evil, and yet who appear to be as other men.<sup>35</sup> Such a person by no slight coincidence happens to be Leduc who let someone else die in his place and who will be forever guilty for he was one Jew who survived. While guilt and survival may at times go hand and hand, by using Leduc as his final human proof of his thesis, Miller fails to make his point. If, for Miller, Leduc is everyman, and if everyman is guilty, then no one is finally guilty for the six million except perhaps Jews like Leduc. Leduc is the only character in the play that has some hold on the "truth". Yet it is Von Berg who seizes it and acts out the "truth". For Miller, this should be

frightening. Given his thesis, instead of universalizing his theme, he merely managed to let the Germans off the hook. And if the Germans are not guilty, who is? Robert Brustein, noted critic, writes -

Only one character has an option on the Truth, which the others will eventually take up with a cry of Eureka! . . . It is apparently Mr. Miller's fate to stumble upon Pressing Questions long after more subtle minds have exhausted their possibilities, and then pass them off as Profound Revelation - but all he adds are the capital letters. The theme . . . is nothing but half-understood Hannah Arendt . . . (who) showed how all Europe was implicated in the fate of the Jews, but she hardly exculpated the Germans . . . Miller somehow manages to get the Germans off the hook. If everybody is guilty, then nobody is guilty, and the extermination of six million can be attributed to the universality of human evil, another agency recently discovered by the author.<sup>36</sup>

II. THE MAN IN THE GLASS BOOTH, THE INVESTIGATION,  
THE CONDEMNED OF ALTONA

INTRODUCTION

"Certain Jews claim the play is pro-German, anti-semitic. Well, they are stupid Jews. There are stupid Jews, you know, though one isn't allowed to say it because they've been so insulted. It is only the stupid Jews who get so emotional about the German thing in it. I think that I am the most pro Jewish writer alive because I have said through Goldman, listen you are such great people that it is up to you to set the example, and I am prepared to insult you if necessary. I have done everything I can to examine the differences between the jailer and the jailed. I am telling you in the concentration camps you have to behave like Nazis to your own people. The Jews have this special vulnerability. I was so moved by the irony of observing the way the Israelis behaved with Eichmann and the way the Jewish community of Johannesburg collaborates in Apartheid. I think that Goldman was worried about what it was in him that enabled him to survive . . . Were not the survivors sometimes the worse?"<sup>1</sup>

"I see Auschwitz as a scientific instrument that could have been used by anyone, for that matter given a different

deal the Jews could have been on the side of the Nazis. They too could have been the exterminators . . . Before the play opened in New York, I had great trepidation because of what I said about South Vietnam where a Nazi-style genocide is taking place in the context of corporate profit."<sup>2</sup> Israel is threatening the peace, certain Israeli leaders have fascist tendencies, and as a result the war in Vietnam has suffered.<sup>3</sup>

It is with these attitudes that Robert Shaw, British actor, director and playwright, and Peter Weiss, author of the controversial Marat de Sade, respectively write their plays, The Man In The Glass Booth and The Investigation. And it is precisely because of these attitudes that one can understand the themes that both playwrights dwell upon, as does Sartre in The Condemned Of Altona, - that the holocaust has an universal message. Man is capable of evil. This is proven by the actions of the Jews in the holocaust, for not only were they collaborators in their own destruction, but "given a different deal they could have been the exterminators"<sup>4</sup> - " . . . people of Israel, if he had chosen you, you also would have followed where he led."<sup>5</sup>

#### THE MAN IN THE GLASS BOOTH

Essentially the story of The Man In The Glass Booth.

which appeared on Broadway on September 26, 1968, contains three different elements. There is Goldman the Jew who has survived the concentration camps and now lives as a successful businessman in New York City. Goldman is portrayed as a coarse, loud, crude, rich and revolting individual. Shaw, by no coincidence, paints him with effective detail as a depraved and amoral man. The play's second component tells of Israeli agents tracking down a Nazi fugitive named Dorff, who Goldman for the moment turns out to be. Dorff (Goldman) is then whisked off to Israel, placed in a glass booth (references to Eichmann are purely intentional), and spews out his philosophy on the Nazi solution for the Jewish race. The final component shows Goldman-Dorff to be a Jew who helped the Nazis carry out crimes against the Jews. Here, like The Investigation, the universal message of the play is presented. By the time Dorff's true identity is revealed, Shaw has had him say all that is necessary - "If he (Hitler) had chosen you, you also would have followed where he led."<sup>6</sup> The Jew Goldman is a perfect example in that he collaborated with the Nazis. So universal guilt is seen through the Jew. The good that can be learned from the war atrocities can never compensate for them; but not to try to learn can only enlarge the calamity. The Man In The Glass Booth emphasizes that our world, increasingly, is divided between the jailer and the jailed - and that sometimes the

two merge.<sup>7</sup> "At bottom, beneath the shifts and the spins of the play, one seems to detect a banal calculus of moral platitudes about the relation between oppressor and victim, between those who lust to kill and those who, excited by the smell of that lust as it engulfs them, lust to be killed. But too many people have dropped to a lethal complacency by falling back on such chic analytical conceits."<sup>8</sup> It is these conceits that see The Man In The Glass Booth move from Nazi exhortation to Jewish confession, thereby placing the play in the we-are-all-guilty camp alongside Weiss' and Miller's plays. This school of thought, however well-intentioned, uses the "bromides of popular psychology or (in Weiss' case) economics not to explain but to explain away what the Germans did to the Jews."<sup>9</sup> What we have here is a play, like Miller's, that lets everyone off the hook, by taking the play out of its historical context and levelling the blame for the holocaust on the Jews.

However, Shaw wants to go further, for as if to prove his point, he picks on the Jews living in South Africa as living proof that they are capable of the same atrocities as the Nazis were.

GOLDMAN: You South African Jewish?

YOUNG MAN: Yes.

GOLDMAN: You live in Johannesburg?

YOUNG MAN: Yes.

GOLDMAN: Doing well?

YOUNG MAN: Yes. I am doing very well.

GOLDMAN: No further questions.

JUDGE: Continue.

YOUNG MAN: Adolf Dorff is a murderer. On May 17th, 1942, he shot my mother and father before my eyes. That is all I have to say.<sup>10</sup>

Here we have the supreme profanity. Tzelniker, the young man, doing well in Johannesburg, is the same type of person as Dorff who killed the youth's parents before his eyes. What is so blasphemous is that we have one Jew who collaborated with the Nazis being used as evidence for a universal statement of world-wide complicity in the holocaust. Shaw insists on this point by showing how vile the Germans and Hitler were. In Dorff's speeches at the end of the play, one senses a prose-love poem, or ode to the Fuehrer. "People of the world, let me speak of my Fuehrer with love . . . (with ecstasy) Heil Hitler, Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil."<sup>11</sup> What we have here, as the play reveals at its conclusion, is a Jew praising Hitler - showing that if a Jew could do this, then perhaps the Jew may have deserved his fate because of his obvious participation in the evil around him. This last point is in harmony with Weiss who claims that because the Jews did not rebel against an unjust socio-political order, they were contributors to their own death.<sup>12</sup>

Implicit throughout the play, and particularly in the court scene, is Goldman's desire to be a kind of Christ-surrogate who wants to be martyred so that people might feel some fitting atonement has been made for the monstrous wrongs done to the Jews. Yet when the play closes and Dorff's real identity is once again disclosed, all we have left is a man sitting in a glass booth who will soon be forgotten. Shaw's conception of martyrdom or atonement makes it seem less a matter of conscience than an attention-getting device on a grandiose scale. Some crimes - and the murder of the Jews is certainly one - dwarf atonement.<sup>13</sup>

While Shaw may be making a major statement about South Africa or Vietnam in his play, there are too many elements in it that merely narrow the play to an ugly treatment of Jews. While Goldman at the outset of the play is the gross Jew Shaw paints, other Jews are crudely presented in the most blatant stereotypes possible.

GOLDMAN: Hey, there's a guy in Carolina upset. God-dam Jewish father gotta boy actin' Jesus Christ in the school nativity. But won't give up the part. Says it's a great role. I got an idea from that. There are all kinds of sick semitics in these shtetls, Charlie. They got these cardiac Jews, that's Jewish in the heart Jews, they got the revolvin' door Jews, that's in-at-Rosh-Hashanah-out-at-Yom-Kippur Jews, they got these South African-keep-quiet-about-Apartheid Jews.<sup>14</sup>

Then later on the witness stand as Dorff, he tells the court

how the Jews collaborated with the Nazis.

GOLDMAN: . . . What I don't get, Your Honor, is why the prosecutor does not demand the exposure of all the German authorities who permitted me to get on with my German work, and all those Jews who helped me?<sup>15</sup>

And, "The prosecutor drives a volkswagon."<sup>16</sup> What makes these last statements of his testimony so abhorrent is the revelation that Dorff is a Jew after all.

There is another problem with The Man In The Glass Booth that is most vital. It is applicable to The Investigation as well. Both plays are written in a dual historical context. They are primarily based on the holocaust itself, but also are concerned with later court proceedings connected to the holocaust. But neither play allows for cross-examination. Dorff-Goldman gives his speeches without interruption. In The Investigation there is testimony, but little dialogue.

The holocaust is an historical event, and to abuse history and to exploit a particular historical event is a shameful act. But perhaps for us to enjoy a play theatrically about an historical experience that may be too enormous and forbidding for effective treatment, then the author must avoid the facts of history. The problem of presenting an historical drama or documentary drama is more challenging for Weiss than Shaw (not so much for Sartre in The Condemned Of Altona), for by Weiss' own admission his play is based on "facts, facts, and more facts until they become unbearable. Ninety-nine

percent of the play is fact."<sup>17</sup> But The Man In The Glass Booth, out of its historical context, the questions it raises about German guilt, Jewish passivity and complicity, the paranoic personality of the arch killer, along with the recital of atrocities, offer no fresh illumination.<sup>18</sup> "The personages in The Man In The Glass Booth are figureheads and not full-bodied characters; its theatrical dilly-dallying with history, psychology, and mental concepts become distasteful, and not to say, shameful."<sup>19</sup>

"Shaw's chief ambition is to construct a hip moral drama, one informed by our contemporary awareness of how the oppressor and the victim may be united, how the sufferer may be a secret, powerless Nazi, dreaming of his torturer's jackboots."<sup>20</sup> What the play does is leave the Jew holding the key to his own death, not to his survival, and the theatre-goer "leaves feeling that this gravest of events in the political order hasn't been newly imagined but exploited, and rather ineptly at that."<sup>21</sup>

#### THE INVESTIGATION

Perhaps no play about the holocaust, with the exception of The Deputy, has caused such a strong reaction as Peter

Weiss' The Investigation, presented to New York audiences in October of 1966. The reason for this reaction was not due to anything the playwright necessarily did, but what he failed to do. His exact account of the testimony of what happened at Auschwitz, while graphically reported, is not the reason for the strong reaction, nor is the fact that it was the first play of its kind presented to German audiences the reason. Weiss' presentation is not like his Marat-Sade which brought the audience into a close participation with the actors. The reason for the reaction to The Investigation is what Weiss failed to mention. Here we have a play based on, "fact, fact, and more facts until it becomes unbearable."<sup>22</sup> But what are missing from the play are these essential facts - 1) that Jews were killed during the holocaust and 2) that this was done because of the theory of the Master Race. Both of these facts, vital to a simple understanding of the slaughter of the Jews, are totally omitted from Weiss' drama, and intentionally in a futile attempt to universalize his theme. "The play is not to be taken as a limited portrayal of Nazi inhumanity to Jews (how could it be, there is no mention of Jews). The Nazis did kill six million Jews, yes, but they killed millions of others. The word Jew in fact is never used in the play. The closest I come to it is in mentioning a victim named Sarah. I do not

identify myself anymore with Jews than I do with the people of Vietnam, or the Blacks of South Africa. I identify myself with the oppressed of the world . . . The Investigation is about the extreme abuse of power, that alienates people from their own actions. It happened to the German people, but that is not important. I see Auschwitz as a scientific instrument that could have been used by anyone to exterminate anyone."<sup>23</sup> To prove his point, what could be more universal than to use the victims of the holocaust as the proof of this view? "For that matter, given a different deal the Jews could have been on the side of the Nazis, they too could have been the exterminators."<sup>24</sup>

Weiss has a real problem, for a play so based on facts should not misread history. While Weiss may be artistically serving his view of history, a problem remains in that there is absolutely no shred of evidence that, had the roles been reversed, the Jews would have done likewise. Admittedly Weiss tries to imply that any understanding of Jew should understand it to mean a strictly "human" character. But the Jews were so singled out in the holocaust that it is virtually impossible to think of them as representatives of human beings responding to the human condition. Weiss points out that Jews have done likewise by showing, under testimony, that Jews in fact did carry out the killings against their

own people.

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENSE: And didn't these prisoners also do the killing?

9TH WITNESS: In the beginning they had to.

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENSE: So the prisoners were killed by their own people?<sup>25</sup>

The circumstances under which the Jew killed is not analogous to the circumstances under which the Nazi killed.

PROSECUTING ATTORNEY: We protest these tactics by which the defense seeks to blame prisoners for actions carried out under the threat of death.<sup>26</sup>

Here Weiss is suiting his own needs and not history's. "Whenever we hear that a theatrical evening is documentary in nature, we make quick, natural, but not necessarily valid assumptions. We assume that the function of a documentary is to convey information and that when we go to such an exhibit we go to acquire information."<sup>27</sup> But for Weiss we cannot assume this, nor can we assume that historical truth is his goal either; "Of course, I selected my facts to suit a purpose, it is Capitalism. The whole Western way of life is on trial."<sup>28</sup> It is because of his political leanings that Weiss shows us no accusers or accused, criminals or victims. Given his "humanistic socialism", the victims were accomplices to the revolting crimes because they had not, at an earlier stage, revolted against the society which produced the men

capable of committing them.<sup>29</sup> And so by Weiss' own admission, The Investigation is used to create a "new world order for the salvation of all mankind, and indeed turns the key to it, socialistic humanism or humanistic socialism. But it is hard not to suspect that it is essentially just for himself because he has rejected or been rejected by so many worlds."<sup>30</sup>

While Weiss never mentions Jews in his play, he does mention Poles and Russians. What has happened is that Weiss, by his own admitted design, has said that Russians and Poles were innocently killed, but the unmentioned killed, the Jews, were not innocent for they were collaborators. Now one can understand that this was done to emphasize the universality of the crime. But it is shocking to the theatre-goer that at least three references are made to Russians and Poles killed at Auschwitz. Evidently one may mention members of the Communist block and remain universal, but may not similarly mention Jews. Others may have suffered at Auschwitz, but it was the Jewish people primarily that endured the terrible agony of the death of one-third of its men, women, and children in the camps.

The frightening thing about Auschwitz may or may not be what Weiss pictures and implies in The Investigation. What is certainly frightening is what is being made of it today - this above all the legitimate symbol of European Jewry's

fate under Hitler, and something horribly beyond a symbol. But the uninitiated visitor (given Weiss' play), should someone ask, would probably react, "Oh, were Jews killed here too?"<sup>31</sup>

It is because of this reaction that The Investigation ultimately fails to make its point. The omission of the word Jew and of the Nazi racist doctrines indicates that Weiss is using a tragic historical incident to suit his own needs, and in the process he has not only prostituted the event, but also has not made his point. For a man who feels so deeply with the oppressed of the world, it is surprising that he cannot feel deeply for that particular historical event he chooses to show his sensitivity. Weiss' tragedy thus becomes a tragic event in itself.

By the end of the performance it is possible to wonder if this playwright who has moved from the Marquis de Sade's world of fantasy to Himmler's world of achievement for his inspiration is grappling with the problem of wickedness, or hardening our sensibilities and habituating the idea of brutality.<sup>32</sup> Theophilus Lewis has written, "Auschwitz has become synonymous with horror, but Weiss restricts our horror to an intellectual rather than emotional level. His aims seem to be to make the audience think about the atrocities instead of feeling their impact."<sup>33</sup> What this may point out is that Weiss is more of a documentarist than a dramatist,

yet any attempt by him to make the audience feel for the victims is by-passed. Walter Kerr who essentially finds Weiss' work to be compelling and understands the play to be extremely powerful says, "When Weiss does attempt a dramatic vignette, as in the episode called 'The End of Lili Toffler', he gets his narrative all back to front, failing to make us see an actual girl named Lili Toffler and leaving us, even here, with only the statistical horror of her having had to endure an unexecuted order, 'Fire', so many times that she finally begged to be killed. He does embody his visions; he does not fit them with clothes."<sup>34</sup>

But now it is important to understand how Weiss can equate prisoner and guard and in so doing present his universal theme. There is an internal inconsistency in his view of the basic differences between victim and victimizer at Auschwitz. The defense counsel tries to argue that since the machine allowed for prisoners to do the killing, then there is less distinction between the guards and the prisoners, than between both of them and the people outside the camp. In the name of fair play, though, Weiss brings testimony of the survivors to refute the claim by the defense counsel.

2ND WITNESS: I had orders to perform autopsies. The purpose of this work was purely scientific. I had nothing to do with the killings.<sup>35</sup>

But Weiss soon confuses this testimony in the Scene "The Song of the Fire Ovens." He confuses the distinction between guard and prisoner, without any foundation in reality, and states that all those at Auschwitz were bound together by a dedication to the same system.

7TH WITNESS: I only want to point out if I may how many spectators lined the way when we were driven from our homes and loaded into freight cars. The accused in these proceedings were only the last in a long line.

ACCUSED # 1: Your Honor. I was against the whole thing. I myself was persecuted by the system.<sup>36</sup>

So Weiss at the play's end has reduced his whole indictment to the ancient one of man's inhumanity to man and to the futile one of everybody's guilty.

Weiss can make so profound a misjudgment because he has left out of his entire vision of Auschwitz the factor of the Nazi indeology of racism. It was racism that Hitler used to justify all his crimes. And so we have the astonishing fact of a play about Auschwitz in which neither racism nor Nazism is mentioned.

Equally astonishing, as aforementioned, is Weiss' ommission of the word Jew. It is general knowledge that the majority of those killed were Jews, just as it is general knowledge that the main thrust of the Nazi extermination camps was directed at the Jewish people as a whole. Yet Weiss mentions that Russians were killed at Auschwitz.

7TH WITNESS: . . . Three million Russian prisoners of war shot to death as well as the ten million civilians of the occupied countries who perished.<sup>37</sup>

How can a play that insists on facts leave out such a fact, no matter what purpose the playwright is trying to serve? While Weiss may be quoted as saying that he omitted the word Jew because "I do not identify myself anymore with the Jews than I do with the people of Vietnam or the Blacks of South Africa" (Of course, many European Jews did not identify themselves as Jews, but that mattered little),<sup>38</sup> would he write a play about Vietnam and not mention the Vietnamese, or about South Africa and not mention the Black South Africans?

Oliver Clausen writes, "The scene is the Polish state Auschwitz museum and as such is principally a shrine to Poland's own heroic resistance to the Nazis or Fascists and Communist parliaments."<sup>39</sup> Countless Poles were indeed killed there, but the guides do not mention that the particular extermination camp has a significance all its own in Jewish history. Likewise the official guidebook reads, "Auschwitz symbolizes German terror and human suffering but primarily Polish and Russian suffering."<sup>40</sup> (This curiously is exactly as Weiss phrases it in his play). The fact that some Jews happen to be among the victims is only mentioned in passing, more specifically in reference to the killing of a shipment of eighty Jewish women.<sup>41</sup> Well, the Jews are not

forgotten after all, except for a few million.

And so Peter Weiss becomes a guide to the museum. Weiss wrote that "he couldn't write about Auschwitz unless he first visited it. I must also go to North Vietnam to write my next play."<sup>42</sup> But Weiss is perhaps the only man who could go to Auschwitz and not see Jews there.

If Weiss thinks that his omission of the Jews from Auschwitz is part of his humanistic socialism, he better take a closer look at it. To say that "given a different deal the Jews . . . could have been the exterminators"<sup>43</sup> is dangerous nonsense. The historic experience of the Jews negates this possibility that they could have imposed or could impose a "Final Solution" on another people.<sup>44,45</sup>

The Investigation ultimately fails to achieve what Weiss wants it to because of his misuse of facts. Facts are not history. And so Weiss can use them to suit his own needs. "To go to the theatre for sheer fact is to eliminate the need for an author. An editor is impersonal; he keeps himself out of his material. An author above all things is personal; the world that is offered us tonight is a world siphoned through his eyesight and born directly out of his (Weiss') head. He had made his world, or at least this view of the world; and we dare not pretend that he isn't there or that we haven't met him." We do not go to meet the

facts, we go to meet the mind."<sup>46</sup> But facts may have a correlation with truth, and misuse of the facts may inevitably turn truth into something expedient. This seems to be what Weiss ends up with, "fact, fact, and more facts until they become unbearable,"<sup>47</sup> and a distortion of the truth of the Nazi horror based on the facts he chooses to omit. Indeed the most tragic result of Weiss' interpretation is noticed by critic R.J. Schroeder, and this tragic result is not necessarily related to Weiss.

And the next series of performances of The Investigation might better take place in a non-Broadway environment - in the "Playbill" handed out at the current Broadway production, detailed diagrams of the Auschwitz death factories are surrounded with deodorant and aphrodisiac-cosmetic ads, and this juxtaposition says more than I, for one, can bear to have said.<sup>48</sup>

#### THE CONDEMNED OF ALTONA

The Condemned Of Altona completed by Jean-Paul Sartre in 1960 is a complex play which, in Sartre's own words, "explores the state of man in its entirety and presents to the modern man a portrait of himself, his problems, his hopes and struggles . . . if the theatre is to address the masses, it must speak in terms of their most general preoccupations, dispelling their anxieties in the form of myths which anyone can understand and feel deeply."<sup>49</sup> It is with an eye

to this statement that Sartre writes The Condemned Of Altona as the play takes place in a town outside Hamburg in a Germany that after the throes of a brutally destructive war has arisen to new heights of prosperity.

The protagonist of the play is a wealthy shipbuilder, Von Gerlach, who lives with his family in his estate in Altona. Once a proud man, all he has left is his estate that was untouched by either the Americans or the Germans. He had sold some property at one time that was later used to establish a concentration camp. The power that Von Gerlach wields over his children is unyielding, but this matters little as he contracts cancer.

The other characters in the play include his son Werner, who was once a lawyer but then took over the shipbuilding business at the behest of his father. Werner's wife, Johanna, subservient to her husband and father-in-law, is forced to give up a once promising acting career. On Von Gerlach's deathbed, both Werner and Johanna promise to stay with the mansion only to find the mysteries it contains. There is Franz, Von Gerlach's other son, who has holed upstairs because of conflicts he has had with his father. And finally there is Leni, the daughter, who is the only one that Franz will allow to come to visit him, and who harbors incestuous thoughts of her brother.

Franz is very much like his father on the surface. He is obdurate and brooding. At one time Franz tried to hide a Polish rabbi, only to witness before his eyes the murder of the rabbi as ordered by his father. In reaction to this, Franz enlisted in the army, distinguishing himself in the war effort. It is in Franz, that the reader understands the sense of guilt that Sartre is trying to establish. Franz is obsessed with guilt. At one time he ordered the murder of Russian partisans. He is referred to as "Hitler's wife," powerless and too weak to revolt against his father and the society in which he lives.<sup>50</sup> (This theme is again identical to the theme pursued by Miller, Weiss and Shaw). And so we find Franz living upstairs as a fugitive from his own guilt. He refuses to come out, believing some thirteen years later that Germany is still the mountain of destruction he thought it to be. His sister, Leni, feeds his delusions, for only thus can Franz's personal guilt be drowned in the collective one"- he must believe that Germany was devastatingly punished for her crimes. If he were to find out that Germany was again prosperous, his solitude would be in vain and the rationalization for his past behavior would be ultimately destroyed. Franz wished the death of Germany and secluded himself in order to exclude himself from bearing witness to Germany's rebirth, which would erase

any pretense he might have had for the justification of his own intimate involvement in the crimes of his country.

In the course of Von Gerlach's writing out his will, he forces Franz finally to come down from his exclusion. The father and son then go for a ride. Their car crashes, and both are killed. Leni then takes up residence in the room so as to transform it into a room of conscience for the world as the play closes with Franz's voice rising from a tape recorder:

. . . Centuries of the future, here is my century, solitary and deformed - the accused . . . The century might have been a good one had not man been watched from time immemorial by the cruel enemy who had sworn to destroy him, that hairless, evil, flesh-eating beast - man himself . . .<sup>51</sup>

It is also with this last speech that Sartre says what he must about the nature of people who do precisely what they condemn others for doing. Franz is a guilty father. Franz, the name chosen to parallel France, suggests the guilt that France should have felt at the time. Indeed, France should feel guilt for her role in Algeria according to Sartre, even as there should be guilt for what is occurring in South Africa, Vietnam and Russia.<sup>52</sup> An eye-for-an-eye is not acceptable for Sartre.

. . . One and one make one - there's our mystery. The beast was hiding, and suddenly we surprised his look deep in the eyes of our neighbors. So we struck. Legitimate self-defense. I surprised the beast. I struck, a man

fell, and in his dying eyes I saw the beast still living - myself. One and one make one - what a misunderstanding! Where does it come from, this rancid, dead taste in my mouth? From man? From the beast? From myself? It is a taste of the century . . .<sup>53</sup>

Finally, though, Sartre would have us answer for our misdeeds.

. . . I, Franz Von Gerlach, here in this room, have taken the century upon my shoulders and have said: "I will answer for it. This day and forever." What do you say?<sup>54</sup>

The Condemned Of Altona is an act of judgment about the society we live in as seen in the quotes from the closing lines of the play. All of Sartre's characters in this play, like those in Sartre's The Victors, are defendants who must answer for their actions, unlike those principal characters in Weiss' and Shaw's works. Not all turns out well. Death is meted out to the father and son, and a daughter is imprisoned for life, and another son and his wife are forced to live a life devoid of any meaning. Because Sartre's treatment is one of an abstract presentation of his theme, unlike Shaw's and Weiss' themes which deal with actual events of history, he was able to write a play that made the stage become a "place of moral inquisition, at once a courtroom and a prison."<sup>55</sup>

## CONCLUSION

One can start out with a perfectly logical formula and misapply it so that it becomes a ridiculous piece of mischievous nonsense. Robert Shaw's The Man In The Glass Booth and Peter Weiss' The Investigation have as their themes that "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other." Granted that the Germans and the Jews are both members of the human race, but are they interchangeable as in the plays, or does one hear a dissenting voice from the German sector? Do the authors intend to say that the victim is as guilty as the criminal? Is the potentiality of doing evil equivalent to actually perpetrating that evil? Translating a supposition into a crime as do Weiss and Shaw is nonsense. Judging a man capable of applying the breaks of conscience as the equal of the uninhibited criminal is a violation of the basic law of justice.

Robert Shaw is quoted as saying, "sooner or later the Germans would have to be forgiven."<sup>56</sup> But must this forgiveness be engineered by a projection of the guilt onto the victim? Must the innocent absorb the guilt for some lame social comment about universal guilt and responsibility by an act of introjection in order that the real guilty ones be

absolved? What about some simple expiation such as West Germany herself has undertaken in the way of reparations to the robbed, the killed, the injured, and the traumatized? Must self-righteous men out-Nazi those genuinely repentant Nazis? Must Weiss and Shaw be the ones to add that additional measure of insult to the injuries so recent in Jewish history?

Perhaps each of us has murder in his heart as Weiss, Miller and Shaw imply: "the wish to kill is never killed."<sup>57</sup> Perhaps they have looked that deeply into their own hearts. In that case one would not mind if they placed themselves or Everyman on trial, or more specifically, in a glass booth as the alter-egos of Dorff-Eichmann instead of the eternal scapegoat, Goldman the Jew.

### III. ANDORRA AND WHEN THE WAR WAS OVER

#### ANDORRA

"The fixed ideas entertained by our friends, parents, and teachers . . . weigh on many of us like oracles . . . and one cannot get rid of an oracle until one proves its accuracy."<sup>1</sup> This is the fate of Andri, the protagonist of Max Frisch's Andorra (written in 1961), who in the course of his time spent in the fictive state, Andorra, becomes a Jew simply by living up to the reputation afforded him by others once they have it in their mind that he is a Jew.

"The Andorra of the play has nothing to do with the actual small state of this name, nor does it stand for another actual small state; Andorra is the name of a model."<sup>2</sup> It is in this model state that Andri finds himself trying to assimilate into the Andorran way of life without reason for doubting that he is a Jew. But the harder he tries to assimilate, the more difficult it is to succeed. Indeed Andri has gone so far overboard in his attempt to assimilate that he becomes self-conscious. Andri was forced into this role by the people in the play, and so we are to an extent that person our fellow takes us for. We are the authors of our fellowman is what Frisch is saying. Once the stereotyping

has set in, it is virtually impossible to crack the mold set for us. Therefore, at the root of the play Andorra stands not so much the image of Andri as such, but the image of Andri, the Jew, formed by a group about him.

We see the play operating on two levels. First Andri tends to believe what the people say about him.

ANDRI: Is it true what they say? Do you think they're right?

BARBLIN: Don't start that again.

ANDRI: Perhaps they're right. Perhaps they're right.

BARBLIN: You've made me all ruffled.

ANDRI: They say my kind has no feelings.

BARBLIN: Who says that?

ANDRI: Lots of people . . . Everybody . . . They say my kind are lecherous, but heartless, you know -

Second, Andri is convinced that he was people say he is.

ANDRI: Ever since I have been able to hear, people have told me I'm different, and I watched to see if what they said was true. And it is true Father (a Priest). I am different. People told me my kind have a certain way of moving, and I looked at myself in the mirror almost every evening. They were right. I do have a certain way of moving. I can't help it. And I watched to see whether it was true that I am always thinking of money - and they were right again. I am always thinking of money. It's true. And I have no backbone. I've tried, it's no use. I have no backbone, only fear. And people told me that my kind are cowards. I watched out for this too. Many of them are cowards, but I know when I'm being a coward. I didn't want to admit what they told me, but it's true. They kicked me with their boots, and it's true what they say. I don't feel as they do. And I have no country.

You told me, Father, one must accept that, and I have accepted it. Now it is up to you, Father, to accept your Jew.

PRIEST: Do you want to be a Jew?

ANDRI: I am a Jew. For a long time I didn't know what it meant. Now I know . . . 4

The play deals with Andri, a young boy, who is reputed to be a Jew. The action in the play revolves exclusively around Andri. Any statements Frisch wishes to make about the holocaust and people's responsibility in it are made through Andri and the people's reactions to him. Upon the alleged statement that Andri is a Jew, all characteristics that are generally ascribed to Jews are ascribed to Andri - for example, self-righteousness, thinking he is better than everyone else:

DOCTOR: I have nothing against these people, but I feel uncomfortable the moment I set eyes on them. However you behave is wrong. What did I say? They can't leave well enough alone; they're always asking us to prove ourselves by our attitude to them. As though we had nothing else to do! No one likes to have a guilty conscience, but that's what they bank on. They want us to do them an injustice. That's all they're waiting for . . . 5

their cleverness, lack of athletic ability, their intellect:

PRIEST: . . . You've said yourself: how can other people love us if we don't love ourselves? Our Lord said: Love thy neighbor as thyself. He said as "thyself". We must accept ourselves, and that is what you don't do Andri. Why do you ask to be like others? You're cleverer than they, believe me, you're more alert. Why don't you admit that? There is a spark in you. Why do you want to play football like all these bone-heads, and rush about the field shouting? Simply

in order to be an Andorran? They don't like you, I know. And I know why. There's a spark in you. You think. Why shouldn't there be some among God's creatures who have more intelligence than feeling? I tell you that is exactly what I admire about you people. Why do you look at me like that? There is a spark in all of you. Think of Einstein! And all the rest of them, whatever their names are. Think of Spinoza!<sup>6</sup>

After these verbal assaults upon his person, it is little wonder that Andri sees himself as a Jew when he says, "I am a Jew. For a long time I didn't know what it meant. Now I know."<sup>7</sup> It is only after this statement that the truth is revealed that Andri is not a Jew. But now it is too late, for even that knowledge is irrelevant because he is still treated as such, even by his half-sister and part-lover Barblin.

ANDRI: Barblin, now I am frightened again - - -

BARBLIN: Brother!

ANDRI: If they know I am in the house and they can't find me, they'll set fire to the house, that's well known, and wait down below until the Jew jumps out the window.

BARBLIN: Andri - you aren't a Jew.

ANDRI: Then why do you want to hide me?<sup>8</sup>

It is in this short dialogue that Frisch is also making a statement about the responsibility of people toward those who are the victims of the holocaust. If Barblin won't protect Andri, then one could readily expect Andri to reach this accurate conclusion -

ANDRI: Look at the old teacher, the way he is going down hill, and he was once a young man, he says, with great ideals. Look at Barblin. And all of them, all of them, not only me. Look at the soldiers. Damned. Look at yourself. You already know now, Father, what you will do when they take me away, a Jew, in front of your kind eyes, and that's why they stare at me so, your kind, kind eyes. You will pray. For me and for yourself. Your prayers won't even help you; you will betray me in spite of them. Grace is an everlasting sham; the sun will shine green in the trees when they take me away.<sup>9</sup>

Yet with all these statements about what a Jew is as seen through the eyes of the townspeople, and how Andri reacts and how he sees others reacting, the truth for Frisch is more than the revealed knowledge that Andri is not a Jew. The truth is that a young boy was killed because of the Andorrans' delusions. Andri actually had everything in common with them.

Andorra operates on many levels. There is little question that Frisch is writing in an historical context. Frisch is very much aware of this, and shows a sensitivity to the victims of the holocaust that is not displayed by Weiss or Shaw. Frisch writes with respect to another of his plays, When The War Was Over, written in 1949, twelve years before Andorra -

In spite of the general claim, there remains a basic question; when the author of an historical play is forced to encounter those who have actually lived through it all . . . and who, even among themselves, cannot agree to actually how things happened. Basically it is always the same question: what right has the poet to write as he does? He justifies himself by saying that he is a poet. But what if he is no poet, or if he is a bad poet? Then the characters he has created will have ample cause for turning against him.<sup>10</sup>

This historical context in which the play is set is only used to show the imminent changes in attitude of the Andorrans toward Andri. At the outset of the play the people are in sympathy with Andri, but as soon as the invasion from another people becomes imminent, the people lose their sympathy and become intolerant of him. Some of the townspeople try to remain dignified in the midst of the invasion, notably the Doctor and the Innkeeper, but ~~it is they who~~ become the most intolerant. "This is a calculated effort on the part of the playwright, who wanted them to appear harmless and well-intentioned, in order to make their about face more dramatic, thereby shocking the audience out of their complacency."<sup>11</sup> Frisch intentionally uses the upstanding and intelligent men in the community, the Doctor, the Innkeeper, the Priest, further to illustrate this point.

Frisch shows that when a society is threatened from without, they use a scapegoat. In the case of Germany he states this in an obvious historical setting. Andri himself is aware of this historical phenomenon.

ANDRI: . . . It isn't superstition; oh no, there are people like that, people with a curse on them - I'm like that. It doesn't matter what I do, the others only have to look at me and suddenly I'm what they say I am. That's what evil is. Everyone has it in him, nobody wants it, so where is it to go? Into the air? It is in the air, but it doesn't stay there long, it has to enter into a human being, so that one day they can seize it and kill it . . .<sup>12</sup>

Once the historical setting is well established, Frisch deals with the psychological ramifications of living at such a time. Indeed, it is out of this historical setting that Frisch stresses the psychological dilemma of one thinking he is what others believe him to be. In the first part of the play Andri does his best to be like everyone else. As soon as he sees that this does not work, he turns to hate his tormentors. In facing the challenge of being someone different, Andri, on false grounds, rises morally above his fellow Andorrans and is, of course, immediately accused of putting on airs. Andri's changed attitude, though no fault of his own, furnishes the Andorrans with an excuse for being hostile to him. Frisch is careful to point out that this is a result of the extreme psychological pressure that is placed on Andri.

The psychological dilemma goes further as it focuses on Andri's growing awareness of the tension, a result of the type of treatment he receives at the hands of the townspeople which causes him to act as one who is persecuted.

ANDRI: I know - I shouldn't keep thinking of myself all the time. But I can't help it, Father. I can't help wondering all the time whether what people say about me is true: that I'm not like them, not gay, not jolly, just not like them. And you think there is something restless about me, Father. You've just said so. I can quite understand that nobody likes me. I don't like myself when I think about myself.<sup>15</sup>

The ultimate crime committed here is that Andri is made to hate himself.

Because the attributes assigned to Andri are psychologically cast, the Andorrans also manage to delude themselves, even to the point that they see Andri as physically different, though he is physically like them. Again this is all seen in the context of the coming invasion, for at the threat of it the Doctor and the Innkeeper, sympathetic figures at the outset of the play, become the exemplars of this delusion. Once the delusion sets in and the scapegoat appears, there is no telling where it will lead to. "As pre-figured in the prose sketch, one after the other traits reputed to be typically Jewish are foisted upon Frisch's protagonist: greed, cowardice, lack of feeling, intellectualism, and excessive professional ambition. He is, in addition, accused of being tactless and oversensitive, traits which are the results, rather than the cause, of his being pushed into the role."<sup>14</sup> The Andorrans generally resent his touchiness, which compels them to "prove" themselves in relation to him as the Doctor phrases it. In reality, the flaws which Andri is saddled with sit better on those who, wittingly or not, hunt him down: the Innkeeper too cowardly to confess that it was he who threw the stone that killed Andri's mother, the soldier who betrays his Fatherland, and the cabinetmaker who is obsessed with money. "The Andorrans," the Innkeeper tells Andri's father, "are agreeable people; but when money is at stake . . . they are like Jews."<sup>15</sup>

Certainly this latter view seems to be more accurate and sensitive than those views expressed by Shaw and Weiss. While they can only universalize the guilt and abstract it from what are basically historical dramas, leaving no one guilty and the Jew to blame for what happened, here we have in Andorra an abstract theatre-form, universal in nature, but one that levels the blame for what happened to the Jews directly upon those who were most immediately involved, thus to a great degree absolving the victims.

The labelling of Andri as a Jew and the psychological sidelights of it grow more absurd as the play goes on when the Jew Inspector, reminiscent of Miller's Professor in Incident At Vichy, comes to detect a Jew even if (the inspector) he is blindfolded. What is the psychological mechanism that brings this to pass? Andri supplies the answer himself.

ANDRI: People told me my kind have a certain way of moving, and I looked at myself in the mirror almost every evening. They were right. I do have a certain way of moving. I can't help it.<sup>16</sup>

And so the psychological part of the drama operates throughout with the reality of an historical event, the invasion. "In the opening scene we are given to understand that the country is threatened by an invasion, which is discussed in terms of an inevitable natural phenomenon: 'A humid evening. I think there's a thunderstorm in the air,' says an unidentified Jemand. 'And yet I see no cloud in the sky. But one senses

it, too. Such a dry and lazy silence. I think there's a thunderstorm in the air, a severe storm at that. It would be good for the country.' In Scene Ten the storm is over. Andorra has surrendered to the Blacks, who have used the assassination of Andri's real mother as an excuse for their invasion. Now the latent Anti-semitism has acquired a status of an official program of extermination, and Andri is killed not on account of the murder, which he is falsely alleged to have committed, but simply because he is a Jew."<sup>17</sup>

There is little attempt in the play to universalize the guilt of the Andorrans, although for Frisch it is always present that this sort of thing could happen to any community. What distinguishes Andorra from The Man In The Glass Booth and The Investigation is that in Andorra Frisch forces the Andorrans to answer for their actions. It is the exterminator who must account for his actions alone, not in relation to how Andri might have acted had the roles and situation been reversed. Weiss holds that the Jew knew what was going on and, because he did not revolt against the society in which he lived, has himself to blame. Frisch does no such thing. One could easily object that, if Andri were aware of the practical consequences, he should have left immediately. But it is only much later, after he has saved sufficient money to establish himself abroad, that he wishes to do so. Was his

timing wrong, or should we interpret Andri's soliloquy -

ANDRI: . . . It isn't superstition; oh no, there are people like that, people with a curse on them - I'm like that. It doesn't matter what I do, the others only have to look at me and suddenly I am what they say I am. That's what evil is. Everybody has it in him, nobody wants it, so where is it to go? Into the air? It is in the air, but it doesn't stay there long, it has to enter into a human being, so that one day they can seize it and kill it . . .18

- as being out of character in the sense that Agnes, the protagonist of Frisch's When The War Was Over, voices opinions that are not her own? "It certainly would not do to apply the yardstick of verisimilitude to a play which seeks to transcend ordinary reality by reflecting it in a concentrating mirror."19 Andri, the young boy of early naivete could hardly be expected to rise so speedily to the heroic level of tragic insight as he does at the end of the play.

ANDRI: . . . I don't want to have a father and mother for their death to come over me with anguish and despair, or my death over them. And no sister and no sweetheart. Soon everything will be torn to pieces. Then neither our promises nor our fidelity will help. I want it to happen soon. I'm old. My trust has broken up, one piece after the other, like teeth. I used to be happy, the sun shone green on the trees, I threw my name into the air like a cap that belonged to no one but me, and down fell a stone that killed me. I have been wrong, all the time, though not in the way they thought. I wanted to be right and rejoice. My enemies were right, even if they were unjust. No matter how much I understand, I still can't feel that I am right. I don't need enemies anymore, the truth is enough. I take fright the moment I begin to hope. Hopefulness has never suited me. I take fright when I laugh, and I can't weep. My afflictions raises me above everyone, and there-

fore I must fall. My eyes are big with melancholy, my blood knows everything, and I wish I were dead. But I have a horror in dying . . .<sup>20</sup>

And so it seems it is Frisch who best understands the holocaust, and the unique meaning it has for Jews. He is most sensitive to the victims' needs, and realizes that if any justice is to be done to a treatment of the holocaust, then those other than the victims must be indicted. This indictment should be specific enough so that one might know who is immediately responsible for this human tragedy, and general enough so that one might also understand the degree of guilt he should feel.

#### WHEN THE WAR WAS OVER

When The War Was Over (1949, a true-life play), while written before Andorra, serves as a summary for some of Frisch's points made in Andorra and serves to place Frisch in contradistinction to Messrs. Miller, Shaw and Weiss.

By writing When The War Was Over, Frisch sought to discourage two views regarding the German, collective or individual, guilt than current among his Swiss compatriots; "first the convenient retreat into the realm of German classical literature, 'where the affinity to the German mind is conceived of as harmless,' and, secondly, the blind compassion

'which offers no less dubious a solution by resolutely forgetting, and thus betraying, the victims of yesterday.'

Frisch disagreed with Churchill, who, in 1949, had proposed to let the past take care of itself. He wanted to deal with the present without losing its immediate antecedents out of sight. As the heroine (of When The War Was Over), Agnes, states in the third act (subsequently removed) of the play, 'It is impossible to live in the same house with a criminal without turning against him. It is impossible or we share the guilt.'<sup>21</sup> This is very much the theme of When The War Was Over which centers around the protagonist, Agnes, whose husband, Horst, comes home after two years in the German army. They closet themselves in the basement of their house whose upstairs is occupied by some Russian army officers.

In both of Frisch's plays there is a melodramatic love relationship, by which he explores the problems of guilt in relationship to the holocaust. This is done with a bit more finesse and understanding than is done by Miller in After The Fall. In Andorra, a relationship develops between Andri and Barblin. Frisch uses white-washing as a symbol for covering one's guilt, painting over one's complicit acts. The act of white-washing is cast in the opening and closing scenes of the play. In the play all the Andorrans are shown decorating the fronts of their houses, but at the end of the

play it is Barblin who is seen doing the white-washing. It is she, Andri's lover and half-sister, who has significantly betrayed Andri.

The relationship between Hörst and Agnes in When The War Was Over is one between immediate guilt and innocent complicity. In the context of the play it is difficult to decide whether Horst actually killed Jews. When Agnes inquires as to whether or not he has, he is strangely silent.

AGNES: . . . I find it strange, too, that you tell me nothing. For two years you disappeared; and not a word of what you did or where you were. Not since Warsaw.<sup>22</sup>

In making Agnes an innocent sinner, Frisch has loaded the question; for in order to remain impartial and fair he should have stressed the mutual betrayal. Agnes, after all, is just as guilty as her husband and he is fully entitled to the reproach, latent in the words " . . . and not a word of what you did . . ."<sup>23</sup> Violation of the moral code is pitted against a violation of basic human rights; and we cannot possibly acquiesce, with Frisch, in one-sided expiation. Frisch vainly seeks to convince his audience that a second Antigone, his heroine Agnes, appeals to a higher law, a divine law, than that earthly law under which her husband, Horst, stands accused.<sup>24</sup>

Yet Frisch is not quite making a case for one-sided expiation. Frisch hints that Horst has not killed any Jews, but

his part in the system holds him more guilty than Agnes who is innocently guilty, but nevertheless guilty. Frisch establishes a line of guilt beginning with the murderers themselves and extending to those who tacitly complied. (Not included in this line however are the victims for the psychological reasons depicted by Frisch in Andorra). No conjecture whatsoever could place the Jews in this line, for to do so would be for Frisch to add to the cruelty already inflicted upon the victims of the holocaust. Frisch is continually aware of his treatment of Jews. Jehuda Karp, the Jew in When The War Was Over, serves as the Russian Colonel's orderly. Frisch goes out of his way not to stereotype him. Because Frisch essentially paints Jehuda as one-dimensional, the audience cannot fit him into any mold that would harbor a prejudicial view or foolish stereotype of this Jew.

At the end of the play, Horst admits to playing a part in the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto (not meaning that he actually killed Jews). The reason that Horst remained silent about it is that, knowing Agnes was having an affair with the Russian Colonel, he hoped the liaison between Agnes and the Colonel would somehow save his neck. But the play ends with Horst standing naked before himself, Agnes, and the audience to face his own criminality. Frisch wants the audience to know that there are those for whom no absolution is possible

considering their active part in the death of the Jews. And as Horst stands alone at the close of the play, Frisch places Agnes beside him to show further to the audience that there is little consolation for those who tacitly, or even innocently, stood by while six million Jews were killed.

## IV. WATCH ON THE RHINE, THE WALL, AND THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK

## WATCH ON THE RHINE

By Lillian Hellman's own admission, her play, Watch On The Rhine, presented in 1941, is not the clear exposé of that dark period of the Nazis that she hoped it to be; "Even now, of course, I know many ideas should have come clearer, many speeches cleaner, many things should have been said with more depth and understanding."<sup>1</sup> Lillian Hellman did not have the advantage of hindsight as she wrote the play within the midst of the Nazi reign of terror. Her knowledge of how extensive the brutality was was limited. Her only confrontation with Fascism was when she visited Spain a few years earlier. She felt that people in America were too dimly aware of the dangers of Nazism and decided to write about it. "I am a writer, I am also a Jew. I want to be quite sure that I continue to be a writer, and that if I want to say that greed is bad or persecution is worse, I can do so without being branded by the malice of people making a living by that malice."<sup>2</sup>

In Watch On The Rhine, Lillian Hellman barely makes a statement at all about the greed of individuals, and barely touches on the evils of persecution. The play takes place

in a suburban home outside Washington, D.C. The action concentrates on Kurt Muller, a German, who is trying to figure a way to get his friends out of Germany. (The play takes place in the late spring of 1940). The visas, proper information for securing their release can be received from Teck, the Count de Brancovis, a depraved man who is out solely for money and who has little concern for the victims of the holocaust. Kurt's family and friends are present at most of the conversations between the Count and Kurt. The Count is painted as an ugly individual. He is referred to as a swine - "Is it true that if this swine talks. . ."<sup>3</sup> - and this is substantiated by the fact that he sells lives as well as allowing himself to be bought off for saving them -" . . . Whatever you are, and however you became it, the picture of a man selling the lives of other men . . ."<sup>4</sup> The climax of the play is reached when a deal seems consummated between Kurt and Teck (the Count) that will enable Kurt to rescue his good friend Max. Yet the truth is revealed that the Count cannot possibly provide for Herr Kurt to get back into Germany; and Kurt, being aware of this, understands that the Count de Brancovis is about to take his money. At that moment Kurt rises and kills the Count. (This rather bland account of what happened is tempered by the dramatic blandness of this climatic scene).

The play ends with Kurt having to go back to Germany, leaving his children and the remainder of the household to wrestle with what happened.

If Mrs. Hellman is attempting to say anything, it is that the Count's death represents the triumph of good over evil. This is quite unlike the other holocaust plays where the force of evil is so unrelenting. What finally happens to Herr Kurt and his children is left untold and unimplied. Watch On The Rhine did not win much acclaim because it is so very superficial and uninformed. Its worth might be that it was produced in 1941. However, because the play is devoid of any shocking content that would have been comparable to what was actually happening in Nazi Germany at that time, the play only served to gloss over the reality of its present history's awful chronicle of death and destruction.

#### THE WALL AND THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK

The Wall, written by Millard Lampell in 1960, more than any other holocaust play requires the reader to see it. It is difficult to judge this play in the context of pure literature apart from what it might have been on the stage. There seems to be a rare unanimity among drama critics that The Wall was not transferred from John Hersey's novel to the stage with

the same impact and characterization.

The Wall, the story of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto, never achieves as a play the same power of feeling as the novel. One source of trouble is that The Wall is an adaptation, something planted in an alien, resisting soil. With The Wall, the spatial element is an essential one which the stage oftentimes cannot convey. "The Wall in the theatre proves to not be personal in appeal nor panoramic in effect; it is too diffused to have impact as a story, too restricted for vast horror as a scene. A Diary Of Anne Frank, (1955) - by remaining the chronicle of a girl and confining its tragedy to a garret, could expand a family's fate into that of an entire race. But in the stage version of The Wall, the mass and weight of John Hersey's novel are lost, while a steady dramatic undertow is lacking."<sup>5</sup> Admittedly though, it is difficult to discern how effective or ineffective the play would be on the stage if one did not see it. Since I have only read the play, the defects of the script suggest that the play is indeed lacking.

The play, The Wall, rather than adding some of the theatrical virtues to its contents and raising the necessary questions for its shocking content,<sup>6</sup> seems to be restricted and obstructed. The gruesome chronicle of the Jews of Warsaw, ghettoized by the imposing wall built around them by the

Nazis, then robbed of homes, health, dignity and freedom until in immeasurable numbers they were carted off in cattle cars to crematoria, explodes its horrors over and over again. "Its nightmares are vivid upon the stage; the mere sight - through the smoke of gunfire - of the wall speaks volumes."<sup>7</sup> Yet the play seems to do nothing more than to plop this down on the stage. Perhaps this is necessary, for if it were played with more powerful identification and more emotional intensity, the pain could easily become unbearable.

The Wall emerges as an ensemble spectacle featuring a series of vignettes, and it is here that the play achieves a worth that is not characteristic of the other plays considered. In the vignettes, The Wall distinguishes itself by depicting the most vivid and real, touching and sensitive scenes of Jews who lived under the brutality of the Nazis. What power The Wall commands comes from the tale and not the telling, from the scattered incidents, rather than the sustained whole.<sup>8</sup> Like The Diary Of Anne Frank, it is the isolated scenes showing the interplay between Jewish characters that make the play a moving experience.

The Wall is most effective when it portrays these scenes of human feeling against the backdrop of its historical setting. In the context of the Warsaw ghetto's daily deportation of Jews, starvation, disease, and ultimate destruction,

a myriad of reactions to these results of Nazism are presented, though admittedly not explored. Questions are raised, although not answered. It is here that we must begin an examination of the play, by isolating some of the scenes, taking them at face value - touching scenes that somehow evoke more than mere scenes that freeze the blood.

There is the scene of the rabbi, Reb Mazur, doing a ritual chasidic dance at the wedding of his daughter Rutka to Mordecai. Behind the wedding scene is "The sound of the German Patrol clomping by."<sup>9</sup> The wild rejoicing in the midst of the German Patrol is short-lived with the entrance of Stefan, the rabbi's son, who tells a Berson, a major character in the play, the details of the latest deportation.

STEFAN: There's a new order, just posted. A weekly quota of Jews to be shipped off and resettled in the East. Put to work in factories near the Russian front . . . They've had us out for the last three hours, rounding them up, dragging them down to the train station. Like dog catchers rounding up stray dogs. Pulling Jews out of chimneys, closets, garbage pails. This house is on the list. They're coming here.

RACHEL: When?

STEFAN: Now. Tonight! Now!<sup>10</sup>

This short scene shows that in the ghetto all joy was fleeting. That night Jews were deported from a home that had celebrated a wedding.

In this same scene we see the Jews having to do certain things that they would never have thought of doing. The rabbi,

the symbol of tradition and strength, is forced to bend the Law because of the existing conditions of the Jews in the ghetto walls. He allows that at the party they can eat horse meat.

REB MAZUR: By the strict letter of the law, it is forbidden to eat a horse. But when I began to reason, I reasoned like this. What is the basis for the Law? The basis of the Law is common sense. If we are hungry, what makes better sense than we should eat? . . . Also, the sixth commandment says, thou shalt not kill. If we allow ourselves to die of starvation, we are violating the law!. Therefore, according to God's will, we should eat a horse.<sup>11</sup>

Millard Lampell at no time amplifies the content of this wedding scene and what types of emotions it evoked in the people. Lampell merely reports the scene as a fact of daily occurrences in the Warsaw ghetto, and it is up to the viewer or the reader to understand the deeper meaning of this tragic scene.

It is important to note at this time some of the attitudes toward the play, particularly attitudes of Catholic reviewers, and to offer an opinion about them. The wedding scene and other scenes that will be subsequently described show that "the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto continued in their habitual way of living - loving or hating each other, competing for employment papers, getting married, having babies, and hoping that tomorrow would be better than today. If there is a message in the play, it is that no hardship or danger can

crush the ~~the~~ resilience of the human spirit."<sup>12</sup> This is spoken like a true Christian. To this type of understanding of the play, it matters little that the wedding scene ends with a deportation to the crematoria, or that a baby is killed by its parents so that they might escape. Indeed, this attitude, while on a less personal and grander scale in The Wall, is clearly expressed with regard to The Diary Of Anne Frank. "The story is a tribute to the ultimate value of the human spirit . . ."<sup>13</sup> There is one critic who feels that Anne is better for her experience. "There is a girl of genuine precocity of mind and heart; or of iridescent feeling, humor, gallantry, love. Under the daily tutelage of her wise father, Anne has learned a great deal. Books have virtually had to substitute for her life, and she is better for it; even the better for her imprisonment."<sup>14</sup> This last statement implies that had Anne been afforded a life free from persecution, a life that would have allowed her to walk in the sunlight, she might not have been better for her freedom. Therefore, if we have no guarantee that she will be better in freedom, then we might as well imprison her and all her other hapless brothers. The adage, "better dead than Red." could be better suited to say "better dead (as this is what finally happened to Anne for being the better for her imprisonment) than a free Jew."

These critics may not be consciously overlooking the

horrors of the holocaust. Rather they may have wanted to underscore the human strength and vitality that appeared in the victims. This approach is certainly a "sentimental" one, and in this sense is more Christian than Jewish. As a result what these critics seem to be saying, and virtually all of them arrive at this attitude as the plays' real messages, is that "see, one can do whatever he wants to Jews, they still come out living normal lives and smiling. Things couldn't have been that bad after all." Of course this attitude absolves people of their guilt in the holocaust, making their responsibility for it limited, allowing them to be relieved for not feeling that much when the horror of the Nazi brutality is told to them because they like to stress the good that comes out of such evil. Yet this attitude to The Wall and to The Diary Of Anne Frank - it is not the attitude of the plays themselves - which tends to absolve people of their guilt is as demeaning, though in a different way, as Weiss' absolution by his insistence that had the roles been reversed the Jews "could have been the exterminators."<sup>15</sup> When The Diary Of Anne Frank and The Investigation were presented to German audiences there seemed to be a certain amount of expiation for the Germans. Weiss' universality allowed for a certain amount of expiation as did the manner in which Weiss chose to present his subject matter which freed the audience

from an emotional involvement with the material and the characters. "All that happens on the stage is questioning and answering. Nothing is acted out. People stand or sit. They rarely even gesture. They only talk, and explain and rationalize, and try to justify their camp-time behavior."<sup>16,17</sup>

Interpreting The Wall as saying "no hardship or danger can crush the resilience of the human spirit"<sup>18</sup> (though it can crush the human body) allows for a play like The Diary Of Anne Frank to receive such a warm reception among German audiences. Time magazine reported the play's opening in Germany:

In all seven theatres, once the curtain rose, a dead silence blanketed the audience. In each case what happened on stage was merely a play within a play; the true drama took place in the orchestras, balconies, and boxes. After a couple of hours the curtains came down with the voice of the dead girl saying, "In spite of everything, I still believe that people are really good at heart," and her father, who had been bitter, slowly closing her diary and saying, "She puts me to shame." At that moment, with the curtain down, an extraordinary thing happened. The audience, which had sat through the performance in what appeared to be a shocked silence, sat on in silence without applauding. The elegant Dusseldorf audience filed out quietly, many moist-eyed and with smeared face powder and rouge. U.S. Actors' coach Paula Strasberg, mother of Susan Strasberg, who created the role of Anne Frank on Broadway, described what happened in Berlin: "After the curtain fell there was a deep, dark silence. Not a sound. It seemed to me the people weren't even breathing. It lasted minutes but seemed interminable. Then a thousand human beings arose and left the theatre. And still there was not a sound. I felt I had to walk outside to breathe. I met friends, and we asked each other, 'Have you ever had this kind of experience before?' None of us ever had."<sup>19</sup>

It is difficult to understand precisely the reason for

this kind of reaction on the part of the German audiences when one doesn't exactly know how the play was translated in German. Using the English text, I can only venture the admittedly subjective opinion that the reason German audiences were so moved was the youthful naivete of Anne who abnormally felt and believed that "people are really good heart."<sup>20</sup> Notwithstanding this touching scene at the Dusseldorf theatre, there has not been a single outcry against what has happened to the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam, against the fact that it presently serves as headquarters for those who embrace the ideology of the Arab liberation movements which includes the destruction of Israel and three million more Jews.<sup>21</sup> Too often, The Diary Of Anne Frank (primarily due to its transference into a play) is seen in the absence of Anne's impending death and this is what would allow for German audiences to be so emotionally moved by her chronicle because they see a girl who asserts life although she must die. The absence of the information of or actuality of death and murder (graphically described) allows for that Catholic reviewer to remark that normal life took place for the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto.

The Jews in the Warsaw ghetto continued in their habitual way of living - loving or hating each other, competing for employment papers, getting married, having babies, and hoping that tomorrow would be better than today.<sup>22</sup>

But secular reviewers also get into the act. They write of Anne Frank, "She was a normal girl with all the waywardness and caprice to which adolescents are entitled. But the record of

her spiritual life is what has humbled readers of her diary."<sup>23</sup>  
 And, "Anne Frank was certainly killed but she was never defeated"<sup>24</sup> (Save for her House now).

None of the events that surround The Wall or that take place in Anne's life should be considered in a vacuum. One must view the lives of those who lived behind the wall of the Warsaw ghetto and of Anne's life in the light of what was to happen to them. They may not have known at the time what would happen to them, but we now certainly know the gruesome details of what happened. If we are to make any sense out of the slaughter of the innocents, then we must understand this point, as must the playwright and the critic. To view the events of the holocaust apart from what was taking place in history allows for such a statement as this which was written with regard to The Diary Of Anne Frank -

The presents she manages to scrape together at Chanukkah, her love affair with the only boy available, her gradual maturing toward consideration of others, these are the actions of the play. The fact of her eventual death at Bersen-Belsen seems accidental, and has no real effect on the action.<sup>25</sup>

The fact of Anne's eventual death, the fact of the eventual death of all the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto - these facts have everything to do with the action. While one cannot fault Anne for her seemingly normal concerns because of the personal nature of a thirteen year old's recordings of events in an hidden attic, one can fault an audience or critic for failing to realize that her innocence should not be reason to assume our in-

nocence. We can never really know, but unless those people who left the German theatres in utter silence were honestly responding to the searing comments that such a play as Anne Frank makes about man's inhumanity to man, then Anne's final statement, "I still believe that people are really good at heart,"<sup>26</sup> will not redeem her naivete and her lofty thoughts.

The Wall, not so personally annotated as The Diary Of Anne Frank, could have been more self-exploratory when presenting such scenes as the wedding scene, but it chooses to present the scenes as facts of ghetto life, and asks the audience to supply the tragic elements in them. What The Diary Of Anne Frank and The Wall have in common is that both plays failed to translate to the stage those recorded facts (which have their own kind of unalterable truth and reality) into another kind of truth - dramatic, poetic.<sup>27</sup> Neither joy nor terror nor malice nor largeness of spirit are in Anne Frank's diary as seen on the stage, just as no power of feeling is transferred from Hersey's novel to the play The Wall. What we have instead is only their stagey counterfeits, fragile shells of emotion.<sup>28</sup> In Diary, "when the tears finally come, as they finally do, it is for the reported fact of that young life snuffed out at Bergen-Belsen concentration camp - not for the imaginative truth of it, which is the only kind of truth we can be concerned with in drama."<sup>29</sup>

A major controversy surrounded the production of Anne Frank. Meyer Levin, noted American-Israeli writer, originally had the rights to make a play of the Diary. But under pressure from Otto Frank, Anne's father, Levin relinquished the rights to producer Kermit Bloomgarden and Lillian Hellman, under whose supervision Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett dramatized the Diary. Levin was greatly disturbed because of what had been done to the Diary. Most of the particularism of Anne's feelings were omitted. Scenes of Jewish content were almost wholly left out. The Broadway play minimized the Jewish content of the Diary and Anne's awareness of what was happening outside the attic. Jerome Greenfield writes in The American Zionist:

Indeed, producer Bloomgarden virtually admitted this in reply to Levin's charge (in Congress Bi-Weekly) where he took a line that could be paraphrased as, "the less Jewish the more universal," which reverberated strangely with echoes of the opposition Levin encountered two decades earlier from both the Left and the publishing world. In the Hellman-influenced play, for example, Anne Frank's touching Jewish affirmations are missing, including the one where she wonders why God is doing this to the Jews and writes perhaps it is through the suffering of the Jews that humanity will yet come to learn the good. Also significantly missing is any reference to Zionism, which occurs on the first page in the book and is discussed thereafter among Anne's closest friends and her sister Margot - all of whom wanted to go to Palestine.<sup>30</sup>

Miss Algene Ballif writes in her article "Metamorphosis into American Adolescent" which appeared in Commentary in 1955:

The Anne Frank on Broadway cannot command our seriousness, for all Anne's true seriousness - her honesty, intelligence, and inner strength - has been left out of the script.<sup>31</sup>

When Levin's version of the Diary finally did appear in Israel it was generally considered "to be more faithful to the doomed girl's diary and to dramatize ideas of deeper Jewish significance omitted from the Broadway production."<sup>32</sup>

Max Frisch wrote about Andorra, "the author of an historical play is forced to encounter those who have actually lived through it all . . . But what if he is . . . a bad poet? Then the characters he has created will have ample cause for turning against him."<sup>33</sup> While some people will find The Wall and The Diary Of Anne Frank an experience of genuine intensity and truth, one cannot but think of the real people behind that ghetto wall, of the real Anne Frank - "of that soft, eager face, and the fine eyes luminous with a response to life - and of how she might have penciled furiously in that diary which is a permanent record of her spirit: 'Oh, no, they have gotten it all wrong. It wasn't that way at all.'"<sup>34</sup>

As aforementioned, it is the isolated scenes that make the plays worth while. I have refrained from discussing these scenes of specific import in Anne Frank because little new can be said about her diary and the events described therein. I only wanted to mention the controversy that swirled about

the play. There are two views - 1) that the play's individual scenes are moving and 2) that the play left out the seriousness of Anne's feelings in favor of some sort of "sentimental" approach to the content contained in her diary. I chose to treat the play as it had its effects on audiences, trying to show that we must understand her diary in light of the times out of which it came. And so we can leave Anne Frank and return to The Wall in order to look at some of the touching scenes included in it in the context of the times in which they took place.

One of the most touching scenes in The Wall closes Act Two. Stefan, the rabbi's son, is charged by the Germans with the task of rounding up Jews for deportation. There is little in the play to suggest what he feels about this task other than he had no choice in the matter (There is one stage direction preceding an announcement by Stefan that he has to take some Jews on a certain night - "On the edge of hysteria").<sup>35</sup> Stefan is now charged with bringing in four Jews for the train. Should he not do it himself then he will go to the train. This scene is reminiscent of the scene in Elie Wiesel's novel Night when Rabbi Eliahou's son, in a similar situation, leaves his father, or rather sacrifices him, so as not to jeopardize his own chances for survival. After Rabbi Eliahou inquires as to where his son is, he leaves not finding an answer. Immediately after he leaves,

Wiesel writes:

He (Rabbi Eliahou) had already passed through the door when I suddenly remembered seeing his son running by my side. I had forgotten that, and I didn't tell Rabbi Eliahou! Then I remembered something else: his son had seen him losing ground, limping, staggering back to the rear of the column. He had seen him. And he had continued to run out in front, letting the distance between them grow greater. A terrible thought loomed up in my mind; he had wanted to get rid of his father! He had felt that his father was growing weak, he believed that the end was near and had sought this separation in order to get rid of the burden, to free himself from an encumbrance which could lessen his own chances of survival.<sup>36</sup>

In The Wall Stefan, Reb Mazur's son, enters.

STEFAN: Father . . . I want to talk to you.

REB MAZUR: What is it? . . . What's wrong? What is it?  
What's the matter?

STEFAN: Papa, the Germans have given us a new order. Each policeman has to bring four people to the train station every day. Or else he has to go himself . . . I was wondering whether you would . . . go with me to the train station. Father . . . they're bound to get you one of these days. You can save me by going a few days earlier.<sup>37</sup>

Upon the father's exit, Stefan then abducts his friend's wife, Symka, for deportation. The argument that his father will have to go soon anyway and therefore will be only giving up a few days of his life is an object lesson, like the one Wiesel presents, for those who would choose the logical path over the honorable one.

The very next scene shows the departure at the train station of Reb Mazur and the parting emotions between a son and a father who is being betrayed by his son. The tragic

parting takes place under the ever watchful eyes of the Germans' eyes.

GERMAN OFFICER: Rabbi?

REB MAZUR: Yes.

GERMAN OFFICER: Left.

RUTKA (The cry escaping her): No!

MORDECAI: Sir, that's my wife's father (referring to Rutka), I'm on the labor battalion, they said that the immediate families would not have to -

GERMAN OFFICER: You wish to accompany him?

RUTKA: No! Please! You have no right! Stefan, tell them!

REB MAZUR: Go children. Go home.

RUTKA: Papa . . .

REB MAZUR: Try to send me an extra shirt to the train station. (He looks at the anguished Stefan, who will not face him. Crosses left to join the others. The Beggar Child steps forward.)

GERMAN OFFICER: Left.

(Stefan picks up the Beggar Child, carrying her to the left to join the others. The Beggar Child steps forward)

GERMAN SERGEANT: All finished here.

GERMAN OFFICER: Next building.

(Rutka crosses left, reaching for Reb Mazur. Stefan blocks her. Mordecai crosses to take Rutka, leading her into the house. Stefan herds off the group chosen for resettlement . . .)<sup>38</sup>

This is the most poignant scene in The Wall as it shows the depths to which a man was forced to sink under the terror

of the Nazis. The play, as throughout, makes no statement about this incident, but only reports it as a fact of the holocaust. The tragedy is that often enough the holocaust did pit child against parent. We have in this scene a child sacrificing his parent. In the closing scene of the play we have a parent sacrificing her child. As the play ends, and the ghetto is in flames, there is a chance for some of the principal characters to escape even though the Germans are about.

(Sound of dogs baying . . . baby begins to cry)

MORDECAI: Do something. Get him quiet. Do something!

(The baby cries)

KATZ: Get him quiet! They'll hear. They'll hear!  
Get him quiet!

(Rutka hunches over the baby, pressing it fiercely to her breast. It's cry is abruptly cut off. . .)  
trying to find him

RACHEL: Dolek . . . He's (Dolek) baiting them (the Germans). He's leading them away. The Germans are rushing around trying to find him.

MORDECAI: (To Rutka) Thank God you got him quiet. How did you manage? (Rutka's face is a numb mask. She hugs the baby, rocking it. Looking at the baby) What have you done? What have you done?

RUTKA: (A sob) Sweet, sweet, sweet . . .

MORDECAI: (Grabbing her murderously) What have you done to him?

RUTKA: Mordecai, Mordecai, Mordecai . . . 39

That the two people in the play who commit murder as

a result of the circumstances they find themselves in happen to be the rabbi's children further accents the brutality under which the Jews lived. Here we have a rabbi, like Wiesel's Rabbi Eliahou, who is the symbol of God's holiness and supreme morality - and it is his children who are forced to profane all that is holy.

There are other scenes in The Wall worth noting. As in Andorra, we find in The Wall some psychological effects that persecution has upon the individual. Just as Andri began to believe he actually possessed those traits that his persecutors ascribed to him, so too we have in The Wall a similar acceptance of these traits on the part of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto.

MENKES: Berson, what do you feel? Pride? Shame? You carry a mark, like they spit on you. Are you the same man?

BERSON: Yes.

MENKES: No!<sup>40</sup>

With the exception of The Deputy and Nelly Sach's poem-play Eli, none of the playwrights deal with the theological aspect of the holocaust, an aspect that haunts such a prose-poet of the holocaust like Elie Wiesel. What if any part did God play in the destruction of the Jews? The Wall briefly alludes to this theological dilemma, but only in the most superficial way. When it is announced that the Germans have

forbidden the Jews to gather for prayer, Reb Mazur tells his friends to have faith. But when he says this he is met with derision.

SHPUNT: You hear? Have faith. Say two hundred prayers a day. A prayer when he eats an apple, a prayer when he buttons his pants. Have faith. Hoo-ha.

REB MAZUR: I will lift up mine eyes to the hills, from whence cometh my help.

SHPUNT: Sure. Wait for God's help. And while I'm waiting, I can jump out a window.<sup>41</sup>

In a later scene:

BERSON: . . . Have you seen Fishel Shpunt?

REB MAZUR: Not lately. Maybe the Germans took him away. Wait, God will punish them.

BERSON: God? Is there a God? What is He, a practical joker?<sup>42</sup>

It is interesting to note that all discussion about God is restricted to the dialogue that includes the rabbi. But an understanding of God's participation in the holocaust is such a difficult task that few playwrights have dealt with it. We will see in the next chapter how difficult it is, as God's role in the holocaust is continually called into question in The Deputy.

What The Wall lacks is a strong attitude toward its shocking content. By merely describing what happens, it glosses over many crucial questions inherent in the play. Were the Warsaw Jews too docile? Is there support for Hannah Arendt's

charge that they let themselves be led like lambs to slaughter? Were the Jews too eager to prolong their captivity to gain life at any cost? Can any group of individuals be reduced to such levels as Stefan and Rutka being fed an exact amount of terror? Would it have been better for the Warsaw Jews to take up their resistance earlier? Did God, if he had anything to do with what happened, inflict these cruelties upon His creatures for some grand design? Do those who survived the holocaust, and those who were unaffected by it have a daily responsibility not to let this happen again? And finally, what degree of guilt and/or responsibility do I share in this most tragic of human tragedies?

Watch On The Rhine, The Wall, and The Diary Of Anne Frank do not provide us with answers or challenge us with much vigor. They do, however, show us important tragic elements of the holocaust that should move us deeply enough to feel for the victims and not follow on the road that Messrs. Weiss, Shaw, et. al. lead - a road that abuses the victims in order to serve some obscure, self-seeking social comment about the type of society we live in.

## V. THE DEPUTY

## HISTORY AS DRAMA

Rolf Hochhuth's play The Deputy, which stormed onto the stage in 1964, has been called the most controversial play of this generation. The play deals with the failure of Pope Pius XII to make an unequivocal statement condemning the massacre of European Jews. Hochhuth's highly documented play shows that facts about the Pope's silence cannot be in dispute,<sup>1</sup> despite the counterclaims, mostly by Catholics, that extend all the way to Pope Paul VI.<sup>2</sup> The Pope possessed all the necessary information pertinent to the deportation of the Jews not only immediately outside the Vatican, but all over Germany and Poland. Hannah Arendt, authoress of Eichmann In Jerusalem, says that "the play might as well be called the most factual literary work of this generation as 'the most controversial.'"<sup>3</sup> The Deputy is a play, a book, a documentary, a news story, and, above all, a factual and philosophical statement.<sup>4</sup>

Once one decides precisely what type of art form, if

any kind at all, The Deputy is, then he can proceed to discuss those themes in the work that give the play its power. The Deputy deals with an event in history, the murder of six million Jews, an event that is itself drama, tragic drama of the highest order. The value of Hochhuth's work is that it can force us back into history, helping us to view history as drama. The Deputy, then, in a traditional sense, can be classified as a modern tragedy. It is worth noting Lope de Vega's comment that "tragedy has as its argument history."<sup>5</sup> Hochhuth has achieved an authentic and artistic tragedy by the "sheer disposition of his facts and the eloquence and the crushing logic of history."<sup>6</sup> Hochhuth himself wrote, "I believe that in a play historical events can be marshalled toward a dramatic climax, and different points of view can be made to clash more sharply, and forcefully, than in a work of fiction."<sup>7</sup>

What is significant, however, about Hochhuth's tragedy is that it cuts through all categories - art, history, philosophy, religion, politics - in an attempt to explain the spiritual collapse of an institution, a civilization, indeed God, through the Vicar of Christ. "If it is anything at all it is an act of frustration in the face of categories and complexity, an attempt to give definition and location to an overwhelming diffuse and imprecise moral anguish."<sup>8</sup> In this sense the play is much like the trial of Adolf Eichmann.

In Hannah Arendt's work on Eichmann she was able to develop much in the character of Eichmann. She showed him to be what essentially he served to be - the local, identifiable, graspable source of horror, "the foul consciousness which could explain all unconsciousness, the bounded agency which could account for unbounded crime."<sup>9</sup> It is a moon shot from Eichmann to Pope Pius XII, but one that Hochhuth undoubtedly wants us to launch. Just as Eichmann served for the Israelis, as Hannah Arendt points out, as the principle upon which all indignation, shame and humiliation was hurled, so does Pope Pius XII, for Hochhuth, serve as an indictment against the past. Hochhuth's Eichmann is Pope Pius XII, the negation of life come to life, whose silence was as instrumental in the human tragedy that struck down six million Jews as Eichmann's active participation in that destruction. As Eichmann was held accountable in the drama that unfolded behind his glass booth for the sins of all, so too is Pius held accountable and responsible for the silence of everyone everywhere.

With an eye toward the drama that unveiled itself at Eichmann's trial, a real event in history, Hochhuth finds drama in the person of Pope Pius XII, and as such Pius serves for him as both a thematic center and an organizing principle for his play. Eichmann also was at center stage in that

glass booth standing on trial in a dual role - as the individual whose personal guilt was immeasurable and as the personification for the whole history of Anti-semitism which reached its dramatic climax in the death of six million Jews. The trial, as is Hochhuth's play, was a real-live drama that tries somehow to make comprehensible the incomprehensible. As Eichmann sat in his glass booth, a great collective dirge was enacted that included the facts of an historical agony. The function of the trial was to let the trial stand as the tragic dramatic force by which to explain the greatest tragedy of our age.

The trial is pre-eminently a theatrical form, and it is interesting to note that such controversial plays about the holocaust as The Investigation and The Man In The Glass Booth have as their form the trial. Hochhuth, who must have been aware of this fact of theatre, moves from the Eichmann trial as drama to place Pope Pius XII on trial. The Deputy, like the trial, is an attempt to deal dramatically with a tragedy of history. Hochhuth follows the classical forms of drama by showing a contest between a protagonist, Riccardo, and an antagonist, Pius; and through them arriving at a "verdict" on the action.<sup>10</sup> The Deputy takes history, the people in it, and presents itself on the stage as drama, drama that is so powerful that we are ourselves become participants with those

dramatic figures and dramatic events which comprise the tragedy of our times, the murder of the six million. The drama unfolds as we are shown not only what happened, but how it happened, why it happened, and who was responsible.

### GUILT AND RESPONSIBILITY

(The unemotional voice of an announcer on tape reads:)

Although the Pope is said to have been importuned from various quarters, he has not allowed himself to be carried away into making any demonstrative statements against the deportation of the Jews . . . And so the gas chambers continued to work for a full year more. In the summer of 1944 the so-called daily quota of exterminations reached its maximum. On November 26, 1944 Himmler ordered the crematoria to be blown up. Two months later the last prisoners in Auschwitz were freed by Russian soldiers.<sup>11</sup>

With this announcement the curtain falls on The Deputy.

Why didn't the Pope speak out? Further, why did the Pope even seem to defend the Germans and Hitler? Who bears the responsibility, the guilt - the Pope, the Church, institutions, God? Unlike the other holocaust plays, The Deputy examines these questions through specific individuals in history, and through, more specifically, the person of Pope Pius XII, the Vicar of Christ.

The play is about choices. Hochhuth demonstrates that an individual can choose the right path. Hochhuth uses the

Pope, a non-combatant of vast world influence, as his crucial example of a man choosing. For reasons of state, neutrality, protection of authority and fear of Communism, The Pope chooses to take a stand that will permit the murder of the Jews to proceed unhindered. The Pope remarks to Count Fontana, Riccardo's (the play's protagonist) father, " . . . Whoever wants to help, must not provoke Hitler . . . "12

The Pope tells the Count in the presence of Riccardo:

POPE: Hitler, alone, dear Count, is now defending Europe. And he will fight until he dies because no pardon awaits the murderer. Nevertheless, the West should grant him pardon as long as he is useful in the East.<sup>13</sup>

Through all of this, Hochhuth demonstrates that the Pope can, by speaking out, do something, indeed that the Pope can save millions of Jews from death. Hochhuth writes, "Perhaps never before in history have so many human beings paid with their lives for the passivity of a single statesman."<sup>14</sup> Yet while Jews were being deported before the Pope's eyes, the Pope refused to utter anything more than the most general Christmas message: " . . . one single plea for brotherly love."<sup>15</sup> - to which Count Fontana replied,

FONTANA: Your Holiness, I too was sadly disappointed that it remains without effect. However, in that message Your Holiness did not, unfortunately, mention the Jews expressis verbis . . . anything addressed to Hitler . . . requires words so blunt as not to be misunderstood.<sup>16</sup>

The Pope by his own admission knew what was going on, arous-

ing Riccardo to respond, "Then Your Holiness has already known - for weeks - what the SS here intended to do to the Jews?"<sup>17</sup> In Germany some of the hierarchy of the Church spoke out, yet Pius chose to remain silent. It is this silence, a willful act, a choice, that troubles Hochhuth, particularly when the Pope himself knew that if he were to speak out, he would save Jews. Hochhuth argues in his "Sidelights on History" (attached to the written text of the play) and through his characters that a protest by the Pope would have been effective. He advances for evidence the fact that in August, 1941, Hitler, faced by the protests of Catholic and Protestant Clergy, halted the mass murder of the German mentally sick, undertaken when the war began.<sup>18</sup> But when Count Fontana pleads with the Pope to issue a proclamation, all the Pope can do is defend his diplomatic stance - " . . . Certainly the terror against the Jews is loathesome, but we must not allow it to insense us so that we forget the duties that devolve upon the Germans for the immediate future . . ."<sup>19</sup> And so the guilt and the responsibility for much of what happened rests squarely on the shoulders of Pius, who not only knew what was going on, but who also knew that one word from him would have helped as evidenced by the words from the German Clergy. For Father Riccardo, the real spokesman of Christ -

(ABBOT: Do you suggest a priest take it upon himself to speak in the Pope's name?

RICCARDO: Yes, when the Pope forgets to speak out in the name of Christ.)<sup>20</sup>

- a Pope who knows of the deportation of Jews and that his word could help prevent it, such "a Vicar of Christ who has that under his eyes and who still keeps silent for reasons of state, who reflects a single day, who hesitates for a single hour to raise his voice in grief to pronounce a solemn malediction - such a Pope is a criminal."<sup>21</sup>

The play is so designed that the question of guilt and responsibility is carried to the Pope himself. But Hochhuth is careful to point out that the Pope is a head of an institution who sees himself as having a duty to guarantee the survival of that institution. All of the Pope's calculations, including that Bolshevism is a worse menace than Nazism, are based on duty as he interprets duty in God's name - "The Lord had made his decision for our salvation."<sup>22</sup> Pope Pius XII's morality is not that of an individual but of an incorporate body with branches in many nations and many heavens. But what is so horrifying is that one man can assume so much corporate guilt. Yet the Pope's hideous inactions show that he does indeed merit this corporate guilt. The Pope's spokesman, the Cardinal, says of his Holiness:

CARDINAL: . . . The Chief would lose a great deal of

prestige if he endangered his position for the Jews, Riccardo . . .<sup>23</sup> The Chief, you know, would be risking a great deal if he took up cudgels for Jews. Minorities are always unpopular, in every country. The Jews have longed provoked the Germans, you know. They overdrew on the credit they'd been given over in Germany. Pogroms do not fall from heaven . . .<sup>24</sup>

It is with these extraordinary comments that The Deputy serves as a symbol for the sins of all during Hitler's mass murder. It is powerful drama to use the Pope as the central figure for collective guilt and responsibility, for he is a big enough figure to command individual blame, and a broad enough figure to suggest universal blame.

It has been suggested that the German people may be pleased with the play because impugning the Pope for his silence exonerates them for theirs. The intention of the play was to show that the buck cannot be passed, but rather is handed in the line of responsibility right up to God who in His silence also refuses to accept it. But the audiences seem to be reacting in a way that is reminiscent of their reaction to plays like Shaw's The Man In The Glass Booth, Weiss' The Investigation, and The Diary Of Anne Frank. Whereas those plays allowed the audience to feel comfortable because they have been told in the plays one way or another that they are free from blame, The Deputy by no stretch of interpretation allows this.

One would be remiss were he not to mention the reaction of the audience to the problem of guilt and responsibility.

Half the public shouts angry defenses of the Church and the Pope, and the other half luxuriates in a "confession" of corporate "sin," safe in the knowledge that no one can be punished for that. "A sort of merchandising of guilt is going on. Some people are buying and others are trying to sell."<sup>25</sup> Instead of seeing Hochhuth's point, playgoers "prefer to hurl accusations at one another . . . But let them not imagine they are in that way helping mankind to avoid the repetition of the evils they deplore."<sup>26</sup> There is no need here to hash over the great controversy that The Deputy has stirred throughout the world - the riots, slander, and general ugliness of many of the protests speak for themselves. "Suffice it to say that the customary conditions following the publication of an unpleasant truth have prevailed, and humanity has managed to disgrace itself once again."<sup>27</sup> By passing the buck, we miss the point of The Deputy. Pope Pius XII, admittedly, is a symbol. He symbolizes the truth that the "way for evil to triumph is for good men to keep silent." To accuse him, we must remember, is to accuse ourselves. Pius was not only God's Deputy, he is our representative - the representative of our inhumanity.<sup>28</sup>

Arthur C. Cochrane summarizes in an article in Christianity and Crisis:

If the symbol of the "deputy" is not applied to the whole Christian church as the vicar of Christ, as the ambassador for Christ to whom the message of reconcilia-

tion has been entrusted, and if the guilt imputed to Pius XII is not recognized and confessed as the guilt of Christendom toward the Jews - not only in Germany during 1933-45 but in every age and in every country since 72 A.D. - the The Deputy will be seen and heard in vain. Then it can only give rise to bitter accusations and counter-accusations, self-righteous protestations of innocence and mutual re-crimination.

No Church, especially in our age, can expect to be taken seriously as the "representative" of God on earth unless she acknowledges her solidarity with the sin of the world and puts her hope in the forgiveness of her sins. And how can the Church ever hope to be reconciled with Israel without confessing her transgressions against God's chosen people.<sup>29</sup>

#### GOD'S RESPONSIBILITY

One of the dilemmas raised in The Deputy, and only barely alluded to in the other holocaust plays, is the question: What was God's part in the whole thing? If God speaks the truth and acts justly, then certainly someone other than Pius should serve as His agent. Indeed, when Pius uses God to explain evil, then someone else must appoint himself deputy. There is little question that Pius and the high ranking Churchmen do use God to justify their action on the side of evil.

GERSTEIN: Your Eminence, that could not be. God would not be God if He made use of Hitler . . .

CARDINAL: Oh yes, oh yes, most certainly, my friend! Was not even Cain, who killed his brother the instrument of God?<sup>30</sup>

This last statement is made to justify the Pope's action for signing the concordat with Hitler and further justifies the Pope's role as mediator so as to make sure the concordat stands -

POPE: . . . Do not you see that disaster looms for Christian Europe unless God makes Us, the Holy See, the mediator? The hour is dark. To be sure We know they will not touch the Vatican. Hitler has only recently renewed his guarantee . . . 31

It is Riccardo who sees himself as the spokesman of God because of Pius' refusal to accept the responsibility. Riccardo does not want to be held accountable for what is happening:

RICCARDO: . . . You must see that the silence of the Pope in favor of the murderers imposes a guilt upon the Church for which we must atone. And since the Pope, although only a man, can actually represent God on earth, I . . . a poor Priest . . . if need be can also represent the Pope - there where the Pope ought to be standing today. 32

It is then Riccardo who takes on the task of explaining God's action in the holocaust. A dialogue is set up between Riccardo and the most sinister of characters in the play, the Doctor, evil incarnate, who presided over the bodily destruction of the Jews and who took great delight in detailing what happened to the Jews at Auschwitz:

DOCTOR: I cremate life. That is modern humanitarianism . . . Nine thousand in one day. Pretty little vermin, like that child you were holding. All the same, in an hour they're unconscious or dead. (Calmly) At any rate ready for the furnace. Young children often go in to the furnaces still alive, though unconscious. An interesting phenomenon. In-

fants, especially. A remarkable fact: the gas doesn't always kill them.<sup>33</sup>

Then the Doctor challenges Riccardo:

DOCTOR: Since July of '42, for fifteenth months, weekdays and sabbaths, I've been sending people to God. Do you think he's made the slightest acknowledgement? He has not even directed a bolt of lightning against me . . . (He laughs like a torturer) History: dust and altars, misery and rape, and all glory a mockery of its victims. The truth is, Auschwitz refutes creator, creation, and the creature. Life as an idea is dead.<sup>34</sup>

Riccardo supplies no sufficient response to the Doctor.

The best he can offer is a lame answer:

RICCARDO: I have nothing more to say if you make God responsible for the crimes of His Church. God does not stand above history. He shares the fate of the natural order. In Him all man's anguish is contained.<sup>35</sup>

To which the Doctor replies, "Oh yes, I also learned that drivell once."<sup>36</sup>

The question remains then, if God is indeed not above history but intimately involved in it, how can He allow such wanton cruelty to be inflicted upon His creatures? This question is never satisfyingly answered. It is Hochhuth's intention not to answer it either, for he wants the Church and her constituents to do the answering. Hochhuth admits, "I had said inexcusable things about God . . . this question about God is more essential than the silence of death of the so-called confessional peace which my play has been accused of endangering . . . Christians live much too

comfortably today . . . "37

There is another reason why Hochhuth can supply no answer for God's silence. In his climatic Fifth Act, "Auschwitz, or Where Are You, God?", Hochhuth's dialogue about God takes place between the two men least likely to hold an honest discussion about God. The Doctor is so sinister a character, painted so black, that it is totally unrealistic that he would be able to raise the challenging questions about God, and thus serve as a conscience for God and a mirror for our belief in Him. Also Riccardo has been painted by Hochhuth as too predictable a character. Just as the Doctor serves as a narrow, and unreal agent of opposition to Riccardo, so is Riccardo the same narrow agent of opposition to the Pope and the Church. Riccardo serves as an emblem of revulsion from moral failure and an unchanging container for the corrective act which sees its climax when he takes the Jewish startupon himself and goes to his death with the rest of the Jews at Auschwitz. Dramatically, Riccardo does not grow in his part. As soon as he learns the facts about the Jews, he swings into predictable motion, approaching every so often "a pseudo-Dostoevskian confrontation with the anguish of faith besieged by social horror but sinking continually back into mere functionalism, a rod of indignation with which to beat Pius and a weight to throw onto the scales."38

When Riccardo finally tries to atone for the sins of the Church and of his people by volunteering his life, it is predictable in the context of the play. While Riccardo is based on an actual person, Father Maximilian Kolbe, Riccardo's death, while true to Kolbe's fate, serves only to give an added dramatic flair to the play, a flair which is not necessary. Indeed, after all that Hochhuth has said throughout the play, it is disturbing that the hero, the martyr, should be this Priest - above the true martyrs. Yet the power of Hochhuth's history does not finally allow Riccardo's death to serve as any sort of expiation for our sins. Quite the contrary, Riccardo's death accentuates our guilt and sense of shame. No Christ-like act can atone for the murder of the six million. That would be too simple. Precisely because the murder of the Jews defies such a Christ-like sacrifice, Hochhuth leaves God's responsibility in the holocaust unanswered. Hochhuth will not allow God to use Riccardo as a means to either exonerate God himself, His Pope, His Church, or His people. Hochhuth writes, "But the question about God is timeless, as the atrocities are timeless ."39

## A FINAL STATEMENT

The main point of The Deputy is not an entirely re-criminatory one. It is for certain an attack on the Germans and the Pope, on the Church hierarchy and on God, but it is also a statement that absolute honor and decency - though they may entail martyrdom - are possible and even mandatory. Because Hochhuth shows us persons who have chosen the right path, the decent and honorable one, he has a right to charge with unforgettable forgiveness the others who refused to choose, who refused to speak out.<sup>40</sup>

The power of The Deputy derives from Hochhuth's ability to show the full weight of the mass suffering and death caused by the Nazis, aided by a silent Church and Pope, and yet keep alive a sense of individual choice and responsibility. Both as a whole, and in individual scenes, The Deputy, in a very real sense, is a traditional "rescue-drama."<sup>41</sup>

## EPILOGUE

It is painful to relive a history so filled with horror. The holocaust is such high drama in itself, a tragedy of such magnitude, that to see the events and the people who participated in this human tragedy unfold on the stage pricks the very core of our being.

Within each play considered here, there is some element that can serve us as a reminder of an event we cannot afford to put from our minds. While some plays use the holocaust in a distorted fashion to explain guilt in our world, they still serve us in some way as a means to understand what happened. It is regrettable if those plays do not succeed above merely scratching our conscience. Yet their attempt to deal with the event of the murder of six million Jews is notable. However, those plays which boldly lay claim to honest answers for the holocaust, these are the plays that can powerfully command us never to allow such evil to enter our world again.

We must understand the holocaust in such a way as to know who is to blame. Once we have done this, we can move to universal or general claims about the involvements

of others. The failure to focus on individual blame is most clearly represented in Weiss' The Investigation.

Intellectually, he (Weiss) appears to embrace the fallacy of universal guilt. The words Jew and German are never uttered in The Investigation. Ironically, this depersonalization is not unrelated to the dehumanization that made the whole merciless horror possible. As the victims the Jews merit the epitaph of being named. As the perpetrators of the crime, the Germans deserve to be indicted.<sup>1</sup>

The best example in a play which, by indicting specific individuals, makes the most authentic universal statement about the holocaust is contained in The Deputy.

On October 28, 1943, Herr von Weizacker, Hitler's ambassador to the Holy See, writes to the foreign office in Berlin: . . . the Pope . . . has not allowed himself to be carried away into making any demonstrative statements against the deportation of the Jews . . . On November 26, 1944, Himmler ordered the crematoria to be blown up . . .<sup>2</sup>

But whatever strengths or weaknesses these dramas possess, they have in them the possibility of acting out for us the entire bitter story that must never be forgotten if humanity and sanity are to enter into our world once more.

## FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

## Introduction

- <sup>1</sup>Tom Prideaux, "Stage Review," Life, Vol. 61 (Oct. 28, 1966), p. 8.
- <sup>2</sup>Susan Sontag, "Reflections on The Deputy," in The Storm Over The Deputy, ed. Eric Bentley (New York, 1964), p. 118.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>4</sup>"Theatre" Time, Vol. 76 (Oct. 24, 1960), p. 73.

## Chapter 1

- <sup>1</sup>Leonard Moss, Arthur Miller, (New Haven, 1967), p. 79
- <sup>2</sup>Arthur Miller, After The Fall (New York, 1969), p. 1.
- <sup>3</sup>Sidney Howard White, Guide To Arthur Miller (Columbus, Ohio, 1970), p. 37.
- <sup>4</sup>Miller, p. 12
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 6.
- <sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 12 & 13.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-16.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 15.
- <sup>9</sup>Edward Murray, Arthur Miller: Dramatist (New York, 1967), p. 149.
- <sup>10</sup>Miller, p. 21.
- <sup>11</sup>Moss, p. 86.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>13</sup>Miller, p. 59.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>White, p. 39.

<sup>16</sup>Murray, p. 132.

<sup>17</sup>Miller, pp. 113 & 114.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 114.

<sup>19</sup>Ronald Hayman, Arthur Miller (London, 1970), p. 14.

<sup>20</sup>Moss, p. 97.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Comparisons between Hitler's extermination of the Jews and the tacit support of the German populace and the surrounding nations are not analogous to America's involvement in Vietnam. While Hannah Arendt and Miller may claim that Jews went like "lambs to slaughter," one does not hear them echoing the same sentiments about the Vietnamese. In fact, Hitler's wholesale slaughter of the Jews was totally apart from the war effort. Both his rhetorical and physical assault on the Jews are not analogous to the killing in Vietnam which is solely attributed to the war there. Indeed, Miller may write eloquently in his essay, "Our Guilt for the World's Evil" (New York Times, Jan. 3, 1965, Sec. VI, pp. 10-11, 48) about Harlem, but rats eating human flesh is not the same as six million bodies being purposely charred in crematoria so that their skin be used for soap.

<sup>23</sup>Penelope Gilliat, "Review of Incident at Vichy," in Contemporary Theatre, ed. Geoffrey Morgan (London, 1968), p. 185.

<sup>24</sup>Murray, p. 178.

<sup>25</sup>Arthur Miller, Incident At Vichy (New York, 1965), p. 4.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>29</sup>Moss, p. 98.

<sup>30</sup>Miller, Incident At Vichy, p. 105.

<sup>31</sup>Jack Sutherland, "Review of Incident at Vichy," in Contemporary Theatre, ed. G. Morgan. p. 180.

<sup>32</sup>Miller, Incident At Vichy, p. 103.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 37-38.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 103-112.

<sup>35</sup>Alan Brien, "Review of Incident at Vichy," in Contemporary Theatre, ed. G. Morgan. p. 181.

<sup>36</sup>Murray, pp. 171-172.

## Chapter 2

<sup>1</sup>Charles Lazurus, "Interview with Robert Shaw," in Montreal Star, Saturday, Feb. 26, 1972, p. A-2.

<sup>2</sup>Oliver Clausen, "A Look at The Investigation," The New York Times Magazine, Sunday, Oct. 21, 1966, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>Peter Weiss, Aftonbladet (Stockholm, June 17, 1968) as paraphrased by Walter Lequeuer, The Road To War (Great Britain, 1968), pp. 250-251.

<sup>4</sup>Clausen, p. 32.

<sup>5</sup>Robert Shaw, The Man In The Glass Booth (New York, 1968), p. 68.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Tom Prideaux, "Theatre" Life, Vol. 65 (Oct. 25, 1968), p. 20.

<sup>8</sup>Jack Kroll, "Theatre" Newsweek, Vol. 72 (Oct. 7, 1968), p. 116.

<sup>9</sup>Gerald Weales, "The Stage: People in Glass Booths," Commonweal, Vol. 89 (Nov. 15, 1968), p. 253.

<sup>10</sup>Shaw, p. 64.

- <sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 68.
- <sup>12</sup>Clausen, p. 34.
- <sup>13</sup>Time, Vol. 92 (Oct. 4, 1968), pp. 65-66.
- <sup>14</sup>Shaw, p. 30.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 62.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid..
- <sup>17</sup>Clausen, p. 32.
- <sup>18</sup>Time, p. 66.
- <sup>19</sup>Harold Clurman, "The Theatre," The Nation, Vol. 207 (Oct. 21, 1968), p. 411.
- <sup>20</sup>Richard Gillman, "Theatre Review," New Republic, Vol. 159 (Oct. 19, 1968), p. 37.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>22</sup>Clausen, p. 32.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 34.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup>Peter Weiss, The Investigation, (trans. Jon Swan and Ulu Grosbard (New York, 1967), p. 196.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 197.
- <sup>27</sup>Walter Kerr, "Weiss' Map of Man's Mind," New York Times, Theatre Arts Section, (Sunday, Nov. 13, 1966, p. 1.
- <sup>28</sup>Clausen, p. 32.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 34.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 36.
- <sup>32</sup>Anthony West, "The Investigation: Vicarious Experience of Cruelty," Vogue, Vol. 148 (Nov. 15, 1966), p. 99.

<sup>33</sup>Theophilus Lewis, "Review," America, Vol. 115 (Oct. 29, 1966), p. 525.

<sup>34</sup>Kerr, p. 2.

<sup>35</sup>Weiss, p. 201.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 268.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 269.

<sup>38</sup>Clausen, p. 34.

<sup>39</sup>Clausen, p. 36.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>44</sup>What Weiss does not face is that evidence contradicts his view in that given a different deal the Jews would not have done the same as their exterminators. While Weiss cites Israel as a nation that is Nazi-prone, on a relative scale Israel seems far less Nazi-oriented than the countries he would embrace (using Nazi Germany as the paradigm as Weiss would want). After the Six Day War of June, 1967 there were no massacres of Arabs as was the case in Biafra and Bangladesh. And how Nazified can a country be when it outlaws capital punishment even against Arab terrorists?

<sup>45</sup>Oliver Clausen writes that all Weiss had to do upon his visit to Auschwitz was "to consider the mountain of suitcases, the owner's names and addresses written on each one in large white letters and the Nazis decreed Jewish name after Jewish name. . . . to take a look at the suitcases or in another room, on walls covered with drawings made by children who were never to grow up. They are naively impressionistic in the universal style of children's art. Some do show soldiers in concentration camp scenes and other motifs from the horror they were enduring. But most recall a preoccupation with a happier past, father and mother, dogs and horses, the sun shining on a peaceful home with flowers around it. The children, as if in return for being allowed into the make believe world of their drawings, had to sign each one with name and number. Again these are Jewish names. One turns

away, dazed from the most pathetic of art exhibitions and walks back to the piles of tiny shoes that become agonizingly real now. Was the child who made that particular sunny drawing wearing this pair when he was called away by the guards in order to undo the shoe laces while big men stood over him with guns to shove him and all his playmates into the nice big bathroom? There were soiled shoes and clean shoes, depending on where the child was when the final call came. The mind cannot grasp the finality of it all. It must be a delusion . . . See everything is alright, then back to the shoes, and belatedly such is the tract that Auschwitz plays on the mind. It becomes almost blindingly clear that what is missing are the small feet inside them." Jews are missing from Weiss' play. Clausen continues, "Why should the Poles seem to have such a bad conscience about acknowledging that most of them were Jewish feet? After all the Nazis placed the great extermination camp at Auschwitz in Poland because it was a convenient railroad junction where Jews could be shipped from all parts of Europe. Perhaps the Poles and other Europeans are uncomfortable at Auschwitz because it reminds them of their own guilt at other times and other place." (Causen, p. 36-38).

<sup>46</sup>Kerr, p. 1.

<sup>47</sup>Clausen, p. 32.

<sup>48</sup>R.J. Schroeder, "The Investigation," Commonweal, Vol. 85 (Nov. 4, 1966), p. 141.

<sup>49</sup>Jean-Paul Sartre, Theatre Arts (June, 1946)- see f.n. 50

<sup>50</sup>Henry Peyre, "Preface" in The Condemned Of Altona by Jean-Paul Sartre, trans. Sylvia and George Leeson (New York, 1961), p. ix.

<sup>51</sup>Jean-Paul Sartre, The Condemned Of Altona, trans. Sylvia and George Leeson (New York, 1961), p. 177.

<sup>52</sup>Peyre, p. vii.

<sup>53</sup>Sartre, pp. 177-178.

<sup>54</sup>Sartre, p. 178..

<sup>55</sup>Kenneth Tynan, The London Observer, found on back cover of The Condemned Of Altona. See f.n. 51.

<sup>56</sup>Lazurus, p. A-2.

<sup>57</sup>Arthur Miller, After The Fall (New York, 1969), p. 113.

### Chapter 3

<sup>1</sup>Ulrich Weisstein, Max Firisch (New York, 1967), p. 155.

<sup>2</sup>Max Frisch, Andorra, trans. Michael Bullock (New York, 1962), p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 45.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>10</sup>Weisstein, p. 110.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 158.

<sup>12</sup>Frisch, p. 23.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>14</sup>Weisstein, p. 161.

<sup>15</sup>Frisch, p. 53.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>17</sup>Weisstein, p. 163.

<sup>18</sup>Frisch, p. 23.

<sup>19</sup>Weisstein, p. 111

<sup>20</sup>Frisch, p. 60.

<sup>21</sup>Weisstein, p. p. 110.

<sup>22</sup>Max Frisch, Three Plays: Don Juan, Or The Love Of Money, The Great Rage Of Phillip Hotz, When The War Was Over, trans. James L. Rosenberg (New York, 1967), p. 133.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Weisstein, p. 116.

#### Chapter 4

<sup>1</sup>Lillian Hellman, Six Plays: The Children's Hour, Days To Come, The Little Foxes, Watch On The Rhine, Another Part Of The Forest, The Autumn Garden (New York, 1960), p. xii.

<sup>2</sup>Jean Gould, Modern American Playwrights (New York, 1966), p. 176.

<sup>3</sup>Hellman, p. 298.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 300.

<sup>5</sup>"~~Theatre~~" Time, Vol. 76 (Oct. 24, 1960), p. 73.

<sup>6</sup>Henry Hewes, "Broadway Postscript: Bricks and Faint Hope," Saturday Review, Vol. 43 (Oct. 29, 1960), p. 27.

<sup>7</sup>"~~Theatre~~" Time, Vol. 76 (Oct. 24, 1960), p. 73.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Millard Lampell, The Wall (New York, 1961), p. 59.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>12</sup>Theophilus Lewis, "The Wall," America, Vol. 104 (Dec. 3, 1960), p. 354.

<sup>13</sup>Theophilus Lewis, "Anne Frank," America, Vol. 94 (Oct. 22, 1955), p. 110.

<sup>14</sup>Marya Mannes, "Review," Reporter, Vol. 13 (Dec. 29, 1955), p. 3.

<sup>15</sup>Oliver Clausen, "A Look at The Investigation," The New York Times Magazine. Sunday, Oct. 12, 1966, p. 32.

<sup>16</sup>R.J. Schroeder, "The Investigation," Commonweal, Vol. 85 (Nov. 4, 1966), p. 141.

<sup>17</sup>There seems to be an attempt among German audiences to water-down the more descriptive parts of the holocaust that show the physical and psychological brutality of the event. Max Frisch, at the end of *Andorra*, implies Andri's shooting without showing it - "For a long time . . . I wished to introduce a prisoner tied to a stake in order to give my action grandeur, as a choric element reappearing throughout the drama, his aria of despair." (Ulrich Weisstein, Max Frisch, (New York, 1967, p. 163.) But even the stake itself is relegated to a shadowy role in the opening scene and does not carry the message that it is a lasting physical symbol of Andri's despair and eventual death. We also have been treated to Weiss' The Investigation and Hochhuth's The Deputy where scenes involving the implication of the Final Solution or the actual horror of it are plastically shown. The Deputy was the pioneer German stage documentary relating to Hitler's Germany. "When this play was produced by Erwin Piscator at West Berlin's Volksbuhne Theatre in 1963, the death camp scenes were either eliminated or muted to a suggestive note (this version showed no more in-the-flesh barbarity on stage than had America's earlier 'The Diary of Anne Frank'). The Piscator production concentrated instead upon those portions of Hochhuth's novel-length script which most directly imputed Pius XII. The Germans weren't yet ready, or at least were not considered ready, to cope with a staged representation of their fratricidal immediate past, or to focus the question of guilt upon themselves," (R.J. Schroeder, "The Investigation," Commonweal, Vol. 85, Nov. 4, 1966, p. 141.)

<sup>18</sup>Theophilus Lewis, "The Wall," America, Vol. 104 (Dec. 3, 1960), p. 354.

<sup>19</sup>"Theatre" Time, Vol. 68 (Oct. 15, 1956), p. 51.

<sup>20</sup>Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett, The Diary Of Anne Frank (New York, 1958), p. 98.

<sup>21</sup>New York Times, Tuesday, January 4, 1972. p. 28.

<sup>22</sup>Theophilus Lewis, "The Wall," p. 354.

<sup>23</sup>Brooks Atkinson, "Review," in The New York Times, Oct. 16, 1955, Sec. II, p. 1:1

<sup>24</sup>Bernard Kalb, "Review," in The New York Times, Oct. 2, 1955, Sec. II, p. 1:6

<sup>25</sup>Henry Hewes, "Broadway Postscript," Saturday Review, Vol. 38 (Oct. 22, 1955), p. 27.

<sup>26</sup>Goodrich, p. 98.

<sup>27</sup>Richard Hayes, "The Stage: Songs of Innocence and Experience," Commonweal, Vol. 63 (Oct. 28, 1955), p. 91.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 92.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Jerome Greenfield, "Meyer Levin: Riding His Own Wave," American Zionist (October, 1970), p. 11.

<sup>31</sup>Algene Ballif, "On The Horizon - Anne Frank on Broadway: Metamorphosis into American Adolescent," Commentary, Vol. 20 (November, 1955), p. 466.

<sup>32</sup>"Anne Frank Play Staged in Israel: Meyer Levin Drama Differs from Broadway 'Diary,'" The New York Times, Sunday, Nov. 27, 1966, p. 32:2.

<sup>33</sup>Ulrich Weisstein, Max Frisch (New York, 1967), p. 110.

<sup>34</sup>Hayes, p. 92.

<sup>35</sup>Lampell, p. 62.

<sup>36</sup>Elie Wiesel, Night, trans. Stella Rodway (New York, 1958), pp. 94-95.

<sup>37</sup>Lampell, p. 74.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 80-81.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., pp. 97-98.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

## Chapter 5

<sup>1</sup>Hannah Arendt, "The Deputy: Guilt by Silence?", in The Storm Over The Deputy, ed. Eric Bentley (New York, 1964), p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>"Silence," from The New York Times, in Bentley, p. 35.

<sup>5</sup>Albert Bermel, "Understudy for The Deputy," in Bentley, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Patricia Marx, "Interview with Rolf Hochhuth," in Bentley, p. 52.

<sup>8</sup>Richard Gilman, "The Deputy Arrives," in Bentley, p. 32.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Susan Sontag, "Reflections on The Deputy," in Bentley, p. 118.

<sup>11</sup>Rolf Hochhuth, The Deputy, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York, 1965), pp. 284-285.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 200.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 206.

<sup>14</sup>Sontag, p. p. 122.

<sup>15</sup>Hochhuth, p. 201. The full text of a latter statement is dictated to the Pope's scribe:

Even more insistently and awakening ever greater compassion, there has come to the Holy Father's ears the echo of those misfortunes which protraction of the present conflict constantly increase. The Pope, as is well known, in vain endeavored to prevent the outbreak of the war by warning the heads of all nations against resorting to arms, which today are so frightful in their power. Ever since he has not ceased to use all means within his power to alleviate the sufferings which are in any form whatsoever consequences of the world-wide conflagration. With the augmentation of so much suffering, the

Pope's universal and fatherly work of mercy has still more increased; it knows no limits, neither of nationality, nor of religion nor of race. This varied and unresting activity of Pius XII has in recent days become still further intensified as a result of the aggravated sufferings of so many unfortunates. May this beneficent activity, supported above all else by the prayers of believers throughout the world who with hearts in one accord and with burning fervor unceasingly raise their voices to Heaven, accomplish still greater results in the future, and soon bring about the day when the light of peace will once more shine over the earth, when men will lay down their arms, all discords and resentments shall fade away and men shall meet their brothers once again to work righteously together at long last for the common welfare. (Pieced together from pages 212-215 of script).

<sup>16</sup>Ibid..

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 203.

<sup>18</sup>Leon Poliakov, "Pope Pius XII and the Nazis," in Bentley, p. 224.

<sup>19</sup>Hochhuth, p. 210.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 158.

<sup>21</sup>Poliakov, p. 224.

<sup>22</sup>Hochhuth, p. 211.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 120.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 117.

<sup>25</sup>Tom F. Driver, "The Meaning of Silence," in Bentley, p. 28.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>27</sup>Robert Brustein, "History as Drama," in Bentley, p. 22.

<sup>28</sup>Arthur C. Cochrane, "Pius XII: A Symbol," in Bentley, p. 162.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 158.

<sup>30</sup>Hochhuth, p. 148.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 205.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 252 & 246.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 246 & 248.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 250.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>Judy Stone, "Interview with Rolf Hochhuth," in Bentley, pp. 51-52.

<sup>38</sup>Gilman, p. 33.

<sup>39</sup>Stone, p. 51.

<sup>40</sup>Sontag, p. 123.

<sup>41</sup>~~Robert Gorham Davis~~, "The Possibility of Individual Choice," in Bentley, p. 96.

### Epilogue

<sup>1</sup>"Theatre," Time, Vol. 88 (Oct. 14, 1966), p. 93.

<sup>2</sup>Rolf Hochhuth, The Deputy, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York, 1964), pp. 284-285.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. Primary Sources: The Plays

Frisch, Max. Andorra. Translated by Michael Bullock.  
New York: Hill and Wang, 1961 (Fifth printing, April, 1969).

\_\_\_\_\_. Three Plays: Don Juan, or The Love of Geometry, The Great Rage of Philip Hotz, When the War Was Over.  
Translated by James L. Rosenberg. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.

Goodrich, Francis and Albert Hackett. The Diary of Anne Frank. New York: Dramatists Play Service Inc., 1956  
(Acting edition - Copyright, 1958).

Hellman, Lillian. Six Plays: The Children's Hour, Days to Come, The Little Foxes, Watch on the Rhine, Another Part of the Forest, The Autumn Garden. New York: Random House, 1960.

Hochhuth, Rolf. The Deputy. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964.

Lampell, Millard. The Wall. New York: Samuel French, Inc., 1959 (Fourth printing, 1964).

Miller, Arthur. After the Fall. New York: The Viking Press, 1964 (Second printing, 1969).

\_\_\_\_\_. Incident at Vichy. New York: The Viking Press, 1965.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. The Condemned of Altona. Translated by Sylvia and George Leeson. New York: Random House, 1961.

Shaw, Robert. The Man in the Glass Booth. New York: Grove Press, Inc. 1968.

Weiss, Peter. The Investigation. Translated by Jon Swan and Ulu Grosbard. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967.

## II. Secondary Sources

Arendt, Hannah. Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil. New York: Viking Press, 1963.

Bentley, Eric, ed. The Storm over The Deputy: Essays and Articles about Hochhuth's Explosive Drama. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964.

Frank, Anne. The Diary of a Young Girl. Translated by B.M. Mooyaart. New York: Doubleday, 1952.

Gould, Jean. Modern American Playwrights. New York: Dodd Mead and Co., 1966.

Hayman, Richard. Arthur Miller. London: Heinemann, 1970.

Hersey, John. The Wall. New York: Pocket Books Inc., 1959.

Laqueur, Walter. The Road to War. Great Britain: Cox and Wyman Ltd., 1968.

Morgan, Geoffrey, ed. Contemporary Theatre: A Selection of Reviews. London: Magazine edition, 1968.

Moss, Leonard. Arthur Miller. New Haven, Connecticut: College and University Press, 1967.

Murray, Edward. Arthur Miller: Dramatist. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1967.

Sachs, Nelly. O The Chimneys. Translated by Michael Hamburger, Christopher Holme, Ruth and Matthew Mead and Michael Roloff. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1969.

Weisstein, Ulrich. Max Frisch. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1967.

White, Sidney Howard. Guide to Arthur Miller. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

Wiesel, Elie. Night. Translated by Stella Rodway. New York: Hill and Wang, 1960.

### III. Magazines, Newspapers, Periodicals.

Atkinson, Brook. "The Diary of Anne Frank," The New York Times. October 6, 1955. P. 24, col. 1.

Ballif, Algene. "On the Horizon - Anne Frank on Broadway: Metamorphosis onto American Adolescent." Commentary. Vol. 20, No. 5. November, 1955. pp. 464-467.

- Clausen, Oliver. "A Look at The Investigation." The New York Times Magazine. Sunday, October 2, 1966. pp. 32-38.
- Clurman, Harold. "Theatre." The Nation. Vol. 207. October 21, 1968. pp. 411-412.
- Gibbs, Walcott. "Amsterdam and Troy." The New Yorker. Vol 31. October 15, 1955. pp. 75-76.
- Gilman, Richard. "Theatre Review." The New Republic. Vol. 159. October 19, 1968. pp. 36-37.
- Greenfield, Jerome. "Meyer Levin: Riding His Own Wave." The American Zionist. October, 1970. pp. 7-12.
- Hayes, Richard. "The Stage: Songs of Innocence and Experience." Commonweal. Vol 63. October 28, 1955. pp. 91-92.
- Hewes, Henry. "Broadway Postscript: Anne Frank." Saturday Review. Vol 38. October 22, 1955. p. 27.
- . "Braodway Postscript: Bricks and Faint Hope." Saturday Review. Vol. 43. October 29, 1960. p. 27.
- . "The Theatre: Pleasence under Glass." Saturday Review. Vol. 51. October 12, 1968. pp. 52-53.
- Kalb, Bernard. "Anne Frank." The New York Times. Sec. II. October 2, 1955. p. 1, col. 6.
- Kemper, Robert Graham. "On Stage." Christian Century. Vol. 83. December 14, 1966. pp. 1540-1541.
- Kerr, Walter. "Weiss' Map of Man's Mind." The New York Times. Sec. K. Sunday, November 13, 1966. pp. 1, col. 1 & 2, - 2, col. 2-4.
- Kroll, Jack. "The Theatre." Newsweek. Vol. 72. October 7, 1968. p. 116.
- Lazurus, Charles. "Author Shaw Denies Anti-semitic Bias in Controversial Play." The Montreal Star. Saturday, February 26, 1972. p. A-2.
- Lewis, Theophilus. "Review: 'Anne Frank.'" America. Vol 94. October 22, 1955. p. 110.
- . "Review: The Wall." America. Vol. 104. December 3, 1960. p. 354.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Review: The Investigation." America. Vol. 115.  
October 29, 1966. p. 525.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Review: The Man in the Glass Booth." America.  
Vol. 119. October 12, 1968. p. 336.
- Mannes, Marya. Review." The Reporter. Vol. 13. December  
29, 1955. p. 3.
- Mc Carten, John. "On Stage." New Yorker. Vol. 36.  
October 22, 1960. p. 89.
- New York Times. "Anne Frank Play Staged in Israel: Meyer  
Levin Drama Differs from Broadway 'Diary.'" Sunday,  
November 27, 1966. p. 32, cols. 2-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Anne Frank House." Tuesday, January  
4, 1972. p. 28, col. 5.
- Prideaux, Tom. "Theatre Review." Life. Vol. 61. October  
28, 1966. pp. 8-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theatre Review: A New Shaw Lives Up to His Name-  
sake: The Man in the Glass Booth." Life. Vol. 65.  
October 25, 1968. p. 20.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. Theatre Arts. June, 1946.
- Schroeder, R.J. "The Stage." Commonweal. Vol. 85.  
November 4, 1966. pp. 139-141.
- Time. "The Theatre: Anne Frank." Vol. 68. October 15, 1955.  
pp. 50-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theatre: The Wall." Vol. 76. October 24, 1960.  
p. 73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theatre: The Investigation." Vol. 88. October  
14, 1966. p. 93.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theatre: The Man in the Glass Booth." Vol. 92.  
October 4, 1968. pp. 65-66.
- Van Rensselaer Wyatt, Euphemia. "Theatre." Catholic World.  
Vol. 182. December, 1955. p. 223.
- Weales, Gerald. "The Stage: People in Glass Booths."  
Commonweal. Vol. 89. November 15, 1968. p. 253.

Wenning, T.H. "Theatre." Newsweek. Vol. 56. October  
24, 1960. p. 121.

West, Anthony. "The Investigation: Vicarious Experiences  
of Cruelty." Vogue. Vol. 148. November 15, 1966.  
p. 99.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Man in the Glass Booth." Vogue. Vol. 152.  
November 1, 1968. p. 124.