University of Dayton Review

Volume 13 | Number 1 Article 7

1976

Type-Casting in Carl Zuckmayer's *The Devil's General*

Roy C. Cowen
University of Michigan

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr

Recommended Citation
Cowen, Roy C. (1976) "Type-Casting in Carl Zuckmayer's *The Devil's General*," *University of Dayton Review*: Vol. 13: No. 1, Article 7.
Available at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol13/iss1/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

Type-Casting in Carl Zuckmayer's *The Devil's General*[1]

by ROY C. COWEN

In his autobiography *A Part of Myself,* Carl Zuckmayer records the reactions to the first performance of *The Devil's General.*[2] On the day after the premiere on 14 December 1946 in Zürich, Zuckmayer met Carl Jakob Burckhardt, about whose judgment he writes: "He was the first to tell me what I afterwards heard from countless Germans: that was what it was like — the way I had presented it in this play; that I had captured the truth which cannot be found in documents, only in literature, and which cannot be delineated with hatred, but only with love" (400/558f.). And about the first performance in Germany eleven months later Zuckmayer says:

> The Germans saw themselves in the mirror of their own times. Many of those present had been in concentration camps, in penal battalions, in the Resistance, or simply in the army. They could not understand how this play could have been written by a man who had been living abroad, who had not been on the scene during those years, who had not personally shared their experiences. The play corresponded to the reality as they had known it, down to the smallest detail. (402/560)

We recognize that Zuckmayer felt particular pride in having been able to capture the different levels and diverse motivations of the characters — while writing in a foreign country.[3]

Obviously, it was Zuckmayer's intention to encompass, as far as possible, the complete spectrum of German life under Hitler and his system. In turn, he projects on this panoramic background the story of a personal friend and adventurous individualist whose fate gave rise to the play. In his autobiography Zuckmayer recounts the circumstances surrounding the genesis of *The Devil's General:*

> In December 1941 . . . the American newspapers had carried a brief item: Ernst Udet, Chief of the Air Force Supply Service of the German Army, had suffered a fatal accident in trying out a new weapon and had been honored with a state funeral. That was all. There were no commentaries, no surmises about his death. Fatal accident; state funeral.
>
> I kept thinking about it all the time. Again and again I saw him as I had seen him in 1936, during my last reckless visit to Berlin. . . .
>
> He was in civilian dress, but he was already a high-ranking officer in the Luftwaffe. "Shake the dust of this country from your shoes," he said to me. "Clear out of here and don't come back. There is no more decency here."

"And what about you?" I asked.

"I'm completely sold on flying," he said lightly, almost casually. "I can't disentangle any more. But one of these days the devil will fetch us all."

. . .

Now, on that late fall evening in 1942, a year after Udet's death, I was trudging back to the farm with my carrying basket. . . . Suddenly I paused. "State funeral," I said aloud.

The last word of the tragedy.

I did not know what had happened in reality, and did not care.

The whole story was there in my mind — without a gap.

(381f./534f.)

In other words, Zuckmayer wanted to reveal how a situation had come into being and was sufficiently characterized by the phrase "state funeral." Yet this situation is itself the tragedy of an entire people. Zuckmayer concedes that he did not know the real events leading up to Udet's death; nor did he care. Everything he needed to know lies in "state funeral" as an ironic comment on one man and on an entire people. For not only was this state funeral the hypocritical "funeral" by the "state" for one of its victims but also the funeral of the state itself, both militarily and morally.

In order to carry out his intentions, however, Zuckmayer, because he was living in exile in America, had to deduce the situation as well as the events preceding the ironic "state funeral." In turn, he was forced to apply types that represented each in its own way, the logically inferable aspects of the situation.[4] Moreover, the characters had to represent a quantitatively complete protrait of the state of affairs. For we sense from the very beginning that Zuckmayer is not interested in creating but portraying, not trying to interpret but to reproduce.

Bertolt Brecht had already tried to dramatize the rise of Naziism according to its latent social cause, but we have to admit that his dramas on *Arturo Ui* and on *The Roundheads and the Peakheads*, by their simplification of the issues, do not provide a convincing picture of Nazi Germany. Reduction to one interpretative idea, be it based on Marxism or any other view, could not encompass the situation's social complexity. How unconvincing his other dramas remain is nowhere revealed more clearly than in Brecht's own powerful work on the *Fear and Misery of the Third Reich* with its naturalistic technique and scenic breadth, for in it the very diversity of reactions to, and effects of, Naziism become evident.

For his own part, Zuckmayer seems to turn to an almost naturalistic technique to portray the events in 1941.[5] Naturalism is, of course, based on a largely quantitative concept of truth: the more you know about the characters, situations and actions, that is to say, the more data you can accumulate, the closer you come to the truth. Since, however, all aspects of characters, situations or actions can never be ascertained, the complete truth, the avowed goal of historical Naturalism, can only be approached, never

attained.[6] Whether we can ever establish the one, absolute truth regarding the causes of human actions in general must remain a moot point. Certainly, however, anyone writing in 1942-1946, indeed even today, still seems to be standing too close to Nazi Germany to be able to find the one, all-embracing truth. Instead, he must — and even this seems far from easy — content himself with many smaller truths, that is, with simple facts. In turn, we see how Zuckmayer's account of Berlin and Naziism in 1941, regardless of its revealed truths or insights, proved convincing to audiences in 1946/47, not in the least because they all saw themselves in one or more of the characters. Consequently, the popularity and general acceptance of *The Devil's General* substantiates, if nothing else, the quantitative success of the play in amassing factually accurate character-types, in being "convincing."

First of all, almost every geographical area of Germany is represented in *The Devil's General*. For example, we hear that Pfundtmayer is "a Bavarian powerhouse," that Hastenteuffel is Westphalian and Writzky a "sharp boy" from Berlin (916/508). Northern Germany is also exemplified by Hansen (= Lüttjohann) from the *Waterkant* (= North Sea coast, 929/542). The wealthy and less so in the *Rheinland* can be seen in Mohrungen and Hartmann. Harras calls Baron Pflungk "ole Saxon" (919/517), and he tells Eilers that Oderbruch stems from Silesian Catholics (923/526). Indeed, we even have a transplanted Frenchman in François and an American newsman Buddy Lawrence, who represents the naive foreign enthusiasm for things German, if not for Hitler. With every major area of Germany, a conquered country and a neutral one represented, we are convinced that we are in fact viewing war-time Germany as a totality.

Moreover, certain areas carry specific historical associations according to the role they played in the rise of Hitler and his minions. We need think only of Bavaria, where Hitler first found his support. The historical aspects of this geographical area provide the basis for the character of Pfundtmayer, who indignantly berates Harras:

> Genurrull! Genurrull! You made it Harry! But if ya really think about it — I was al'ays in the party — right from the Bloody March in '23 — marched right behind the Fuehrer too — a little ta the left. . . . And now, in uniform, what am I now? A poor ole Captain — me, with my low party number and all. And you — you're the Genurrull! Ya call that justice? (917/511f.).

The geographical and historical facts one would associate with Bavaria are all present in a character as typical as he is unpleasant.

Just as the greatest possible horizontal breadth is achieved, so is the greatest possible vertical range. For example, the first time we see von Mohrungen, Eilers, Pflungk, Schmidt-Lausitz and Hansen (= Lüttjohann), they are crowded about on the threshold, where they apply the extremes of courtesy toward higher ranks. Consequently, the audience is immediately apprised of the hierarchy they embody. Moreover, the stage directions virtually call for typified characterization (913/500f.). Mohrungen must look like what he is, "a good-looking man of about fifty with grey temples, representative of the old upper class of heavy industry," and "his junker-like conservative outlook is subdued by a southern German naturalness." Pflungk appears to have no character, and he will prove to have none, but he must also display the looks of an "elegant greyhound," a dog

associated with the nobility and its "smooth manners." Schmidt-Lausitz' appearance likewise corresponds totally to the type of party-fanatic he represents. Even Eilers looks like what he is: "Durchschnitt," average, and here we must understand the average as the common denominator. His death will incite Harras to action, whereby we can recognize that not his exceptional qualities but his very lack of them will imbue Harras' reaction with more sweeping implications. No less characteristic are the women: Olivia Geiss, the diva, has a "full bust of the professional singer" (917/512) and, in her own way as an artist, presents a feminine counterpart to Harras: just as he can separate flying from the political system that allows him to fulfill his goals as a flier, so Olivia, who feels disgust for the Nazis and sympathy for their enemies, nevertheless accepts Goering's presence at the performance of *Die lustige Witwe* and even wishes that Hitler, whose coming would have been an even greater compliment to her as an artist, had been there. Diddo, the *ingenue,* looks like "a school-girl who is going to her first ball." And Lyra, who will appeal to Pfundtmayer and, in the German text is called the "Tankstelle" (filling-station), suggests decadence by her monocle and excessive cosmetics. In other words, Zuckmayer achieves type-casting effects by avoiding any discrepancy between a character's appearance and what he represents. Similar observations could be made regarding the figures around Harras like Korrianke, his chauffeur. In no case could the audience remark: he doesn't look like a . . ., or sound like a . . ., or act like a . . .,

No less synchronized or typified is the march of different age groups across the stage: we have the pre-Hitler and Hitler-generations and perhaps even the post-Hitler survivor, if Pflungk proves successful in his attempts to hedge his bets (he is already thinking about his own chances if Hitler loses the war). In turn, the two important generations can be sub-divided along predictable lines into the supporters and opponents of the regime. Among the younger members of the group there are the indoctrinated and the not indoctrinated. Indeed, the indoctrinated are sub-divided again into the type that has learned only the idealistic and the type that has learned only the cynical. Pootsie (= Pützchen) outlines the contrast succinctly in an early dialogue with Harras. Regarding herself she says:

> We modern girls have nothing against marriage if it's the right man. But just stop and think for a minute all the rigmarole we have to go through; the proofs of Aryan blood, all the way down to your great-grandfather's big toe. Health certificate, proof of fertility, semen count, and so forth. Yes, it's all necessary on account of race — but who wants to wait around for all that? With your normal drives — you can grow old and rancid in the process. (914/504)

But she describes Hartmann, another example of Nazi education: "He's a sharp boy — three sports prizes, twelve planes shot down and tip-top ideology. But something's missing — I don't know what — real dash. He doesn't dance, imagine!" (914/504). Hartmann has become what the Nazi leadership wanted him to become, and Pootsie what the leadership itself is.[7] Consequently, when the marriage between Hartmann and Pootsie, which seems to have been made in Nazi heaven, does not take place because he lacks papers on his grandmother, he accepts the rational of the process, and she dismisses it with cynical indifference. Hartmann, who is ready to sacrifice himself for the Nazi

cause, will later be converted to self-sacrifice for the anti-Nazie cause. Through Hartmann Zuckmayer expresses a belief, if not directly in a new German humanity, then at least in the limits of the Nazi indoctrination. Only where exposure to the Nazis has destroyed the moral fiber does the effect seem permanent, as with Pootsie, who is loyal to neither persons or principles. After discovering the letter from Bergmann she would join forces with Harras, an "enemy of the state," but ultimately denounces him because he, as a person, has rejected her.

Logically speaking, we would have to distinguish yet another possibility among the members of the Hitler-generation: the person remaining uncorrupted by the ideals or the persons of Naziism. Here Diddo appears. In Act II she says to Harras:

> Look . . . I . . . often I don't know where I'm at anymore. I was only twelve in 1933. . . . If you come right down to it, you see only what crosses your path. I only know one thing. I would like to get out, out! Why, I couldn't even explain. But sometimes I think if I were my age and were Jewish and had to emigrate — maybe it wouldn't be so bad. Maybe it would even be better. To see the world — my God! New York . . . And the ocean — and the harbours — maybe China — or Rio de Janeiro. Me, I wouldn't care. I could do anything: wash dishes, wipe children, factory work — only to be free — outside! Sometimes I envy the Jews madly.
>
> I mean the ones outside. (938/565f.).

Her view of emigration is, of course, quite naive. Nevertheless, she does point up that not everyone has been misled or morally destroyed. She also reveals the serious flaw of a Hartmann, who cannot dance, i.e. be light-hearted, or, for that matter, of a supposedly devil-may-care Pootsie, who is really cynical and ambitious beyond her years: their seriousness. In most of Zuckmayer's works, to laugh is to be human, but both of these people have lost their youth and ability to be happy. Harras underlines this aspect by his commentary to Diddo: "Maybe they'll throw us out at the right time because we're so illegally happy" (938/566). How little the Hitler-generation understands about being young and happy is also revealed by the everyman Eilers, who is described as unusually serious (913/501).

Among the members of the older generation, all possible motives for their participation are likewise systematically explored. The active contributors to Hitler's rise to, and retention of, power reveal their reasons, one by one. Pfundtmayer, the crude bully, wanted to raise himself from his obviously humble station, but only to enjoy the wine, women and song that would then become available to him. Schmidt-Lausitz, who is vaguely reminiscent of Goebbels, not in the least because he implies frustration as an author through his hatred of Remarque and Ullstein (927/536), promised himself more intangible rewards. Von Mohrungen represents all too patently the responsibility of his class and even repeats the slogans of the 20's and 30's with which the industrialists were won over by the Nazis. Ironically, he expresses in conclusion the slogan that links him with Pootsie and Hartmann: "We don't live just to be happy, after all. After all, we do have to make sacrifices" (954/584). Once again, we hear how life has become such an inhumanly serious business for the Nazis and their supporters.

Yet Mohrungen represents only the successful *Mitläufer* ("fellow-traveller"). Aware of the other side of the coin, Zuckmayer doen not ignore the unsuccessful type of *Mitläufer* like Schlick, the Expressionist painter. Believing that a German could paint only in Germany, Schlick after 1933 divorced his Jewish wife, who with their children disappeared; but he is still considered "degenerate" (944/581f.). As a calculated, logically inferable contrast and alternative to Schlick, the wife of Bergmann, the Jewish physician, albeit unseen, plays her role. Unlike the painter, she does not abandon her Jewish spouse but rather chooses suicide with him. Like the active Nazis Pfundtmayer and Schmidt-Lausitz, the *Mitläufer* also represent all logically and historically deduceable motives. There remains, however, yet another reason to be a *Mitläufer:* survival. Such is the case with Eilers and his wife. When poor average Eilers questions how Germany can combine such terror and beauty, his far more perceptive wife answers:

> Don't question, darling. Believe. Believe. Remember what you wrote to me — when you left the first time? I know it by heart. I say it to myself over and over. "Let nothing confuse you — Let nothing make you waver. Believe with every fiber of your being in Germany — in yourself — in us — in our mission — Whoever believes will survive. Believe!"
>
> (923/527)

Here we find an almost existentialist, forced belief, possible only with the believer's eyes closed to the truth. In Eilers, Zuckmayer has answered the question of why so many German men fought so well, and why their women let them, why Hitler apparently received so much support, yet achieved and held power without an active majority.

All of these types have a common trait: they reveal the impact of scoial change on man's behavior. There is no suggestion of the demonic, dionysian in Germans and German culture, as for example, in Mann's *Doktor Faustus.*[8] No Satanic overtones appear in the ardent Nazis, as in Hochhuth's *Deputy.*[9] Likewise, the uncanny, grotesque yet humorous Oskar Mazarath with his tin drum finds no counterpart. As a matter of fact, through Harras that very tendency among Germans toward the metaphysical, the Faustian and demonic is ridiculed:

> How sick I am of Significance, the Intoxication of Death, the demonic Block Warden, the split inner life, the Faustian Mail Carrier. Our half-culture has filled our bellies with metaphysics and our heads with intestinal gas. "The indigestible pulls us on down." We have become a nation of constipated public school teachers who exchanged the rod for the riding whip in order to disfigure the human face. Cloud-chasers and slaves of death. A miserable nation. (946/587)[10]

The problem lies not in the fact that the Germans are demonic but in their seeing themselves as such. Like Brecht, Zuckmayer considers the social causes, but unlike the *Stückeschreiber,* he eschews a single, facile interpretation. The only unifying factor is the Germans' tendency to take themselves too seriously and their resultant misery. Yet Zuckmayer, by his almost too "slick" use of geographical and social types, attempts a quantitatively complete presentation of all conceivable reactions — economic, artistic, moral and otherwise — to Nazi rule and war. The main danger of such type-casting lies

in the very fact that each character personifies attributes so thoroughly, so purely, that he comes close to becoming a mere abstraction of historical forces.

Against this panoramic background he portrays a man who is supposedly least interested in social pressures or values.[11] If the secondary figures appear as almost too "slick" type-casting, then General Harras borders dangerously on a Hollywood-type hero.[12] When we first see him, for example, he is still holding his empty glass in his hand, and a cigarette is hanging from the corner of his mouth. Moreover, Harras' single-minded indifference to political and social changes seems to produce a too striking contrast to the secondary characters. Following faithfully Udet's remarks cited above, Zuckmayer lets his protagonist explain his motives: he could have made a career of stunt and daredevil flying in America (Udet did exhibition flying there), but he would have been only a "sort of flying clown." He could have made movies, but "those boys have no imagination, and that was precisely the positive factor in this whole business here for me, at least" (921/522). He continues:

> Nowhere else in the world but here would I have been given these possibilities, these unlimited means — this power. These five years, making the Luftwaffe airborne — I don't regret them. . . . Spain, of course, was slightly sickening. But the first two years, when it really started up, we had something to offer, there was some style to it then. The best, most exact, most effective machinery that ever existed in the history of war. (921/522)

Yet Harras seems like an anachronism, like the last knight of the air, for he still lives the life of a flier in World War I. Nowhere does this emerge with greater clarity than in his story about how he received the old watch from the first pilot he had shot down (939/568f.). And later in the act another symbol appears: the picture of his best enemy in the previous war. It had been sent by the mother, whom Harras later visited. Pootsie, whose attitude so resembles that of the leadership in 1941, scornfully comments: "The famous chivalric gesture. Good for the historic reputation but antiquated" (943/579). Despite his obvious technical expertise and ability, Harras is basically still living in the past, and consequently he has never succumbed to, nor undertaken active opposition against, nor fled from, the Nazi regime. Far from being merely a technician, he still loves the age of individual "style." Yet, as glamourous as he appears to all — not in the least as a representative, as Detlev says in the beginning, of "die alte Schule" — he has virtually become a relique. As the play progresses, it becomes increasingly evident that this living monument to a past age and out-dated standards will not be allowed to stand much longer.

With his emphasis on types, however, Zuckmayer has also suggested a model for Harras himself. Seen as an anachronism, Harras' situation resembles not so much that of some trite, banal Hollywood hero but rather that of Georg Büchner's Danton, who, in his *Weltschmerz,* is very German indeed.[13] We recall, for example, Lacroix's words in Act I of *Danton's Death:* "Danton, you are a dead saint, but the Revolution knows no reliques. It has thrown the bones of all kings into the street and all columns out of the churches. Do you believe they would let you stand as a monument?" (25). Harras has become just such a relique.[14] And the more Harras leans toward several other themes from *Danton's Death,* the more the very obvious type-casting of the secondary characters is brought into a new perspective.

Admittedly, several German authors and works are alluded to: Kleist's *Prince Frederick of Homburg* (919/516), Matthias Claudius (923/527) and Goethe (930/545; 946/587).[15] But no allusion is as pointed and lengthy as Diddo's speech in Act II:

> I've always wanted to play a madwoman. I don't know why. Perhaps to get rid of something that's trapped inside me, that might not come out otherwise. But maybe that has no place on the stage. Do you know *Danton's Death* by Buechner? (Harras *nods*) Sometimes when I'm walking down the street, I'm Lucille — They've murdered my lover — The hangman of the revolution stalks through the night — And suddenly I must step out of the darkness and call: "Long Live the King!" That's how I would like to die. Is that mad? (946/586)

And if this is not enough, one need only note how often Harras steps to the window, for each time he expresses thoughts similar to Danton's in his famous window scene in II, 5 of *Danton's Death.*

One of the most important scenes in *Danton's Death* deals with Danton's confrontation with Robespierre in Act I. As soon becomes apparent, not two political principles but rather two ways of life underly their conflict. Thus we hear from Danton:

> There are only epicureans and only crude ones or refined ones at that. Christ was the most subtle; that is the only difference that I can make out between men. Each one acts according to his nature, that is, he does what gives him pleasure. It's cruel, isn't it, "Incorruptible," to knock the props out from under you like this? (27)

Indeed, the political philosophy of the Dantonists stems from this view, as we hear in Herault's statement:

> Every man must be able to assert himself and behave according to his own nature. He might be reasonable or unreasonable, educated or uneducated, good or bad — that is no concern of the state. We are all fools, and none of us has the right to impose his own particular foolishness on another. Every man must be able to enjoy life in his own way, but only in a way that no one may have his pleasure at the cost of another or disturb him in his form of pleasure. (11)

Such a philosophy and the politics it spawns assume the individual as the greatest unit. Danton has lost faith in all principles, all attempts to communicate beyond his own person, and, as a result, he feels buried alive in the world of his body, knowing only what his senses can communicate. In short, Danton, the hedonist, represents the ultimate stage of individualism.

For his part, Harras also advocates by word and deed extreme hedonism, a fact not ignored by his friends and enemies. For example, Olivia Geiss calls Harras a *GenuBmensch* (hedonist) and says to him that the Nazis are after him for that very reason (940/572). We remember that Danton liked to flirt with death (39), and we now find the same flirtation driving Harras. Even Schmidt-Lausitz recognizes Harras' nature as a gambler: "It might appeal to you," he says to Harras, "to challenge the devil to a round of poker in hope of out-bluffing him" (953/603). For the absolute hedonist, who believes in

nothing beyond his own person, there can be no greater stake than his own life. Gambling with his life provides the ultimate titillation.

Like Danton, Harras personifies individualism in its most extreme form, not in the least because, like Danton, he stresses throughout the play that the attacks on him are personal. And like the French revolutionary, he depends on the strength of his personality to repulse the attacks on him. But the day of reckoning finally catches up with Harras. His deadliest enemy is Schmidt-Lausitz, who, in giving him 10 days to expose the saboteur, says: "In me you see a mortal enemy. You are quite correct. There isn't room enough under the sun for us both" (935/559). We note, however, that the tone is less political than existential, that Schmidt-Lausitz' relationship to Harras resembles Robespierre's to Danton.[16] Robespierre, the Incorruptible, hates his opposite because of his vices, particularly the sexual ones, for Danton "wants to hitch the horses of the Revolution to a brothel" (28).[17] The parallel between Danton's and Harras' situation is in fact summarized by Olivia, who expresses her own hedonism through sex, when she says:

> And besides, you had too much success with women. That's the worst of it. With our Nazis everything is really jealousy, bed-jealousy above all. But on that point they're way below zero — always wanting to go to war and make out like great men — it's all a fake. . . . First great sounds — then it's all over before it really began and off they run, back to duty. (940f./572f.)

And throughout the play, Harras, like Danton, continues to make jokes in the face of his all too serious opponents, serious because they have sublimated personal pleasures in the attempt to realize an abstract ideal.

Danton, as the hedonistic cynic, as the individualist, cannot accept the fact that his opponents persist in their actions, in their continued belief in such vague, abstract principles as they mouth. He therefore sees them as helpless actors, playing roles in which they have themselves come to believe. Consequently, Danton challenges Robespierre:

> Robespierre, you are disgustingly righteous. I would be ashamed to run around between heaven and earth with such a moral expression on my face, just for the miserable pleasure of finding others worse than myself. Isn't there anything in you that doesn't sometimes quite softly, secretly say: you're lying, you're lying! (26)

At the same time, Danton realizes that just as the Revolution has formed them, not vice versa (32), so the roles they have played have taken them over. Lacroix reports: "And Collot screamed like mad that they should tear off their masks" (24). And Danton answers: "Then their faces will come off with them." Throughout *Danton's Death* the image of role-playing and theater appears correspondingly often as a symbol of the effect of the Revolution even on its supposed "leaders." In turn, a similar image-pattern recurs with no less impact in *The Devil's General.*

Harras' cynicism finds almost its equal in Pootsie's, and it is she who says to him: "I am not that stupid, Harry. We all put on a little act. You do too. We have a habit of

over-playing in public and forget ourselves that we are doing it. Harry, things can't go on like this with you" (947/590). She even repeats this image a short time later (948/592). Harras himself shows a similar insight in his dialogue with Oderbruch, who says a beard would be too much a mask, when he retorts: "Yes — it's better to hide yourself behind a naked face" (950/596). Indeed, Harras' Danton-like fatigue, his approaching the end, reveals itself when he can no longer carry out his theatrical banter with Korrianke (vid. 950/598). Even to the end, however, Harras tries to remain true to his role. He rejects the suicide suggested by Schmidt-Lausitz' leaving him a pistol; instead, he plays the gambler to the last and entrusts his fate to a "Gottesurteil" (divine judgement) (957/616). It would be a serious mistake — admittedly it has been made frequently[18] — to continue seeing Harras' death as a suicide pure and simple. He cannot know for sure that the ME41-1303 is defective. When he calls his flight a "divine judgment," he means the chance element. Danton could have killed himself, but instead he stands trial and closes his speech with a monumental testament to his belief in the individual: "Now you know Danton; in a few hours he will be sleeping in the arms of fame" (54). If Danton had, by any slim chance, won his plea, he would have saved his life; even while losing his life, however, he assures himself of fame. If Harras' flight succeeds, he will land in Switzerland; if it fails, he will have a "state funeral."

Thus we see that Zuckmayer has not idealized Harras out of all proportion. His guilt, like Danton's, still weighs too heavily, even in death. Ann is right in her criticism of Harras:

> Do you believe this war is just? You know that it is unjust. Then why do you let it happen? Why don't you acknowledge it? Do you believe our leadership is good? You know it is ruinous. Why do you watch it? You put on a great show of courage with your sarcasm and lukewarm doubt. What good is that to anybody? You are a part of the rottenness. You are guilty of every murder committed in the name of Germany. You stink of death! (955/609)

Harras can only take refuge in the argument:

> That is madness. Don't you see what is happening in the world? The nations are in turmoil. Do I know where they will end? Can I stop them? Change their direction? . . . Who am I anyway? Am I more than a man? Can I know more — do more — suffer more — than a man? I'm no God. (955/609)

These sentiments echo clearly Danton's abhorrance of the "Must" *(MuB)* (41) and the corresponding biblical passage, cited by Büchner in a letter (II, 426): "Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!" (Matthew 18, 7). Like Danton, Harras has played a role to the death. Like Danton, he has also come to realize that he has been playing a role, that he could ultimately do nothing to eliminate evil, but for that very reason he admits: "Permitting viciousness is worse than doing it" (940/571).

We now return to our problem of type-casting. As naturalistic as this play seems to be, such types, not by their nature, but by their convenient convergence at one time in one place, seem to flaunt pure realism. Back during the heyday of Naturalism, Alfred

Kerr pointed out one unresolvable paradox of realistic drama: it must limit itself to a short span of time yet contain all of the important information regarding what is happening, who is doing it, and why it has come to be. It is, however, in real life never the case that all information about the situation and characters is naturally brought up by the participants in an action.[19] Similarly, we could say that Zuckmayer tests our credulity by the "coincidental" appearance of all main *types* in the Third Reich at the same time in the same place.

Our insight into the role-playing by all of them, on the other hand, reveals the essentially theatrical nature of that world. How far it has all come is brought home by the dialogue between Harras and Buddy Lawrence, once again with Bücherian undertones. To Lawrence's profession of love for the Germans, Harras answers: "Me too. To the point of hate. Just like an actor who loves and hates the character he plays, the role to which he has been sentenced — love and hate" (946/587). Harras continues: "We all act. We are hidden in roles and don't know their end. We don't even know their character. How much evil is in yourself? Ask the author. Is he crazy? Or a swindler? Should he be worshipped — or nailed to the cross?" And when Diddo asks whether they are playing grand opera, comedy or tragedy, Harras answers with a smile: "Everything together." In order to emphasize this very fact that so many wanted to, or were forced to, play a role — one can also include Detlev, the spy for the Gestapo — Zuckmayer pushes his type-casting to an extreme — just as the times themselves did. Thus the play will end with the irony of a "state funeral," the most farcical piece of theatrics, but also, as we have seen in Zuckmayer's description of his inspiration for the play, the phrase that characterizes the situation as a whole.

In turn, Harras must be viewed in a new light. During the later 60's a serious attempt was made to revive *The Devil's General* throughout Germany, but the public reception of the play fell far short of the enthusiasm shown right after the war.[20] Above all, the role of Harras was criticized, despite the fact that Zuckmayer had felt obligated to expand the conversation between the general and the saboteur Oderbruch. But his changes, on the one hand to make Oderbruch more human through a sense of guilt about Eilers, on the other to give Harras a concrete plan of action by letting him suggest that Hitler, not the average Germans, must be killed — such changes did not save the play from a negative reception. Above all, Harras is roundly condemned and the play for glorifying him.

By 1967, of course, the political climate had changed. One might say that the public now felt itself far enough removed from the events of the Third Reich to want them interpreted, indeed that the public believed it had already interpreted them correctly. But Zuckmayer sought only even more balance through his changes, for, as we already noted, he wanted from the beginning to portray the times, not reduce them to one idea. Whether or not we like Harras or even agree with him remains as inconsequential as whether we like Danton or any other literary figure. After all, Büchner had himself said about his portrayal of the French Revolutionaries that he was not a teacher of morality but only a writer of history who wanted to show them as they had been, not as they should have been.[21] In other words, Büchner is, in effect, making a plea for understanding, particularly in the face of human weakness.

In his drama about Harras, Zuckmayer also hits the heart of the human problem. Harras always thinks in terms of the individual. But Oderbruch represents the shame of a German who has gone beyond his person as such. Consequently, Oderbruch proves just as "serious," albeit in the opposite direction, as Schmidt-Lausitz.[22] Indeed, as a reaction against the very type of personal charisma shown by Harras as well as against ambition or self-salvation, Oderbruch's group remains virtually nameless. What we see in Harras, therefore, is not the man completely above and beyond the events, the self-indulgent hero, nor the person thoroughly enmeshed in them, but rather the man who instinctively rejects a prescribed role. Yet, by playing out his own personal role, he reveals how human the others are. If Zuckmayer made Harras personality attractive, then he did him no real service, for he did so only to make his guilt and weakness even more obvious. And regardless of our feelings toward Harras and the rest, we have to concede one thing: for many, that was what it was like. What, however, could be more important for a dramatist who said that he wanted to portray life and the burning questions of his time, not solve them?[23] In conclusion, we must hear Zuckmayer as well as Harras when the latter says: "Ich bin kein Denker, und kein Prophet. Ich bin ein Zeitgenosse" (547) (I am no thinker and no prophet; I am a contemporary).

University of Michigan

NOTES

1. The following is a somewhat revised version of a paper presented at the University of Cincinnati on 3 May 1976. I would like to thank the members of the audience for their provocative questions and helpful suggestions.

2. Carl Zuckmayer, *A Part of Myself*, Translated by Richard and Clara Winston, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970) is a translation of the author's *Als wär's ein Stück von mir*, (Vienna: S. Fischer, 1966). Translated by Ingrid G. and William F. Gilbert, *The Devil's General* appears in *Masters of Modern Drama*, ed. by Haskell M. Block and Robert G. Shedd (New York: Random House, 1962), pp. 911-958. This translation is, however, of the original version. The second, definitive version appears in Carl Zuckmayer, *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. III (Berlin/Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1960), pp. 495-618. Page references for all quotations will be given first to the translation, secondly to the German text.

3. Murray B. Peppard, "Moment of Moral Decision: Carl Zuckmayer's Latest Plays," *Monatshefte*, 44 (1952), 349-356, calls attention to the unusually long exposition in *The Devil's General* and "how much Zuckmayer was concerned with evoking a well-rounded picture of Nazi Germany" (p. 349).

4. Ingeborg Engelsing-Malek, *"Amor Fati" in Zuckmayers Dramen* (Konstanz: Rosgarten, 1960), p. 88, divides the characters into four groups: 1) the young people (Ann and Friedrich Eilers, Hartmann, Diddo); 2) the Nazis (Schmidt-Lausitz, Pfundtmayer, Pützchen); 3) those who have learned to bow to the power at the moment (Detlev, Mohrungen, Pflungk); 4) those who serve a hated system and yet try to remain true to their character (Harras, Lüttjohann, Korrianke, Olivia Geiss). These groupings, however, reveal nothing about Zuckmayer's analytical approach, nor do they allow for any subtle or logical differences between characters within a given group.

5. Most critics call this drama "naturalistic," e.g., Volker Wehdeking, "Mythologisches Ungewitter. Carl Zuckmayers problematisches Exildrama 'Des Teufels General'," *Die deutsche Exilliteratur 1933-1945*, ed. Manfred Durzak (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1973), pp. 509-519. Wehdeking, who calls Act I a combination of the best *Sekundenstil* of the Naturalists Holz, Schlaf and Hauptmann with the virtues of the "New Objectivity" (p. 510) and in its dialogue and structure a masterful achievement of the naturalist tradition (p. 517), admittedly sees Expressionist elements in Act II and Schiller's pathos in Act III. Be that as it may, the theme of our study draws mainly on the exposition in Act I, not on the personal development of Harras in II and III. Zuckmayer's debt to Naturalism in almost all of his works is, however, brought out in the excellent study by Wolfgang Paulsen, "Carl Zuckmayer," *Deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Hermann Friedmann and Otto Mann, Vol II: *Gestalten*, 4th edition (Heidelberg: Rothe, 1961), pp. 302-322.

6. Thus Theodor Fontane in his famous review of Ibsen's *Ghosts*, as performed on the *Freie Bühne* in 1889, could correctly surmise that the naturalistic approach results in "conviction" *(Überseugung)*, not truth, which, for him, was something quite different. *Vid.* my *Naturalismus: Kommentar zu einer Epoche* (Munich: Winkler, 1973), pp. 48-50.

7. The comparison of Pootsie (= Pützchen) to "the eternal Lillith — the personification of evil in woman," made by Henry Glade, "Carl Zuckmayer's *The Devil's General* as Autobiography," *Modern Drama*, 9 (1966-67), seems quite strained; Glade cites Schlick's description of her, but the distraught and guilt-ridden painter can scarcely be considered a reliable judge.

8. Erich Müller-Gangloff, "Faust als Fliegergeneral," *Berliner Hefte für geistiges Leben*, 4 (1949), 90-93, asserts "demonic" qualities for Pützchen and Schmidt-Lausitz, but he offers no substantial proof. Likewise, Wilfried Adling, "Des Teufels General," *Die Entwicklung des Dramatikers Carl Zuckmayer*, Schriften zur Theaterwissenschaft, ed. by the Theaterhochschule Leipzig, Vol. 1 (Berlin: Henschel, 1959), pp. 177-217, who speaks for the Marxist critics, sees a "demonization" of fascism by Zuckmayer and condemns him for such a "limited" view.

9. Thus Murray Peppard, *op. cit.*, asserts: "There are no villains . . . but only people who are weak or who have chosen the wrong side" (p. 356). This view, however, overlooks the fact that there can be villains without metaphysical implications.

10. Nevertheless, many critics still stress the supposed "Faustian" aspects of Harras' mania for flying and his presumed "pact" with the devil, e.g., Henry Glade, *op. cit.*, p. 58. If his problem is indeed "Faustian," then Harras himself seems unaware of it.

11. There are, of course, patently autobiographical elements in Zuckmayer's portrait of Harras (= Udet). See, for example, Luise Rinser, "Porträtskizze," *Fülle der Zeit: Carl Zuckmayer und sein Werk* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer), pp. 13-30. On the problems arising from the autobiographical intrusions, see Henry Glade, *op. cit.*

12. To be sure, Arnold Bauer, *Carl Zuckmayer*, Köpfe des XX. Jahrhunderts, Vol. 62 (Berlin: Colloquium, 1970). p. 73, cites Elisabeth Langgässer's comment at a performance in 1947: "Das ist ein antiker Held." See also Rudolf Lange, *Carl Zuckmayer*, Friedrichs Dramatiker des Welttheaters, Vol. 33 (Velber: Friedrich, 1973), p. 72. Nevertheless, and despite the classical aspects of the protagonist's progress toward his tragic decision, Zuckmayer's experience in the film industry does seem to make itself felt; of course, we recall that Zuckmayer did write most of the dialogue for, among others, *Der Blaue Engel*. Also the influence of Hemingway could be suggested; see, for example, Wayne Kvam, "Zuckmayer, Hilpert, and Hemingway," *PMLA*, 91 (1976), 194-205, on Zuckmayer's adaptation of *A Farewell to Arms*, though Kvam

emphasizes Hemingway's influence on earlier works. Moreover, Hemingway's works belong to the most frequently filmed, and Zuckmayer's *Hauptmann von Köpenick* and *Devil's General* did become vehicles for two of the post-war "super-stars" of Germany: Heinz Rühmann and Curd Jürgens.

13. Zuckmayer has, of course, documented amply his interest in Büchner in his autobiography (unfortunately several instances are omitted in the translation). All page references to Büchner's works are to: *Georg Büchner, Sämtliche Werke und Briefe* (Hamburger Ausgabe), ed. by Werner R. Lehmann (Hamburg: Wegner, 1967 ff.). When no volume number is given, Volume I is understood. Translations are my own.

14. John Jacobius, *Motive und Dramaturgie im Schauspiel Carl Zuckmayers*, Schriften zur Literatur, Vol. 19 (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1971), calls attention to several passages that echo Büchnerian chords; unfortunately, however, he does not delve deeper into any parallels.

15. Obviously, Harras' name also represents an allusion to Rudolf der Harras, Gessler's riding-master in Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* and himself in a "Devil's General" of sorts.

16. Engelsing-Malek, *op. cit.*, p. 83, sees a similar structure in *Der fröhliche Weinberg* and Knuzius as a less intelligent and less dangerous predecessor of Schmidt-Lausitz, but the latter comparison seems, at best, strained.

17. Maurice B. Benn, *The Drama of Revolt: A Critical Study of Georg Büchner*, Anglica Germanica Series 2 (London et al.: Cambridge U. Press, 1976), p. 146, writes: "The envy which causes the downfall of Danton is to a great extent sexual envy." On Danton's hedonism see also my article "Grabbe's *Don Juan und Faust* and Büchner's *Dantons Tod:* Epicureanism and *Weltschmerz,*" *PMLA*, 82 (1967), 342-351.

18. A laudible exception is Henry Glade, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

19. See Alfred Kerr, "Technik des realistischen Dramas," *Gesammelte Schriften in Zwei Reihen, Erste Reihe: Die Welt im Drama, 1. Band: Das neue Drama* (Berlin S. Fischer, 1917), pp. 425-445.

20. For selected reviews of the original version and the later performances, see *Zuckmayer: Des Teufels General*, bearbeitet von Siegfried Mews, Grundlagen und Gedanken zum Verständnis des Dramas (Frankfurt am Main: Diesterweg, 1973). Mews also offers an excellent orientation in the research on the play and a bibliography as well as detailed notes on the text.

21. See Büchner's letter of 28 July 1835 to his family (II, 443f.).

22. Oderbruch has proved to be one of the most controversial characters in the play, not in the least because he, no less than Schmidt-Lausitz, believes that the "ends justify the means." See, for example, Hanns Braun, "Glosse zu 'Des Teufels General'," *Hochland*, 40 (1947-48), 498-500.

23. See *A Part of Myself*, 279f. (396).