

WHAT DOES “OUR HISTORY” LOOK LIKE TODAY? POLITICAL THEATRE IN POSTWAR GERMANY PERFORMING HISTORIES OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM AND THE HOLOCAUST

Key words: political theatre, Germany, national socialism, World War II, holocaust, Carl Zuckmayer, Rolf Hochhuth, Heinar Kipphardt, Frank Castorf.

In 1964, the East-German playwright Peter Hacks wrote to his, at that time already again West-German friend and fellow playwright, Heinar Kipphardt, who during those years was deeply absorbed in writing political documentary plays about recent historical events: “[I]t is odd, that you always make plays according to documents. The only informative documents from former times are – if I at all know how to read – plays.”¹ Following this remark, which, as many of Hacks’ remarks in his letters, shouldn’t be taken too seriously, but seriously enough, one could understand plays performing history as documents of how the past was perceived in the past and presented as history.

In modern states, a politico-historical discourse about the past’s transformation into history, or histories, shapes the “collective identity” in important aspects of political self-conception and thus configures current potentials of political action. This applies not only to an entire political system, like a nation state, but also to the various political collectives active as parts forming it, different as they may be. In a politico-historical discourse, to perform history in political theatre appears as a way to understand and to retell, from a contemporary perspective, past and historic political struggles, to set them up for re-evaluation, and thus to rethink today’s social order. The contingency of today’s social order is stated and it is questioned why certain political conflicts of the past sedimented into exactly these social conditions and standards of today.² Political

theatre performing history might stir a rethinking of the ways in which history is integrated into the hegemonic social order of the day and thus exerts power. The critical exploration of a collective identity’s history might change the delimitations of its potential of political actions, of which political positions and means are acceptable today, in opposition to, divergence from or continuation of the past. Then, to perform history means to deal with what will be politically acceptable and socially legitimate in the future – look into the past, call its ghosts to see the future.

To understand different approaches of intervention, one might analyze how the author perceived the past and by which ideological or cultural patterns s/he interpreted the historical events when scrutinizing them, and was thus capable of representing them on stage. Which information did s/he choose to present, according to his/her conception of the historical events and their socio-political meaning? In question are the philosophical and political claims and pretensions guiding him/her and the effects of his/her method. Then again, the audience might see in what is presented on stage, first quite different features as attractive and appealing than the ones in the author’s focus, so that the political play will create an interplay of always differently strong energies of critique or disruption of the hegemonic and of continuing the hegemonic, silently adapting it to an only partially changed understanding of the situation – a probably only partial critique or disruption

of hegemonic narratives. This interplay of “counter-acting forces” seems inevitable. In this, the understanding of political agency appears as crucial – of who is presented as a political actor in the historical setting, and concluded from this, how political agency in contemporary society – on the play’s field of intervention – is imagined and thus how prospects of change might be thought.

Among a number of German plays that immediately after World War II performed the most recent history, aiming to influence the political formation of German postwar society(s), a very influential one was *The Devil’s General*³ by Carl Zuckmayer. Zuckmayer had just returned from exile in the U.S. when he finished his play, begun already during the war, about a German air force general who “nonpolitically” starts working for the Nazis in the 1930s, during the war detects that someone in his unit sabotages the warplanes, and finally sacrifices himself to cover up for the saboteur and thus allows the clandestine resistance operations to continue. Previous to this “tragic” end, a long talk takes place between the sabotaging engineer Oderbruch, who is displayed as rather unsympathetic character as his act of resistance first includes killing his air-force friends, and general Harras, who praises Oderbruch’s intent, but condemns his action. Harras chooses for himself “tragic doom” over decisive political action, thereby following a pattern of German ideology – the mythologization of “tragic doom” – that played also a part in Nazi ideology. In the course of the play, he tells that he only wanted to fly and did not think of politics, when helping the Nazis to rebuild a German army, and thus became entangled in crimes that he did not intend. Only later, at a certain point in the historic development, he clearly sees the crimes, but cannot cut himself off from the regime.

While Zuckmayer wanted to perform a political statement about shared responsibility in taking part in the realization of a war, and thus wanted to make the German audience think about their share of responsibility, the play’s perception by this audience was mostly quite different.⁴ Instead of engaging in

thinking about how one could behave differently, about the potential of political and social resistance and change, the audience first of all enjoyed seeing German uniforms again, even though only on stage, after having missed them for two years already. Since the play was banned by the Allies for fear of its militaristic potential, it was first staged at *Schauspielhaus* Zürich in 1946, by Heinz Hilpert, who had been the artistic director of *Deutsches Theater* in Berlin in the years 1934-1944, and was a close friend of Zuckmayer. After the Western Allies lifted the ban, the first German production premiered in 1947 in Hamburg, many more followed, turning *The Devil’s General* into one of the most staged German postwar plays. In the Soviet Zone, later the GDR, the ban was never lifted.

The play was perceived as an example of the German military’s innocence and its “misuse” by the Nazi elites, fostering a perception of “us”, the Germans, and “them”, the Nazis, as two different groups of people – a perception for which the groundwork was laid already by several German intellectuals in exile in the Soviet Union and in the United States during the last years of the war.⁵ The play also contributed to a narrative that the few Nazis somehow had made us do wrong things without us having had any bearing on that, just aiming for the best as we were. Unintended, *The Devil’s General* created a political impact in 1947 by adapting to an already present narrative of the Germans as being different from the Nazis and thus unrelated to their crimes, and enforcing in that the component of the military as being misused.⁶ This effect was produced by Zuckmayer’s decision to base his play on an older part of German ideology, namely that the military is a nonpolitical institution, only doing its duty – an ideological pattern Zuckmayer himself probably believed in wholeheartedly. What was intended to work counter-hegemonic by a weak attack against the many who didn’t resist, became, due to a lack of reflection regarding the ideological patterns of the hegemonic social order and a lack of engaging with them in a critical way, an integrative part of the hegemonic discourse and a vivid image of adapting the hegemonic order to changed political circumstances, in order not to question the basic constituents of this social order.

One of the basic constituents of the social order of the late 1940s was anti-Semitism. In *The Devil's General*, the persecution of the Jews appears only at the margins, in a form that plays down the extent and history of the persecution, and partly reproduces anti-Semitic stereotypes.⁷ But, following a change in generation, a new interest in the Nazi crimes, and the trials on Nazi crimes, like the First Auschwitz Trial in Frankfurt am Main in 1963-1965⁸, the Holocaust became more central in performing the history of National Socialism on German stages.

In 1963, *The Deputy*⁹ by Rolf Hochhuth was first staged by Erwin Piscator at the *Freie Volksbühne* Berlin. The play's political agenda was to attack the Vatican, namely Pius XII, for keeping silent and thus helping in the murder of the European Jews. So far, it was very successful in stirring a debate about the pope's behavior during the Holocaust that allowed for clear positions in favor of or against Hochhuth's position, or the moral verdict on the pope the play suggests. By his chosen target and mode of representation, Hochhuth had denounced a basic narrative of the political culture of the FRG, namely the hegemonic representation of the Catholic Church as a "martyr" during fascism. It had been used to cover up the channeling of former SS-personnel to Latin America via Catholic monasteries, and served – a main component of West-German post-war political culture that Hochhuth does not approach – many middle and lower ranked Nazis to disguise themselves as ardent Catholics who thus could not have been Nazis. One of the most prominent cases of successfully applying this disguise was the national socialist philosopher of state and law Carl Schmitt¹⁰, whose theories are influential even today in certain areas of cultural studies. Hochhuth's exposing attack on the church's conduct during National Socialism was perceived as so crucial, that several German politicians who had built their political career exactly on the Christian-petit-bourgeois disguise of the continuity in politics and the social, namely the chancellors Konrad Adenauer, Ludwig Erhard, and still Helmut Kohl in the 1980s, offered their apologies to the Vatican for the "injustice" done to it by a young German writer.¹¹

One of *The Deputy*'s weaknesses can be found in the displacement of a question of political interests, formations, and actions to a moral one by appealing to an authoritative figure to whom is ascribed that he should have acted differently, but failed. Thus the play expresses a certain understanding of society during National Socialism and its political actors. It locates as political actors single authoritative figures who could have changed something, if they had just wanted to, but not powerful ideologies, interests, or collectives forming society and thus political actions – like in this case the ideological system and traditions of Catholicism. The play cannot account for the social mechanisms active during National Socialism and still active or slightly changed today, as it presents its accusation in the representational mode of the hegemonic social order and does not scrutinize the forms of representation that express the hegemonic social order. The undertaking to represent events of the Holocaust in single representational characters misses the historic truth and appears melodramatic, as has especially been criticized by Theodor W. Adorno.¹²

Furthermore, the play continues a hegemonic component of the German way of telling not only the history of the Holocaust, as Jewish characters appear only in an illustrative way on the sidelines, but are denied to be legitimate political actors of their own.¹³ On the one hand, the fomenting aspect of *The Deputy* could be called "successful political theatre" because it opened up a debate about the role of the pope and the Catholic Church during National Socialism. But on the other hand, one might say, that the integrative aspect of *The Deputy* was not less successful, especially among its leftwing target audience, because it shifted the focus of the discourse on National Socialist history to a moral verdict on a figure in a way external to the German political events of National Socialism, like the pope. It offered to deal with the National Socialist past via a shallow approach, while continuing main aspects of the hegemonic German Holocaust discourse, like not focusing on the German perpetrators, or of German ideology, like denying Jews a status as equal political actors.

Regarding this continuation of major lines of the hegemonic narrative that Hochhuth's *Deputy* performs, it might be interesting to cast a look on Heinar Kipphardt's play *Joel Brand. The story of a deal*¹⁴, first staged by August Everding at the *Münchner Kammerspiele* in 1965. *Joel Brand* differs from other German plays dealing with the Holocaust until and during the 1960s in that it puts forward several Jewish figures among the main characters, presenting them as political agents. The play tells the story of a group of bourgeois assimilated Budapest Jews, led by Joel Brand and Rescö Kastner, who try, in 1944, to negotiate with Adolf Eichmann and his SS-colleague and rival Kurt Becher a deal to save the lives of up to one million Hungarian Jews in exchange for 10,000 trucks or other goods required by Germany's war economy. Therefore, Brand travels to Istanbul and Cairo to gain support from the Western Allies, but he ultimately fails, while Kastner succeeds in the meantime in saving at least 1,000 Jews in a much smaller deal with Eichmann. Heinar Kipphardt's way of reading the historic events – and consequently his way of representing them – was informed by an economic-political model of history and society in Marxist tradition and an according interpretation of fascism. Thus he scrutinized only those traits of National Socialist politics that are common with capitalism at large.

Since Kipphardt aimed to forgo identification, which he disapproved of in theatre, and to trigger thinking about the aspects of a historic constellation, he applied in the play *Joel Brand* a matter-of-fact way of presenting the different aspects and situations of the unfolding story. Consequently, the presentation of Brand, Kastner, and the other Jewish characters avoids any cultural or religious patterns, allusions, or stereotypes to let these characters appear somehow "Jewish" – whatever that might mean. Yiddish words, remarks on Jewish customs, or anti-Semitic stereotypes are uttered by the SS-men only, and these images don't receive any positive or negative reflection in how the Jewish characters on stage are represented; they just do not apply. Nothing differentiates those assimilated Jews in their behavior, speech, and appearance on stage from non-Jews,

except the historical situation of self definition and/ or definition by others. They are "normal". But the negotiations about the deal touch from both sides on the anti-Semitic myth of an incredible powerful and immense rich world Jewry (*Weltjudentum*). Belief in this myth might be a cause for the SS-men to start the negotiations. The Jewish negotiators clearly play with this belief to attach to their small Hungarian committee the aura of representativeness and power, thus transforming it into an acceptable partner in negotiations with the mighty SS. The drama's course of action clearly shows all anti-Semitic beliefs to be illusions lacking any base in reality. So far, Kipphardt's drama is exceptional among its contemporaries in exposing anti-Semitic beliefs as illusions without walking into the philo-Semitic trap. But, as the theory of fascism appropriated by Kipphardt does not consider historically specific socio-cultural patterns that distinguish different experiences of any given capitalist situation and more or less influence a subject's interaction with it, he can't account for an ideology guiding the interaction with reality in such an extreme that it overrides all other political or economic considerations. Thus, in the play the SS-men have a quite distanced relationship to their own anti-Semitism, as if it had no major influence on their actions and was a mere question of practicability. Due to the reality Kipphardt was capable of seeing and presenting, he could show anti-Semitism as a bunch of illusions, but failed in showing these illusions as decisive for the actions of those who believe in them. Thus, the question of why the SS-men kill Jews is left an enigma.

Interestingly enough, the reception of the play was primarily interested in the representation of Eichmann, and in the responsibility of the Agency and the Western Allies for not saving the Jews, but a lot less in the Jewish characters or in aspects of the representation of anti-Semitism. Kipphardt himself developed in the years to come a growing interest in Eichmann, writing another play on the interrogation of Adolf Eichmann by the Israeli authorities before his trial, in which Eichmann tried to portray himself as not accountable for any of his deeds.¹⁵ This play, called *Brother Eichmann*, was first staged a few months after Kipphardt's death,

by Dieter Giesing at the Munich *Residenztheater* in January 1983. The play appears as the product of a leveling of the historic specificity of National Socialism in Kipphardt's preoccupation with the material concerning Eichmann towards perceiving "the Eichmann conduct as the bourgeois conduct par excellence"¹⁶, as "the ordinary conduct in our world today".¹⁷ The play interweaves the interrogation of Eichmann with so called "scenes of analogy", some of them depicting events in Auschwitz, but most are post-war and denouncing political behavior in Western capitalist states (only) as analog to Eichmann's – prominent among them a young Israeli soldier perceiving himself in the uniform of an SS-man searching the Bialystok Ghetto, and several scenes dedicated to Ariel Sharon and the massacre in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps. As if conscious of Kipphardt's view, even the Israeli main interrogator states in the middle of the play his own felt "convergence" with Eichmann.¹⁸ The decision to display the alleged universality of the "Eichmann conduct" in the Western capitalist countries by emphasizing Jewish/Israeli examples seems to follow a trend in the German left after 1967, when parts of it exchanged traditional anti-Semitism for anti-Zionism, to cling to it until today.¹⁹ Again, as in *Joel Brand*, the conduct of the Jewish characters is presented in *Brother Eichmann* as being "normal". But almost 20 years later, Kipphardt's political insight had degraded to a level of understanding "normal" as being like all other wrongdoers. Interestingly, this "normalcy" of capitalism is stated by casting the most prominent traditional character of otherness in German cultural discourse, "the Jew", as "being the same", "being normal". The representations of Jewish characters without a proper presentation of the historical and socio-cultural situations from which they are taken, tend to serve as means of blurring the causes and the ends of political actions, so that no understanding of these actions and thus of responsibilities, needs and ways of changes can be achieved – here theatre stops being political in a productive way.

In 1996, Frank Castorf staged *The Devil's General* at *Volkstheater* Berlin, reading the play and its reception

– in particular the 1955 film version, directed by Helmut Käutner, with Curd Jürgens as lead – as documents of the postwar German history of coming to terms with the history of National Socialism. The production deconstructs not only the character of the military hero Harras²⁰, but also the community of Germans around him – partly Nazis, partly "only" hangers-on.

In the end of the 1940s, the sacrifice of Harras offered to the audience – similarly composed of former Nazis and, suddenly in the majority, hangers-on or opponents – the easily acceptable idea, that the intent of resistance might have been good, but that it is alright at the same time to be comfortable with having done nothing of the like, and to continue unimpaired. In the play, this position receives an interesting twist performed by Anne Eilers, who was an ardent Nazi as long as her husband, the airman Friedrich Eilers, had not crashed with his sabotaged plane. After her husband died, she accuses Harras of letting things happen – that is, the continuation of the war – though he does not believe in them. It seems, that it was either preferable, if Harras supported the war as a believer of Nazi ideology and politics, or, if he is not a follower of Nazi ideology and politics, that he should have resisted and thus saved the Nazis – here esp. Friedrich Eilers – from the consequences of their deeds. Both ways, Harras failed in the eyes of Anne Eilers, and the question of guilt is turned into an argument on belief, not on political actions. Harras is called a murderer because he did not save Eilers, though he did not believe; while Eilers is called a hero, for he died in a war he believed in.

Near the end of the *Volkstheater* production, Anne Eiler's accusation is voiced by all the actors – by a chorus of hangers-on who perceive themselves as victims of National Socialism or of Harras, against Harras. Thus, the wrongness of a people's community (*Volksgemeinschaft*) and its aggressive and whiny self-righteousness is exposed as having been, and still being, a distinctive trait of German performing the history of National Socialism, the World War II, and the Holocaust. Still, this chorus wishes the one who started to act irregular to their concepts of uniformity, Harras, to be dead. He agrees, and

only then the saboteur Oderbruch appears to give the reasons behind his deeds. The others flee, as they don't want to hear him. In Castorf's staging, Oderbruch's way of speaking sounds so much like propaganda, like state-official antifascism, that he appears unsympathetic not for what he says, but for how he says it. He ends with a report of Harras' death: "State funeral. Black."

Notes

¹ Letter by Peter Hacks to Heinar Kipphardt 14 June 1964 in: Heinar Kipphardt, *In der Sache J. Robert Oppenheimer. Ein Stück und seine Geschichte (In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer. A Play and Its History)*, Uwe Naumann (ed.), Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1987, p. 210. [All quotes from German texts are, unless noted otherwise, translated by me.]

² This understanding of the social "as the realm of sedimented practices [...] that conceal the originary acts of their contingent political institution," and, contrariwise, of the political as conflicting with a given, a hegemonic social order, follows Chantal Mouffe's definition of the political in: Chantal Mouffe, *On the Political*, London, New York: Routledge, 2005, p. 17.

³ Carl Zuckmayer, 'Des Teufels General' ('The Devil's General') in: Carl Zuckmayer, *Die Deutschen Dramen (The German Plays)*, Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer, 1947, pp. 243-397.

⁴ For a more extensive study of the reviews of the first productions of *The Devil's General* and of discussions with the audience following those shows, see Katrin Weingran, "Des Teufels General" in der Diskussion. Zur Rezeption von Carl Zuckmayers Theaterstück nach 1945 ("The Devil's General" in Discussion. On the Reception of Carl Zuckmayer's Play after 1945), Marburg: Tectum, 2004.

⁵ E.g., the resolution by Bertolt Brecht, Heinrich Mann, Lion Feuchtwanger, Bruno Frank, Ludwig Marcuse, and Hans Reichenbach – and opposed by Thomas Mann – where they strongly emphasized that there were a difference between Hitler's regime and the "German people"; see Brecht's *Journal* 1 August 1943 in: Bertolt Brecht, *Werke (Complete Works)*, Große kommentierte Berliner und Frankfurter Ausgabe, Vol. 27, Berlin, Frankfurt am Main: Aufbau and Suhrkamp, pp. 161-162. Zuckmayer himself expressed the same attitude already in writings during the war, see Weingran, 2004, pp. 10-13.

⁶ This includes introducing an opposition between the Wehrmacht, the military as represented by Harras, and the SS, as represented by Harras' main antagonist Schmidt-Lausitz.

⁷ See Dagmar Deuring, "... was dazu gehört, ein Mensch zu sein". Wiederholung und Zeugenschaft. Zu einem Theater-Denken "nach Auschwitz" ("...what it takes to be a human being". Repetition and Witnessing. On Thinking

Theatre "after Auschwitz"), München: Epodium, 2006, pp. 96-100.

⁸ Based on his visits of the First Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial, Peter Weiss wrote *The Investigation*, a play and theatrical event that can't be scrutinized here, though it would fit into the context, as several other plays too; cf. http://www.wollheim-memorial.de/en/ermittlung_theatertext_en and http://www.wollheim-memorial.de/en/ermittlung_inszenierungen_en_2 [accessed 25 January 2010].

⁹ Rolf Hochhuth, *Der Stellvertreter (The Deputy)*, Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1963.

¹⁰ See Raphael Gross, *Carl Schmitt and the Jews. The "Jewish Question," the Holocaust and German Legal Theory*, Madison, WI: University of Madison Press, 2007.

¹¹ Klaus Wannemacher, *Erwin Piscator's Theater gegen das Schweigen. Politisches Theater zwischen den Fronten des Kalten Kriegs (1951-1966) (Erwin Piscator's Theatre Against the Silence. Political Theatre Between the Frontlines of the Cold War (1951-1966))*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2004, p. 170. In light of history, it seems like an ironic twist that it's a German pope, Benedict XVI, who grew up under National Socialism and still seems influenced by that socialization, and now strives to saint Pius XII, regardless of his silence during the Holocaust and anti-Semitism.

¹² See Theodor W. Adorno, 'Offener Brief an Rolf Hochhuth' ('Open Letter to Rolf Hochhuth') in: Theodor W. Adorno, *Noten zur Literatur (Notes to Literature)*, *Gesammelte Schriften (Collected Works)*, Vol. 11, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997, pp. 591-598.

¹³ The character offered to identify with is the young catholic priest Ricardo, not the Jewish characters; see also Andreas Huyssen, 'The Politics of Identification: "Holocaust" and West German Drama' in: *New German Critique*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1980, p. 129.

¹⁴ Heinar Kipphardt, 'Joel Brand. Die Geschichte eines Geschäfts' ('Joel Brand. The Story of a Deal') in: Heinar Kipphardt, *Joel Brand und andere Theaterstücke (Joel Brand and Other Plays)*, Uwe Naumann (ed.), Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1988, pp. 7-96.

¹⁵ Heinar Kipphardt, *Bruder Eichmann. Schauspiel und Materialien (Brother Eichmann. Play and Materials)*, Uwe Naumann (ed.), Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1986.

¹⁶ "Gehört die Eichmann-Haltung zu den erschreckenden Symptomen unserer Zeit?" ("Is the Eichmann Conduct One of the Appalling Symptoms of Our Time?"), interview with Heinar Kipphardt, first published in *Welt der Arbeit*, 22 December 1967 in: Heinar Kipphardt, 1986, p. 194.

¹⁷ Introduction to the prepublication of one scene in *Theater heute*, Jahressonderheft 1982 in: Heinar Kipphardt, 1986, p. 205.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

¹⁹ See for that context, Martin W. Kloke, *Israel und die deutsche Linke. Zur Geschichte eines schwierigen Verhältnisses (Israel and the German Left. On the History of a Difficult Relationship)*, Frankfurt am Main: Haag + Herchen, 1994.

²⁰ Harras is played in the first part by the actress Corinna Harfouch and in the second part by the actor Bernhard Schütz; as well other cross-gender castings take place.

Matthias NAUMANN

Frankfurto prie Maino Goethe's universitetas, Frankfurtas

Kaip šiandien atrodo „mūsų istorija“? Istoriniai spektakliai apie nacionalsocializmą ir Holokaustą politiniame pokario Vokietijos teatre

Reikšminiai žodžiai: politinis teatras, Vokietija, nacionalsocializmas, Antrasis Pasaulinis karas, Holokaustas, Carlos Zuckmayeris, Rolfas Hochhuthas, Heinaras Kipphardtas, Frankas Castorfas.

Santrauka

Pjeses apie istorinius įvykius galima suvokti kaip istorijos atkūrimo pastangas, būdingas tam tikram laikmečiui, ir kaip sociopolitinio visuomenės diskurso atspindį. XX a. antrosios pusės vokiečių teatre daugelis reikšmingiausių politinių pjesių buvo susiję su atskirų nacionalsocializmo, Antrojo Pasaulinio karo ir Holokausto aspektų scenine reprezentacija. Šios pjesės siūlo teatrui scenoje vaizduoti kariškius ir SS narius, persekiojamus žydus ir nusikaltėlius, minias pakalikų ir apskritai – nacionalinę vokiečių bendruomenę. Reprezentacijoms būdingas kritinis santykis, kai politizuojamos nusistovėjusios socialinės praktikos, vertybės ir ideologiniai visuomenės modeliai, ir integruojamas santykis, kai toliau laikomasi hegemoninės socialinės santvarkos, tik iš dalies ją keičiant, o iš dalies pritaikant prie pasikeitusių istorinių aplinkybių, tačiau neabejojant giluminėmis ideologinėmis struktūromis, ar jos būtų susijusios su militarizmu, antisemitizmu ar nacionalizmu.

Straipsnyje analizuojama politinių ir integravimo aspektų sąveika istoriniuose spektakliuose, siejant su platesniu sociopolitiniu diskursu, ypač akcentuojant kariškių reprezentaciją (Carlo Zuckmayerio *Velnio generolas*, 1947); politinio tarpininkavimo klausimą (Rolfo Hochhutho *Atstovas*, 1963); žydų personažų reprezentaciją kaip „skirtingų“ arba „normalių“ (Heinaro Kipphardto *Džoelis Brandas: sandėrio istorija*, 1965 ir *Brolis Eichmannas*, 1983); ir, galiausiai, kaip spektaklio recepcijos istorija tampa jo pastatymų scenoje istorija (Franko Castorfo *Velnio generolas*, pastatytas 1996).

Gauta 2010-05-19

Parengta spaudai 2010-09-07