Rose-Anne Gush

Artistic Labour on Violence: the work of Elfriede Jelinek

The phrase from the title of this thesis, 'Figuring Austria's Repressed Violence' reflects the extent to which the body became the primary material, site and consideration in artistic practices in Austria in the 1960s onwards. The body is taken as the central focus and material which artists and writers both figured and disfigured in the space of art, in attempts to work through their history. The chapters so far have shown how this is articulated: through the fixation of the body by film; through the limit of the body and the limit of shame; through the labour of sexuality, the body in the family and the state, and the subterranean history of the body under capitalism, fascism and mass culture. We have explored what Adorno considered a new moral imperative after Auschwitz for bodily [*leibhaft*] thoughts and feelings.

In chapter 3, we have seen how in Austria revivified ideas of the *Volksgemeinschaft* are burgeoning within far-right politics, reconnecting the state to an idea of the people as *Volk*, and the family to authoritarianism. This final chapter continues this thread in Jelinek's work but it looks at this problem anew. The *Volksgemeinschaft* is an idea that can be paired with *Heimat* (though *Heimat* pre-existed National Socialism), a notion of homeland and *Gemütlichkeit*, cozy culture, in the interwar years. This gives rise to an exclusive collective, the collective of the *Volk* under the National Socialist state of the Third Reich. It meant being German and fulfilling the destiny of that being. *Heimat* culture, culture-industry feel-good culture, was reinstated in the postwar decades, as we have seen in chapter 4 and in relation to Jelinek's *Burgtheater*, as Austrians rapidly forgot the horrors of the 1940s. I propose that Jelinek's ongoing critique of this notion, stemming from the commodification of the prevalent concept of *Heimat,* amplifies the register of her work beyond Austria although this is the specific context and history that she addresses. This chapter will follow two works by Elfriede Jelinek, namely *Totenauberg* (1991) and *Die Liebhaberinnen* (1975). The first is a play. The second is a novel. They share, albeit in very different ways, a concern with the concept and reality of *Heimat*. This final chapter provides an analysis of this concept which has regained in import. I want to use these two works to try to articulate a claim about the role of fate, capitalist-work, nature and history in Elfriede Jelinek's writings, and in turn to see what Jelinek tells us about the meaning of fate, capitalist-work, nature and history. The two sides of this chapter address differing conceptions of history and fate. First this is addressed through Jelinek's staging of Heidegger and Arendt on the mountain.

Secondly, it is read, aided by Jelinek's novel, as a gendered concept, and a concept which has been made abstract.

Totenauberg stages a critical, poetic, juxtaposition of Martin Heidegger and Hannah Arendt. Jelinek's depiction of Heidegger as the Old Man, is premised on 'Die Frage nach der Technik' (1954, 'The Question Concerning Technology'), an essay which is read as his retroactive attempt to justify his Nazism. There are two further texts by Heidegger which Jelinek is concerned with. 'Abraham a Sankta Clara' from 1910, is a text which endorses conservative discourses of health and illness, which would later become part of the 'pro-peasant' politics of National Socialism (as discussed in chapter 3) and 'Schöpferische Landschaft: Warum Bleiben wir in der Provinz?' ('Why I stay in the Provinces') from 1933 in which Heidegger describes being affirmed by an old farmer in his rejection of an invitation to go to Berlin.[1] Jelinek's Woman figure is based on Hannah Arendt's essay 'What is Existentialism' (1948), her letters with Karl Jaspers, and the text she wrote for Heidegger's eightieth birthday. As we will see, Jelinek stages the Arendt figure in a way that offers direct critique of Heidegger's thinking. The Arendt figure allows Jelinek to gain proximity to Heidegger's thinking. Yet, as Marlies Janz claims, the Arendt figure is resigned and the play *Totenauberg* is resigned with her. At the very end of the play we hear the Woman say to the Old Man: 'But now it's time to celebrate! We have found each other again!'.[2]

This chapter reads Jelinek's play in its historical context. It reads Heidegger's text, and Jelinek's response to it, proposing this as a response not just to Heidegger, but to both the production of fascism's afterlife as a form of work and production which mirrors the increased worklessness which comes with automation under capitalist social relation, and this addresses the political meaning of *Heimat* as nativism. In the second part of this chapter, I will read *Die Liebhaberinnen* against the grain, reading out of it the gendered concept of fate. Through my analysis of these two texts, this final chapter attempts to read out of these texts, the body of time and history, and the logic of fate and abstraction. What I want to propose is that Jelinek's own texts do the important work relating the logic of fate, to history, more specifically, to the history of capitalism.

In the first part of the play, 'Im Grünen' ('Out in the Country') the Heidegger figure is placed in the lobby of an upmarket hotel dressed in an old ski-outfit. He is strapped into a body frame, which the author calls a *Gestell* (in the style of an enlarged mould of his body [*Art Körper-Moulage*]). The word *Ge-stell* extended through the dash takes on the meaning of 'Enframing'. The historical Heidegger ascribes the essence of technology to this meaning. On one level 'Enframing' provides the conceit of the play. Jelinek's body frame is a device that literally fits onto

the person and enlarges it, Heidegger stands in his own frame, which is an extension of his *Körper*, the aspect of the body which gives rise to measure and control.

The title, *Totenauberg*, is derived from the Black Forest village, namely, Todtnauberg, where Heidegger's ski-hut was located. *Todtnauberg* is also the title of Paul Celan's poem, written directly after his meeting and confrontation with the philosopher in 1967. Jelinek underscores *Die Toten* — the dead, playing on both Heidegger's idea of 'Being-toward-death' and the millions killed by the Nazis during the Holocaust. Gitta Honegger notes that the title brings together nature, home and dwelling, as they operate in National Socialist ideology and politics by incorporating the native and excluding the foreign, while the *Berg*, the 'mountain' remains full of the dead.[3]

There is a thread which runs through Jelinek's work, which ceaselessly loops back into history. In many cases this means the history and consequent forgetting and denial of National Socialism in Austria. This chapter continues to pursue the question of what 'artistic labour of the body' means in this context. Jelinek's oeuvre evokes a way of working which relates to the genre of documentary. Yet, she doesn't merely document. Rather, she dissects history, in particular, what is forgotten, repressed or disavowed, and transmits it into the present. The thread in Jelinek's writing ties time in knots, as it reveals the waxing and waning of forces of history through losses and gains in power. Her texts agitate these forces of history. They do not give up on history, as they do not surrender history to memory's distortions: in Austria this is best characterised by what became a cliché slogan, 'I don't remember anything'. Her texts astutely describe political genealogies which, in a way akin to EXPORT's image meteors, pierce into the present.

If, for a moment we consider Jelinek's later play *Rechnitz* (2009), we find that it too points us in this direction.[4] *Rechnitz* explores the concept of pride of sin [*Sündenstolz*], which in this case means killing for pleasure.[5] It relates to an occasion when, late into the night, guests at a dinner party killed 180 Hungarian Jews.[6] The Rechnitz massacre took place in the village of the same name in Burgenland on the border between Austria and Hungary, shortly before the Red Army entered Austria in 1945. Records show that a party took place at the Castle in Rechnitz and when all the guests were sufficiently drunk, the Countess Margit von Batthyány led her partygoers to kill the 180 Jewish-Hungarian forced-labourers who were building the *Südostwall*. The next day 18 Jews were forced to bury the bodies. After they had completed this task, they too were killed.[7]

Returning to *Totenauberg*, Matthias Konzett has interpreted this play as a critique of Austrian culture as authentic *Heimat*, where Austria is characterised as a society with

'insidious marketing of ethnic and cultural identities as its primary commodities'.[8] *Heimat* translates as homeland, yet in Austria and Germany, this term is inflected with nativism. In the first half of the twentieth-century it was a concept used by traditionalist actors within Austro- and Nazi fascism. Part of conspiratorial anti-Semitism included the notions that the *Heimat* was being destroyed by the Jews and the *Heimat* was the location or countryside where one could escape the frays of modernity and the hectic cities. In Austria *Heimat* continues to be exemplified by the image of the Alpine landscape and traditional clothes, namely *Tracht*. In *Totenauberg*, as Konzett explains, Jelinek's critique of *Heimat* culture is re-articulated through a tourist and cultural landscape depicted as a 'theme park of genocide', intersecting along the two poles of Heideggerian belonging '*Zugehörigkeit*' (belonging to a *Volk*), and Arendtian (Jewish) rootlessness.[9] Konzett describes Jelinek's play not as a 'casual reconstruction of what may have ultimately lead to Nazi genocide. Instead, she is more interested in trying to account for a "second death" threatening the victims of Nazism'.[10] This second death concerns the loss of memory. Moreover, Konzett describes Jelinek's method as one where language is shifted 'from the ideological discourse of fascism, of the unity of soil and being, to that of a more dispersive and ideologically evasive course of consumerism with its deceptive and evasive modes of *Zuhörigkeit*'.[11] Konzett describes Jelinek's method as displacing the 'discourse of fascism', if one can call fascism a discourse, onto something like 'consumerism' and culture-industry lubricated belonging. Thus, Konzett proposes that nativism is rewritten as commodity nativism, encapsulated in Austria's obsession with winter sports, and its tolerance of profitable strangers (tourists) at the expense of immigrants or refugees.[12] I would add that her play *Burgtheater* and her writings on media also function in a similar way, but I would disagree that fascism is merely taken up as a 'discourse'. I would emphasize that it is through intertextual dialogue that Jelinek stages the two philosophers, in a way which *also* enacts a displacement of a political debate: it pits the cosmopolitanism of Arendt, the exiled Jew, against the nativist traditionalism of Heidegger.

Does Jelinek manage to sharpen or obscure the political stakes in this debate? Jelinek's method works by way of a kind of rewriting of Heidegger's and Arendt's texts. In so doing she seeks to get as close to their language as possible. Does her rewriting, her *distortion* of these texts, or what Konzett describes as 'displacement', begin to reveal a truth about them and what kind of ideas they underpin?

I am interested in *how* Jelinek excavates these moments which have been repressed or erased in a way which avoids understanding history in relation to the present by way of comparison, a way which reifies victimhood or identity politics, since as Konzett astutely claims, Jelinek 'advances a minority discourse without relying on an identity politics that reifies the position of minorities'.[13] I propose that while she carefully investigates history, Jelinek's art claims that historical events do not have fixed positions. Rather, as such events migrate through time their meaning shifts. With specific conditions of possibility, this meaning is reproduced and repurposed. Therefore, *Totenauberg* is a play which concerns the renewal of tradition. We are returned to the questions which I posed in the introduction to this thesis concerning the role of history in Jelinek's (and EXPORT's) work. I propose that Jelinek's time-study shows the continuity between capitalism and fascism, since fascism is understood not only as a system culminating in concentration camps, where there were no exit points, and minimal possibility for resistance, but also as a system of which destroys humans through labour in the sense of *Vernichtung durch Arbeit* (destruction through labour) as discussed in chapter 3. Fascism is also a form of work-time.

In an article titled 'Working Through Working' Werner Hamacher analyses three motifs of 'work' found in Hitler, Heidegger and Ernst Jünger (mytho-theological, ontological and morphological). He does this to argue that it is the connection between these forms of work that undergirds National Socialism:

> National Socialism does not lie behind us as a historically surmounted phenomenon; it may even be utterly insurmountable and resistant to attempts at working through it. For, as a 'monstrous' form of work, it is nothing but the production of its own afterlife and survival, and thus it continuously produces itself as a spectre—not as a chimera and mere illusion but, rather, as a reality worse than death: namely, the sheer positivity of life, dead life, living death.[14]

A correspondence is legible between Konzett's reading of Jelinek's *Totenauberg* as a work which tracks the displacement of the *discourse* of fascism from 'soil and being' *to* deceptive modes of belonging, and Hamacher's concern with the *production* of fascism's afterlife and survival as 'a reality worse than death', namely 'dead life' and 'living death'. Yet, the distinction between them lies in what Hamacher terms 'a spectre', a haunting, *not* 'chimera' or 'illusion' to which Konzett's deception and evasive modes of belonging relate, because chimera and illusion imply that this 'discourse' exists merely on the surface. Yet, what we have established in this thesis, from Reich and Adorno (via Marx), is that ideology does merely exist as an external layer to social life, but rather that it lies within it, it is reproduced as society is

reproduced. It cannot be lifted, or even torn off. For Hamacher, National Socialism produces its afterlife as a form of work, namely capitalist work premised on extracting value from labour, dead or living, and as a ghost of itself, as a reality in the guise of 'a sheer positivity of life'. I want to read *Totenauberg* as a response to this '"monstrous" form of work', while asking what form of work Jelinek undertakes. If this play is a way of working through working, how might this also be a form of artistic labour of the body? I propose that with poetic means Jelinek takes Heidegger's texts not merely to displace a discourse, but to submit the text to reworking. She rewrites the text so that it is at once recognised for its historical truth (technology sets upon nature and by extension also humans), and its historical violences become readable (humans are worked and destroyed through work and the principle of exchange).

The temporal placing of *Totenauberg* lies both in the postwar decade with Heidegger's essay 'The Question Concerning Technology', and the final moments of Eastern European Communism. *Totenauberg* is partly a reading of the spectre of Heidegger's essay in the crisis of its own time and in the time of political upheaval. In Austria this relates to the 1986 Waldheim scandal, an unwanted reminder of the fragility of Austria's *Opferdoktrin*, highlighting the continued presence of former Nazis in positions of power, including Kurt Waldheim as president; the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the opening up of the East, and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. In Jelinek's view the play is 'written under the impact of German unification and of the failure of Eastern European communism as a politically practicable model'.[15] She explains: 'I was after the sense of resignation, pain and irony.'[16] The 'opening up of the East' signals to the migration that took place after the fall of the Iron Curtain. Labour shortages at the end of the 1980s and the violent disintegration of Yugoslavia brought an influx of refugees to Austria. These political crises were instrumentalised by the FPÖ, which under Jörg Haider became increasingly vocally anti-immigrant, xenophobic and nativist, calling for 'zero immigration', a move that was not forcefully resisted.[17] Jelinek describes what followed as 'white fascism' in the sense of a 'renewed respectability of thinking along the rightist margin'.[18] She relates this to the burgeoning Green party and movement which in turn leads to an obsession with health, and a claim to 'physical intactness'.[19] For Jelinek, in the historical moment of the globalisation proper of capitalism, both irony and resignation, as I have mentioned at the start of this chapter, are attributes ascribed to the Hannah Arendt figure, who was historically, precisely the philosopher who was forced to become political through emigration.[20]

A Work in Four Parts

Totenauberg is structured into four pictures, or scenes. Each is dialectal, entering into tension with its opposite: 'Im Grünen' ('Out in the Country') deals with the myth of nature and *Heimat*; 'Totenauberg (Gesundheit)' ('Totenauberg (Health)') focusses on health, illness and euthanasia; 'Heim Welt' ('Home World') explores, as Konzett describes, the commodification of tourism, and xenophobia, and 'Unschuld' ('Innocence') follows up on a philosophy of innocence in the face of Auschwitz, the atom bomb and as Janz claims, genetic engineering.[21]

These scenes contain an extended reflection on Heidegger's considerations on technology and nature. *Totenauberg* was written in the wake of the publication of *Lust*. Although it takes the form of a play as opposed to a novel, and it takes a different object, namely a conversation between 'Heidegger' and 'Arendt', I would argue that there is a closeness between the works. As *Lust* articulates the dual reproduction, both in the family and through the image, *Totenauberg* is a play that interweaves the stage and the screen: the play is set against a background of moving images. According to Jelinek's stage directions a video should be made by the director in an amateurish style. In this chapter, I will refer to Jelinek's instructions for both the video and play as a kind of ideal form, a notation of something objective.

Jelinek has described her conception of *Totenauberg* as 'a dialectical interpenetration of language and film'.[22] She explains, 'I wanted the pathos of the text to encounter the one-dimensionality of the screen, thus appearing to traverse and obliterate the horizontal plane. […] If you have the cinematic element underexposed, the dialectic vanishes, language stands abandoned, alone'.[23] Video is aligned with the technological index, and language with both its written and spoken forms. How do the visual descriptions of video technology oppose or relate to the technology of the text? Does or can the text embody video and video processes, rather than signifying a mere description of these procedures? The video portrays a kind of busyness or restlessness, minimal serenity, noise, and lack of peace. It functions as a background busyness that clutters, fills in silences and fills up space. But its images are also specific. Yet, without the language of the text the video is insufficient, because it reinforces the jargon, which Jelinek wants to pierce through.

The script of *Totenauberg* moves between scales of catastrophe. If we turn again to the first scene the Arendt figure begins to speak from the screen towards the old man. The source of her monologue alternates between the actor on the stage and the image on the screen. This pulls into view a contradiction in scale between the tiny human on the stage, who is simultaneously blown up and framed by the screen. She says: "Lets start with the insignificant, the small: Aren't the words needed now smaller than any you could ever possess? And you yourself make a nice little picture [*Bilderl*], a 'reproduction' [*Abbildung*]! Don't fit into the fine but phoney suit of

this phoney landscape."[24] Heidegger is depicted as a picture, or copy.[25] He is made into a little picture which is also an *Abbildung*, a reproduction. He is blown up like a photograph, or a small picture inside his literal *Gestell*, his frame. He is expanded, scaled up by his frame into his Being. On one level, it is through the frame, which makes fun of his concept that Jelinek works on the concept of 'Enframing' [*Ge-stell*]. If we turn to Heidegger's essay in question, *Ge-stell* is understood in the sense of calling forth, of an active *en*-framing, a 'challenging claim' that gathers its objects, its humans, in order to reveal them to be used. However, *Gestell*, in normal, non-hyphenated use refers simply to a rack, frame or shelf, to that which props or holds something up, to an apparatus or a structure, to something which structures, to a skeleton. It is the extension of the word *Ge-stell*, through the hyphen that renders it active. *Ge-stell* is designated by Heidegger as the essence of modern technology. Yet, paradoxically, the essence of modern technology is not technological; there is a split meaning in the word 'Enframing'. *Ge-stell* stems from *Stellen* — to put upon — but 'producing' and 'presenting' [*Her/Dar-stellen*] are also derived from *Stellen*. For the historical Heidegger, these aspects of the word's etymology function as modes of revealing, which allow their presence, in the way of *poiēsis*, to be revealed, to come into unconcealment.[26] This mode of revealing is what Jelinek's body frame points to with some irony, yet her gesture is also resigned. At this point it seems to say something like: 'Heidegger and his ideas are here to stay, here is how we can laugh at them'.

Heidegger begins his 'The Question Concerning Technology' by asserting a kind of processual questioning, where one can not simply answer the 'question'. The essay is laid out in such a way that each instantiation of the questioning, each repetition reconfigures the question. Each new iteration of the question sinks deeper into the meaning of the essence of technology in Heidegger's thought. Here, there is no static question, rather, this questioning implies a relation: "The relationship will be free if it opens our human existence to the essence [*Wesen*] of technology. When we can respond to this essence, we shall be able to experience the technological within its own bounds."[27] Heidegger's questioning is led by an open comportment to the world. It should reveal the essence of what is being questioned, in this case: technology. What is the quality of this openness? If we return this question to Heidegger, we find an openness which can only be afforded to those who are not being persecuted. In Heidegger's view, there are two definitions of technology: technology is a means to an end, and it is human procedures. Both means and procedure refer to *instrumentum*, which arranges, builds and heaps Heidegger's mountain of thought.[28] One aspect of the production of *Totenauberg* utilises visual imagery to create a visible distance from, and contradiction with, Heidegger's philosophy. Jelinek explains: "The philosophical voice would encounter the electronic media which today have the

capacity to destroy everything. On the one hand, Heidegger is building up a 'mountain' of thought—in the truest sense of the word—which, on the other, would be smothered by the world of the media."[29] Heidegger's definition of *technē* is formulated in relation to the Greeks. In his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle marks out the distinction between *technē* and *epistēmē. Technē* acts to bring-forth what fails to bring-forth itself. Heidegger takes this forward but draws a distinction between technology under the aegis of the Greeks, as handcrafts, and technology in the period of large-scale (capitalist) machine-powered industry. Furthermore, he introduces the latter mode as oppositional to the former. In Jelinek's view this oppositional meaning comes to represent the anti-modern, protectionist and traditionalist worldview of National Socialism.

For Heidegger, although this technology *reveals,* it is not connected to truth, since it consists of a 'challenging' [*herausfordern*], rather it is connected to *poiēsis*.[30] The term *her-aus-fordern* means to challenge, or to call to action, invoking a different kind of revealing to *her-vor-bringen,* to-bring-forth and *poiēsis*. But Heidegger notices something obvious. As technology measures up to physics as an exact science, the challenging, *her-aus-fordern,* the revealing that invokes action, puts pressure on nature.[31] In his essay Heidegger implies that with technology's transformation, nature becomes the supplier of energy and a source of extraction.

Against the blossoming flower that can be brought forth *in-itself,* modern technology challenges nature to supply, and to be put to work. The world is revealed as a resource that can be harvested and stored. As opposed to the peasant who did not challenge the land, but merely lived on it and used it according to its own terms (and who were for this reason ideologically celebrated by the Nazis, as discussed in chapter 3), Heidegger says that modern technology '*sets* upon' [*stellt*] nature.[32] He writes, '[a]griculture is now the mechanised food industry. Air is now set upon to yield nitrogen. […] What the river [*Rhine*] is now, namely a water power supplier, derives from out of the essence of the power station'.[33] Heidegger pauses on the name — *The Rhine* — because it speaks of both the scene of the river, and the poem by Hölderlin. He asks if the river can still be a landscape, but answers quickly that this can only be fulfilled as a landscape for tourists, organised by the holiday industry.[34] We begin to see that *Totenauberg*, a play about the commodification of *Heimat* and wanted (tourists) and unwanted (refugees and migrants) guests, also echoes the structural limit points of Heidegger's thinking. Heidegger's notion of 'challenging revealing', implicitly speaks of a kind of metabolism of industry and nature, periodised since the development of modern physics. But Heidegger omits to mention the human and their labour. He uses the following words to characterise this metabolism/re-vealing: '[u]nlocking, transforming, storing, distributing and switching about'.[35] The process of this challenging is a repetitive one which regulates itself. It is defined by its temporal infinity,

its endlessness. This analysis of Heidegger's formulations on nature and technology is important in order to understand the precise way that Jelinek responds to it. 'Everywhere, everything is ordered to stand by, to be immediately at hand […]. We call it the standing reserve [*Bestand*]'.[36] For Heidegger, this *Bestand*, this standing reserve is *inclusive*, it includes everything. What it constitutes is ready for use. This means that humans are rendered material. If we translate this, in Heidegger's context this was a human-material to be worked, and then killed, *Bestand* implies the concentration camps *KZ*. Yet, this was something about which Heidegger, the NSDAP philosopher, remained silent.

Marlies Janz describes Jelinek's method as somewhat complicated: it is not merely ideology critique because it also alludes to a truth in Heidegger's work. Janz claims that in this allusion, Jelinek doubles herself and thus her discourse becomes a 'schizoid' discourse, which presupposes the critical interpretation of her own language.[37] We know (from chapter 2) that Jelinek's characters carry both history and its antithesis on their bodies. In *Totenauberg*, this is made literal by means of the use of the body frame and language. In her rewriting of Heidegger and Arendt, Jelinek enacts a concealing, revealing moment. She reveals where the danger which Heidegger refuses to recognise, lies.

In 'The Question Concerning Technology' Heidegger implies that the human relationship to technology can only be understood belatedly. This brings us closer his concept of time and history: '[t]he essence of modern technology starts man upon the way of that revealing through which the real everywhere, more or less distinctly, becomes the standing reserve.'[38] Heidegger begins to inflect this mode of thinking with the language of destiny. 'It is from out of this destining [*das Geschick*] that the essence of all history [*Geschichte*] is determined' he writes.[39] His concept of *Enframing* means that humans are sent, *destined* to their revealing, to their becoming resources, to their being measured as '*Bestand*'; the echoes of this language are startling, but not surprising. Jelinek's play *Wolken.Heim* (1988) cites Heidegger's 1933 address as rector of Freiburg University, where he describes the ontological grounding of Nazi institutions: *Arbeitdienst* and *Wissensdienst* in what Ben Morgan describes as a 'collective, a state and a sense of destiny' combined. This became the meaning of what Morgan continues to describe as Heidegger's 'misguided, utopian desire to overcome the division of labour'.[40] Yet, in the post-war context there is a silent implication that those who were killed in the labour camps and death factories under National Socialism were 'destined' there, as the inverse of the destiny at play in the fulfilment of Germany's destiny, as the destiny of the *Volk*. As if Heidegger's refusal to consider the Holocaust belongs to the same philosophical move as *destining* as the essence of all history. The blindness in the first position is the same blindness as in the second. If we

return to Hamacher's essay, we are reminded that National Socialism defined Auschwitz as a workplace:

> A workplace where the non-proper, the non-working—and it is insinuated, the already dead—are once more put to death, in order that the proper, the society of work, can emerge as the product of its own labour. It defines murder as the work of life on itself. It defines Jews as the unredeemed; it defines Communists as the dualists of class conflict; it defines Gypsies as the homeless and propertyless; it defines homosexuals as the un(re)productive: it defines them all as materials for work, as work materials—namely as the always already former, as the dead, unproductive people—and it defines work, on the one hand, as the production of corpses, and, on the other, as the production of the 'gleaming' spectral body of the work-state.[41]

Hamacher's reading of 'work makes free' the destruction, as the 'murder as the work of life on itself' amplifies the historical meaning of Heidegger's destining as the determination of all history, a history outside of which, he claimed to stand. As we have seen, Heidegger's notion of Enframing is posited as *destining*. Destining is intimately connected to the 'open', or is it itself. This implies that only from an open relationship to technology can one meet the essence of technology outside a relation of domination. Yet, Heidegger introduces an element of danger, as that which emerges from the precise moment of destining.[42] In 'destining', what is revealed or unconcealed can also be misinterpreted, for Heidegger this is what produces fear.[43] 'The destining of revealing is in itself not just any danger but, danger as such'.[44] Heidegger implies something akin to 'pure danger'. This 'supreme' danger lies in the moment when what is revealed, is no longer considered an object but merely 'standing-reserve'. And, it is humans, in the midst of objectlessness, who order the standing reserve. The 'supreme' danger, is characterised insofar as the 'regulating and securing of the standing-reserve mark all revealing'.[45] This means that revealing as such, for its own sake, as truth, is no longer possible. Heidegger calls this a block: 'Enframing blocks the shining-forth and holding-sway of truth'.[46] If we reconsider destining as the moment of danger, producing fear, in the *Jargon of Authenticity* (1964), a text which takes aim at the language of the 'Authentics', Adorno brings us back to the level of history. Without referring explicitly to Heidegger, he emphatically criticises this idea of technology:

> It is the fear of unemployment, lurking in all citizens of countries of high capitalism. This is a fear which is administratively fought off, and therefore nailed to the platonic firmament of stars, a fear that remains even in the glorious times of full employment. Everyone knows that he could become expendable as technology develops, as long as production is only carried on for production's sake; so everyone senses that his job is a disguised unemployment.[47]

In this instance, Adorno's criticism comes inflected with Marxism. In a world dominated by exchange, there is no existence outside of capitalism, this gives rise to the brutal fear of unemployment, and its more brutal reality. We could say that the spectre of monstrous work and productivity is paired with the actuality of increased worklessness (which has come to represent the meaning of automation). Adorno describes the fear of unemployment as one factor attributed to the resentments against any scapegoated group of people. Brutal violence is itself a response to the subject's reification to commodity (as discussed in chapter 4). Heidegger displaces the causes of this fear; in his account of technological expansion, capitalism is understood as merely being in the service of the profit motive and humans are sent, destined to becoming stock, or work to be destroyed. This moment in Heidegger's essay we find something like a defence or justification for what Hamacher terms 'murder as the work of life on itself'.
Making use of Heidegger's method of 'questioning' technology allows us to read more closely Jelinek's intertextual language. In *Totenauberg,* the Heidegger figure is accused of forcing himself along the '*Holzweg,* […] timber trail of modern Dasein'.[48] Jelinek cleaves between and hacks into Heidegger's concepts. To be on a *Holzweg,* in the sense Heidegger uses the term, means to be on a wooded path, which when it becomes overgrown comes to an abrupt halt. From this point one is off track, *lost,* unless one knows the way, through a kind of sense. Heidegger cites the woodcutters and forest keepers as the ones who know these *Holzwege*.[49] The Arendt figure says:

> Look how people today pursue their recreative battles [*Erholungsschlachten*]! And you dare say that nature rests, stretched out shamelessly in front of us, in our better suits [*angezogen*], or better: pursuits [*ausgezogen*]. Out into nature! Technology doesn't let her be! Forcing the brook out of its bed and the river of history back into its course, whether it surges up, again and again. We are the target, the eye of the bulwark. But we also have an inkling of what's beyond. Actually it has been ours for a long time. Haven't we held onto our title on the shakiest of grounds.[50]

In a people enjoying recreative battles, we find a neologism in which convalescence and rest is paired with battle or slaughter. Technology does not let nature rest. Technology adapts the course of nature. Here, the 'river of history' also refers to the Danube, Jelinek's own river which runs directly through Vienna, and which featured in Hölderlin's poem, *Der Ister*, the subject of Heidegger's 1942 lecture on that poem. But the river of history also implies sending, destining by way of its current. Jelinek's Arendt figure recognises the inkling of truth in Heidegger's claim that nature is set upon by technology. The target insinuates Heidegger's notion of *Bestand*, 'standing reserve', humans reduced to materials. The 'we' of the target here implies Arendt (and Jelinek) the Jew, but throughout the play this identification remains unstable. The

Arendt figure continues her monologue: 'Everyone endures the measure of his being.'[51] She says, '[t]he human is set into silence'.[52] As we have seen in Heidegger's essay, being set upon refers to being sent, technology 'sets upon' [*stellt*] nature, revealing it for industry, and revealing humans as standing reserve. Jelinek's rewriting of Heidegger's being 'set upon' shows being revealed into silence, meant and continues to mean, death.

What Hides in Language?

Jelinek has stated that she wanted to write a play about Heidegger, and that this would be a play about thinking. 'This must be the case, since fascism is the ideology of non-thinking per se. No philosopher can seriously believe he can lead a Hitler—one precludes the other'.[53] If we consider the question informing this chapter: how does this play about unthinking-thinking help us understand how the body is figured, disfigured or transfigured by technology, and in Jelinek's art? Like the body frame which Heidegger is set into Jelinek mocks Heidegger's existential philosophy: '[t]hinking is dealing in used cars! Please memorise the many models existing in one era!'.[54] In the context of *Totenauberg* and commodity nativism, thinking is rendered learning by rote, or bartering. The Arendt figure says: '[n]o one buys anymore this utter absorption in what one is'.[55] Heidegger is accused: '[y]our thinking atrophies inside you'.[56] Thinking, which for the historical Heidegger is held in the human, wastes away, it deteriorates. On the stage the old man attempts to get out of his frame. By the end of the scene he has succeeded. He drags the detritus of his frame as he staggers around the stage. As we have seen, from the standpoint of the Heidegger figure, we enter into his language. By engaging with the spectre, the production of the afterlife of fascism, precisely as that which, as the figure of Heidegger shows, is so resistant to its overcoming as he is resistant to his being framed, Jelinek shows the latent fascistic meaning in his ideas, dragged through time.

In the increasing build-up of unthinking language, the part of *Totenauberg* which focusses on health sees the Young *Mutter* say: 'I exercise the privilege of the species by coupling wisely. […] Only quality women have something to give to the world. […] I have desires for my future without shying away from taking possession of the present. As long as my child is well, it may live'.[57] This fascistic figure of speech reveals echoes of a National Socialist style *Lebensborn* mother, transmitted onto the 1990s style eugenicist ethics of Jelinek's adversary: Peter Singer.[58] Jelinek's *renewed* mother is an articulation of what she deems the continuity in practice of the ideology of 'race' improvement. The character is not historical but merely represents the strain of thinking which takes its obsession with health and intactness to its life and death extreme. Yet, in the present, screening for foetal defects is common practice. The scene changes with the

entrance of two men wearing Lederhosen. On the screen, an old documentary shows Jews waiting for transport.[59] On the stage, as if expressing her fate, Jelinek's young mother character explains: 'The thin thread ahead of me becomes my path. I need to accomplish my task as master breeder. […] We DNA-enriched mothers know how to do that. We pull them, unconscious, though consciously produced, out of ourselves'.[60] As we have seen, Jelinek attempts to show the racist health discourse and practice of the Nazis, pulled through time and revealed in the capitalist health discourse and practice of the early 1990s, which persists into the present. It is worth questioning this move. These practices do not carry the same weight, but as we have seen throughout this thesis, both Jelinek's and EXPORT's work attempts to tear open the continuities, renewed traditions of thought processes and images, which both preceded the National Socialist period and also survived it. Health and hygiene, an obsession of National Socialist unthinking is constituted in Heidegger's concept of the people's soul or '*Volkseele*', where life is valued through categories of worthy and unworthy.[61]

The image on the screen changes to people in old-fashioned clothes being humiliated. The two men [*Die Gamsbärtler*] wearing *Tracht*, traditional Austrian/Bavarian clothes, speak with rural accents:

> Masses of people are adrift. The borders are open. They are hurled at each other as if they were their own pictures in an exhibition. […] Some day these foreigners too, will have to become hosts to the new; that is when they will own themselves. When they have something cooking. Their neediness has been corralled for so long, rubbing its back against the fence. We don't need to destroy their views; let them convert them into our currency. […] there are those foreigners who force their way across the border to hoard with us: they only know the kind of deprivation that wants to HAVE. We, on the other hand, don't want anything, because we ARE.[62]

As Konzett claims, Jelinek sets the nativists and the foreigners within a commodified traditionalism, where nativism is given over to the clutches of capitalism, but also pictured, as if staged in an art exhibition, or a play like Jelinek's own. She brings our attention to the mediated spectacle of migration. From the nativist perspective: 'We don't need to destroy their views; let them convert them into our currency' is put in the same breath as: 'they only know the kind of deprivation that wants to HAVE'. The nativist can make a claim to want nothing in the same breath as he states his own 'superior essence'.[63] To Be is pitted against to Have, against what a Self might be in relation to Dasein, which for Heidegger is not a property, but rather shifts between having and not having and is revealed/unconcealed.

If we return to Heidegger, we find him following in the footsteps of Hölderlin, trying to unravel another paradox: 'the destining of revealing is in itself not just any danger but, danger as such';

where one finds a danger one also finds the possibility of safety, in a 'saving power'.[64] But the word 'save' also takes on an enigmatic meaning, rather than meaning securing, or rescuing, 'saving' means: 'to fetch something into its essence, in order to bring the essence for the first time into its genuine appearing'.[65] It is precisely in its moment of danger that Heidegger's concept of 'Enframing' contains within itself the power to save. Yet, Heidegger uses the language of taking root, and the power to save only *grows* if what is Enframed takes root. This rootedness in the land/nativism, points to its opposite: historically in Heidegger's time this meant anti-Semitism qua anti-rootlessness.

So far in this chapter I have used the terms 'nativism' and *Heimat* in relation to Jelinek's historical rewriting of them. Yet Jelinek's works claim, the term *Heimat* and the idea of nativism have gained in traction along with the production of fascism's afterlife. Here I want to show the limits of these terms. To unpack the idea of rootedness (and its opposite rootlessness) one must inquire into the concept of *Bodenständigkeit,* about which Heidegger writes in several places. *Bodenständigkeit* means rootedness in a land. It indicates paradoxically, both the actual depth of the native soil, and figuratively, one's relationship to the native soil in the sense of dwelling [*bleiben*] there. Marc Crépon argues that the term *Heimat,* which we have been tentatively interested in, does not necessarily refer to one's place of birth, but is closer to the Heideggerian notion of the place of destining, where as we have seen in 'The Question Concerning Technology', one comes into Being.[66] In his lecture *Gelassenheit,* meaning 'releasement', or 'serenity', Heidegger declares: 'I thank my homeland [*Heimat*] for all that it has given me along the path of my life'.[67] Crépon characterises Heidegger's meaning of *Heimat* as the rootedness of the work (thinking) tethered to its production.[68] Heidegger writes, '[w]e grow thoughtful and ask: does not the flourishing of any genuine work depend upon its roots in a native soil [*die Verwurzelung im Boden einer Heimat*]?'[69] Crépon argues that for Heidegger the ground or proper basis of thinking or doing, relies, 'depends', on *Heimat*. He continues to show how this notion takes *Heimat* as a summons, a calling, a ground. Crépon claims that the premise of *Heimat* in rootedness, though 'not directly political in itself' means that all politics connected to it, demand 'rootedness in a land [*die Bodenständigkeit*]'.[70] He continues: '[i]n this way, after the war Heidegger considers the problem of Germans who have become estranged from their country more troubling than that of refugees'.[71] In his Memorial Address for the composer Conradin Kreutzer presented in 1955, Heidegger says:

> Many Germans have lost their homeland [*Heimat verloren*]. […] They are strangers now to their former homeland [*der alten Heimat entfremdet*]. And those who have stayed on in their homeland [*die in der Heimat Gebliebenen*]? Often they are still more

> homeless [*heimatloser*] than those who have been driven from their homeland [*die Heimatvertriebenen*].[72]

Crépon cites the well-known passage from *Gelassenheit* to show how Heidegger's attempts to depoliticise *Heimat* lead directly to political demands for rootedness in this sense:

> Thus we ask now: even if the old rootedness [*die alte Bodenständigkeit*] is being lost in this age, may not a new ground and foundation [*ein neuer Grund und Boden*] be granted again to man, a foundation and ground out of which man's nature and all his works can flourish in a new way even in the atomic age? What could the ground and foundation be for the new rootedness [*welches wäre der Grund und Boden für eine künftige Bodenständigkeit*]?[73]

While 'even in the atomic age' refers to Hiroshima, after his 12 year membership of the NSDAP and his early speeches in praise of Hitler's 'new dawn', Heidegger remained silent about Auschwitz, rather, attributing equal importance to Stalin's purges, Hitler's atrocities and the UK bombing of Dresden.[74] Today, it is worth paying heed to Crépon's description which demonstrates how the 'ontological rootedness' which closely connects to the everyday language and concept of *Heimat*, cannot be apolitical. Even if the content of *Heimat* linked to *Bodenständigkeit* doesn't refer to a nation state such as Austria or Germany, but rather to a place where someone takes root disconnected from *Vaterland* and the idea of the nation state as 'place of birth' and the 'political community', it cannot be fully separated.[75] In Heidegger's own context, as Jean Améry has written, the stateless Jews deprived of their rights show the impossibility of this conjunction.[76] At the time of writing, the stateless people prevented from even setting foot on European soil, continue to show its impossibility. Crépon's important conclusive remarks are as follows: "*Heimat* is therefore not only a proper place but also one that furnishes at least a minimum of security. What the depoliticization of *Heimat* forgets, in falling back on a traditional familiarity, is that for an individual deprived of rights, someone without a country, no *Heimat* is possible."[77] The contradictions emerge between the figures on the mountain in Jelinek's *Totenauberg*. In Austria in the interwar years, where the so-called threat to *Heimat* and the traditional way of life of the peasant, by modern industry was resolved by all types of nationalists in the eradication or just the complicity with the eradication of this perceived threat, which was scapegoated onto the shoulders of the Jews and other non-'figureable' lives. In the context of *Totenauberg*, this was the migrant escaping the violence of the wars in Yogoslavia. Today, the renewal of far-right traditionalist nationalism reconceives the threat to *Heimat*, which is again scapegoated onto the shoulders of the migrant, the stateless person and the Muslim, while racism and anti-Semitism also animate this politics. In Heidegger's context, the

mountain was both the mountain of thoughts, piled up from within the landscape of the Black Forest, and the mountain seen as a refuge from the chaos of the cities. There is an element of Heidegger's thought which is 'correct'. He is right to draw our attention to the effects of being without a *Heimat*. Yet, for Heidegger this remained an exclusive concept. *Heimat* is for Germans, or those who can become 'rooted'.

Since 2015, statelessness has once again emerged as the crisis of our time. The growing tendency, globally, is to deny refugees and migrants entry to a new possible homeland. Swathes of stateless people are denied a place to live, to be at home, to have a homeland. Thousands have died in camps as well as crossing mountains and seas. Right-wing extremists lay claim to new battles, claiming they are not over 'race' or religion, but over citizenship, albeit when citizenship is something that a State will grant or rescind on the grounds of 'race' or religion. Meanwhile campaigns of hatred against "Islam" (never understood in its complexity, but scapegoated and made to account for socially produced problems) and Muslims, are now integrated into mainstream politics across the world.

In *Totenauberg* Jelinek mocks the way that tourism monetises the image of Alpine nature, making it consumable. It is a truism to say that the old traditional village has been ruined by tourism. This is a contradiction taken up in *Totenauberg*, which asks how capitalism intersects with the image and legacy of *Heimat*. *Totenauberg* indexes wanted and unwanted visitors. Nature becomes a picture providing pleasure to those who can afford it. This is part of fascism's spectral production. However, for the people who lack means, who carry only themselves, barefoot, this nature remains hostile.

In the section 'Home World', the documentary changes to show an image of the mountain close-up. The ski-slope is littered with the corpses and skeletons of mountain climbers. On the stage the Heidegger figure is wrapped in bandages. He builds a toy train-track and a village, an image which resonates as transport for Jews, transport which, as mentioned in chapter 3, was a kind of manic, useless use of technology and resources.[78] This scene now replicates what was previously shown in the documentary. Jelinek works with feedback, or a kind of data feed, which confronts Heidegger's thinking with its own eternal return: its expanse of technology and lack of memory.

In 'Why do I stay in the Provinces?' Heidegger explains his rejection of a position in Berlin so that he can remain in his ski-hut in the Black Forest. In this text he describes his thinking as a kind of peasant philosophy.[79] Heidegger's farm boy, who drags a sled up the mountain slope, piling it with logs and guiding it down a dangerous path, is in Jelinek's formulation a 'recruit of dusk', who 'sleds loaded with merchandise [*Warenschlitten*] that they keep lugging up the

hill to drive them in a dangerous downhill race toward the warehouses, in which both disappear'.[80] It is Jelinek's Heidegger figure who describes these recruits pulling not log-covered sleds but sleds loaded with commodities, which they have to sell in order to survive. The Heidegger figure says: 'We become innocent through them'.[81] Jelinek points to a dynamic that is similar to what is described in chapter 1 as 'guilt management', where from the position of amnesia the new 'victims' become an object through which one purges one's guilt and purifies oneself. Heidegger's own piety is expressed in his text: 'my work […] is intimately rooted in and related to the life of the peasants [*Bauern*]', and '[t]he inner belonging [*Zugehörigkeit*] of my work to the Black Forest and its people comes from centuries-long and irreplaceable rootedness [*Bodenständigkeit*] in the Alemannian-Swabian soil'.[82] We have already seen the meaning of this ontological rootedness. Jelinek emphasises the falsity of Heidegger's alignment with the peasant way of thinking, where being 'left alone', the message of Heidegger's own text, becomes an impossibility under capitalist social relations. Though Jelinek sometimes shares with Heidegger the target of criticism, her aim is levelled at Heidegger's piety and assumptions of preservation, his 'innocence'. Jelinek's text is complex in that its time-study aspect risks collapsing events and temporal moments together, such as allusions to transport for Jews and culture industry motifs. It does this in the name of highlighting historical continuities and dangers. This produces a question concerning the necessity of precision in artistic or theatrical language. In Jelinek's attempts to blast open her present with recourse to the near past, *Totenauberg* pursues a dangerous move which risks conflation. Yet, where she is accurate in her diagnosis, this gesture is one against the reification of history, it forms part of her struggle over history.

The corpses of mountain climbers rise and begin to speak. 'We are the man of this century, the emigrant who is capable of misery several times in his life'.[83] The dead on the mountain appear almost forgotten. They are spread across the mountain like a tarpaulin. The tarpaulin is an object which would cover the sleds and their piles of logs as it would also cover unwanted commodities; waste not quite thrown away. They appear like a collapsing billboard with the message: 'Dare to be different. Let me be happy!' Jelinek speaks of the forgotten dead, via a commodity and jingoist language. The dead are depicted as an image of a product whose sign is collapsing.[84] This is the production of the spectre of fascism, unable to collapse. A relation or a line is drawn between the production of commodities and the inability to remember the dead. The endless production of commodities leads to the endless production of the present against history and memory. Capitalist reification is part of the production of Heideggerian piety and the historical inability to work through the past. Perhaps we could say that in *Totenauberg* there is a

claim, or a demand, that to change one's relationship to the object world, would also be to change one's relationship to the dead. The object world is the world of deathly commodities made from the dead labour of humans and the production of commodities is also the infinite production and reproduction of the spectre of fascism as 'the sheer positivity of life, dead life, living death', Hamacher remind us.[85]

The last scene of *Totenauberg* is titled 'Unschuld', 'Innocence'. The image on the screen is transformed to the interior of a rural castle adorned with horns and antlers, where the Heidegger figure, sits elegantly dressed in a chair and listens to live classical music. On the stage, the toy railroad and village have been scaled up to become metres tall. A constant flow of travellers carrying luggage cross the stage. They have to squeeze past the newly expanded props. Again, Jelinek plays with scale, this time in a literal manner so that the Heidegger figure sits on the stage, cramped in his now shrunken frame, implying a shrunken, defeated Being. What follows is the final interaction between the Woman and the Old Man. As the Arendt figure speaks she is wearing travel clothes and accompanied by a suitcase. In this scene Jelinek brings us right to the heart of her play, to Heidegger's lack of memory or as Alexander Düttmann describes, Heidegger's 'thought without memory'.[86] The Old Man describes 'home' as the place for essence 'which darkens the sun'. Home, which in Jelinek's formulation, one comes to have, allows the Heidegger figure to not think about the past, but deny it. 'In nature there is innocence, and May makes everything new. It did not happen! It is beautiful in the forest, our hearts belong to all beings. But what is done, we love to forget'.[87] We can read an oblique reference to Hitler's 1933 anti-Semitic, anti-Bolshevik and anti-Marxist speech to commemorate Labour Day. This speech calls for the purification of May-day, as the purification of nature against and from struggle.[88] Nature is rendered innocent and is once again elevated in the liberal-environmental movements of the 1990s a gesture which for Jelinek hallows the past, it contributes to the forgetting of the dead and the abandonment of justice. Jelinek hammers this home: 'The blood stays in the ground [*das Blut bleibt im Boden*]. It doesn't speak to us'.[89] This formulation confronts the reader with a paradox: what remains from the ideology of Blood and Soil, linked with the 'community of nature', no longer speaks, it is both outlawed and it became its opposite: the dead on the mountain. The language of Blood and Soil is rendered silent, yet it is still produced as its spectre. 'And yet, wherever one stops, a cruel, ghostly world. A march into history; and yet we've never been there!'.[90] Jelinek's Heidegger is forced to recognise and yet cannot recognise history. The stage directions advise that the woman change into a *Dirndl*, implying through dress, that this is a move towards the Arendt figure's resignation, a move towards her joining Heidegger as we saw at the beginning of this chapter. *Tracht*, typically the *Dirndl* and

the *Lederhosen* are the traditional clothes of Austria and Bavaria. In the late 1930s such clothes were banned for Jews.[91] Arendt is not Hannah Arendt, but comes to stand in for a historical figure of resignation, for resignation in history. The Woman Arendt says:

> Your technology, that dismal place with which you are obsessed, didn't create anything new. It made millions of people disappear! History suddenly ran backward, a hand appears and once again hands over the dead lovingly, as to a waiting mother. Strange film, in which the person who was laughing cheerfully is now robbed of his Being.[92]

In 'The Question Concerning Technology', humans occupy the roles of either the philosopher asking the questions, or the artists or craftspeople bringing-forth, effecting their objects. But with modern technology, the historical Heidegger says that humans bring everything into the position of 'standing reserve'. What takes this place can be used, or used up. It can also be destroyed. Heidegger asks a leading question: '[i]f man is challenged, ordered, to do this, then does not man himself belong even more originally than nature within the standing reserve?'.[93] Heidegger has already considered the Human Resources which supply people to workplaces, clinics and so forth. Yet this sentence is even more explicit: if humans are challenged, called to action to accomplish the revealing of the standing reserve (of nature) do not humans belong *to* the standing reserve, to a quantity, as a material which can be 'set upon', used, used up, *more* originally than nature. Jelinek's Arendt figure speaks what is unspoken in Heidegger's essay, precisely that he took no position and said nothing in relation to people being sent to *Bestand*, 'standing reserve' in the context of the work-death factories:

> You have spooled these people in the frantically running film of history; it doesn't make any stops; one has to jump on and off. Yes, it has become quite evident, you didn't quite master this technology—people actually disappeared! They became matter [*Material*] jumping up, waving, briefly made visible in the glowing beam of the projector, one second, only a fraction of one second, brought out by you, big and glowing in a somber light, and instantly used up. Jumping over the edge of the snowbank. Don't be sorry! That sort of people is sometimes sensitive to the weather, like an entire forest! So lets get rid of them! You had to start them up, over and over again as it were. A perpetual, millionfold repetition. And before they are allowed to finally see what's been left behind, they are the ones left behind.[94]

Jelinek's method gathers up Heidegger's work, his concepts and ideas and throws them onto the stage in a way which uses Heidegger's own method of following language into the unknown, as if on a *Holzweg*. In Heidegger's essay, he can only muster to add that the human is commanded by the profit motive, not within capitalism but rather within a specific single industry. From this position humans are made subordinate. In this logic, humans do not become the 'standing reserve', quantified. But, before writing this essay millions of humans were put

into this position. For Heidegger who refused to acknowledge that, this is because humans are both responsible for pushing technology towards rendering everything quantity, stock, 'standing reserve', and they also participate in this. In this sense Heidegger's moment of rescue in this brutal questioning comes in the form of a kind of an eerie idealism, (a kind of Christian redemption, which Adorno would call the language of the Authentics). "Wherever man opens his eyes and ears, unlocks his heart, and gives himself over to meditating and striving, shaping and working, entreating and thanking, he finds himself everywhere already brought into the unconcealed."[95] The case is reiterated again that the basis of the human relationship to technology relies on a particular kind of comportment that implies an openness and non-alienated experience, this appears positive, and perhaps there is truth here. Yet, there is also opportunism. This was written in the immediate wake of millions of Jews and others dead, destroyed, displaced, without a *Heimat*, made into *Bestand*, 'standing reserve' by the Nazis whose project Heidegger openly endorsed.

The eerie idealism of salvation is expressed in Heidegger's concept of destining. If we unpack this here in order to understand more clearly the text of Jelinek's *Totenauberg*, destining [*Geschick*] is separated from a 'fate [*Schicksal*]' that 'means the inevitableness of an unalterable course'.[96] Heidegger relates destining, hearing and freedom: '[f]or man becomes truly free only insofar as he belongs to the realm of destining and so becomes one who listens and hears [*Hörender*], and not one who is simply constrained to obey [*Höriger*]'.[97] This concept of freedom is attached to a kind of listening and hearing that goes beyond hearing constraints and rules to obey, and towards a hearing that is open. Heidegger goes even further: 'The essence of freedom is *originally* not connected with the will or even with the causality of human willing'.[98] Here freedom is not attained through free will, as the freedom of choice, but 'freedom' is not granted to persons who are stateless or persecuted. Heidegger's idea bears a radical trace but is haunted by material restrictions: the world is ordered by white supremacy and capitalism. In the face of 'Aryan supremacy' and the Final Solution this theory reads not just as absurd, but duplicitous, blind and sinisterly forgetful.

If we re-enter Heidegger's world, the open [*Freie*] (as what is revealed) implies illumination: what is governed by freedom [*Freiheit*] is lit up, it comes into light. In this formulation, this coming to light is connected to truth. It is to this truthful occurrence that freedom shows its closest proximity and kinship. But this open should be understood as paradoxical because in each moment of revealing there also simultaneously occurs a concealing: "Freedom [*Freiheit*] is that which conceals in a way that opens to light, in whose clearing [*Lichtung*] there shimmers that veil that covers what comes to presence of all truth and lets the veil appear as what veils.

Freedom is the realm of the destining that at any given time starts a revealing on its way."[99] The paradox of freedom means that what is concealed also comes to light. Heidegger's clearing is lit. One could say this is corollary to Adorno's notion of the work of art as a force field which both shows and veils itself simultaneously, which however, emerges from a different premise.[100] In *Totenauberg* — photography and television provide the light and the illumination that takes the place of *poiēsis*. Jelinek perverts and reduces the *Lichtung* of the clearing to the light emitted by a TV set. Earlier in the play the Heidegger figure says: "The small pool of light in front of them creates a clearing [*Lichtung*], in which they finally can be seen through the TV cameras. No, no, it's the other way around! Without the clearing [*Lichtung*] they had cut for themselves, the light wouldn't even be seen! It wouldn't hit them. And they wouldn't radiate to the living rooms."[101] Like Heidegger's farm boy, whom Jelinek rewrites as a character who sleds merchandise down into warehouses, she also pollutes Heidegger's conception of *poiēsis, Lichtung*, the clearing is reduced to what is emitted from television. I propose that the historical meaning of Jelinek's works lies in this perverting, it is a meaning which takes seriously the effects of the culture industry on perception.

In the final part of Heidegger's essay we read again that Enframing does not mean essence in terms of a universal genus containing all real and possible examples. Heidegger does not attribute Enframing to a tool or any kind of apparatus (although he told us earlier that *Gestell* refers to a frame), yet all these things belong to Enframing. Through the notion of Enframing as the essence of technology, Heidegger is prompted to reconsider the concept and notion of 'essence' itself. This new characterisation of essence lends itself to something that, following Plato and Socrates, essences; it is something which comes to presence and endures. 'The way in which technology essences lets itself be seen only from out of that permanent enduring in which Enframing comes to pass as a destining of revealing.'[102] We must return to the case of humans in this questioning.

> It is precisely in Enframing, which threatens to sweep man away into ordering as the supposed single way of revealing, and so thrusts man into the danger of the surrender of his free essence—it is precisely in this extreme danger that the innermost indestructible belongingness [*Zugehörigkeit*] of man within granting may come to light, provided that we, for our part, begin to pay heed to the coming to presence of technology.[103]

The essence of technology is not technological. We are returned to where we started. Heidegger attributes the place for the right questioning of technology in art. To some extent he locates the problem. Art is like the essence of technology: 'Enframing', destining, revealing, but it is also fundamentally different to it. Heidegger's logic, or way of thinking is thus: the closer we look

into the face of the danger, the more strongly and brightly does the saving power shine, and we question more, '[f]or questioning is the piety of thought'.[104] Yet, Jelinek's *Totenauberg* questions the premise and legacy of Heidegger's authenticity. Her use of reproductive technology (video) with language endeavours to show that what is propelled by a lack of memory and repression, returns as a compulsion to repeat. This is crystallised in the Heidegger figure, who refuses to remember. Jelinek's play throws light onto Heidegger's unthinking, onto his silence. She throws his thoughtlessness onto the stage and once again spools the film. Yet, Jelinek does not reify history. As she says, it is not a history play.

Notes

[1] See: Janz, p. 133, 144.

[2] Elfriede Jelinek, *Totenauberg, Ein Stück*, (Rowohlt, 1991), p. 89; Elfriede Jelinek, 'Totenauberg (Death/Valley/Summit)', in *DramaContemporary. Plays*, ed. by Carl Weber, trans. by Gitta Honegger (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), pp. 217-265 (p. 262). (Hereafter: *Totenauberg*; trans).

[3] Gitta Honegger, 'This German Language...:An Interview with Elfriede Jelinek', *Theater*, 25.1 (1994), 14-22 (p. 14). The mountain also appears explicitly in Jelinek's later *Die Kinder der Toten* (1995) and *In den Alpen* (2002). *Totenauberg* was completed in 1991 and premiered in the Vienna Akademie Theater (the second stage of the Burgtheater) on September 18 1992.

[4] Elfriede Jelinek, *Die Kontrakte des Kaufmanns, Rechnitz (Der Würgeengel), Über Tiere. Drei Theaterstücke* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2009); Elfriede Jelinek, *Rechnitz, and the Merchant's Contracts*, trans. by Gitta Honegger (London: Seagull Books, 2015).

[5] Thanks to Allyson Fiddler for highlighting this to me.

[6] See also the documentary film *Totschweigen* (1994), directed by Margareta Heinrich and Eduard Erne. The title refers to the act of killing through silence. This film revisits the massacre at Rechnitz. The directors interview the remaining villagers who were alive in 1945 when the massacre took place. They discuss with them what happened, their reactions and the silent aftermath: some are more willing to speak than others. In 2009 Teresa Kovacs attributed the assenting silence after the massacre to the fact that Countess Margit von Batthyány gave away money and land to all of the Rechnitz inhabitants up until her death in the early 1980s. David R. L. Litchfield, 'Reason for Rechnitz Silence Revealed', *David R. L. Litchfield*, 2009 <davidrllitchfield.com/2009/06/reason-for-rechnitz-silence-revealed/> [accessed 22 July 2017].

[7] Bischof, 'Victims', p. 20.

[8] Matthias Konzett, *The Rhetoric of National Dissent: In Thomas Bernhard, Peter Handke, and Elfriede Jelinek* (Rochester: Camden House, 2000). p. 99.

[9] Konzett, p. 102.

[10] Konzett, p. 109.

[11] Konzett, p. 109.

[12] Konzett argues that Alfred Bäumler, Hitler's ideologue of the body viewed *Leibübungen* as a kind of political education of the body that would contribute to the formation of the *Gesamtleib* (collective body of the nation). Konzett, p. 112.

[13] Konzett, p. 99.

[14] Werner Hamacher, 'Working Through Working', trans. by Matthew T. Hartman, *Modernism/Modernity*, 3.1 (1996), 23-56 (p. 25).

[15] Eva Brenner and Elfriede Jelinek, '"Where Are the Big Topics, Where Is the Big Form?" Elfriede Jelinek Discusses *Totenauberg*, Theater and Politics', in *Elfriede Jelinek*, ed. by Jorun B. Johns and Katherine Arens, pp. 18-34 (p. 24).

[16] Brenner and Jelinek, p. 24.

[17] See Jelinek's award speech from 1986: Elfriede Jelinek, 'In den Waldheimen und auf den Haidern', in *Blauer Streusand*, ed. by Barbara Alms (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1987), pp. 42-4; see also Jelinek's text: 'Die Österreicher als Herren der Toten', in Janke, *Nestbeschmutzerin*, pp. 61-3.

[18] Honegger, 'This German Language', p. 17.

[19] Honegger, 'This German Language', p. 17.

[20] Honegger, 'This German Language', p. 18.

[21] Janz, p. 135.
[22] Brenner and Jelinek, p. 22.
[23] 'My use of film in *Totenauberg* is certainly not accidental, should not be limited to a matter of stage design. I envisioned that there would always be something going on, on the big screen, even when nothing is going on.' Brenner and Jelinek, p. 22.
[24] 'Fangen wir mit dem Unscheinbaren, dem Kleinen an: verlangt es nicht nach kleineren Wörtern als Sie überhaupt besitzen? Sie sind auch so ein Bilderl, eine Abbildung! Passen nicht ins Fesche, aber falsche Kleid dieser falsche Landschaft.' *Totenauberg*, p. 10; trans. p. 222.
[25] *Bilderl* is idiomatic, the *-erl* is a Viennese diminutive, rather than the usual *-chen*.
[26] Martin Heidegger, 'Die Frage Nach Der Technik', in *Gesamtausgabe 1. Abt. Bd. 7: Vorträge Und Aufsätze* (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klosterman, 2000), pp. 5–36 (p. 22); Martin Heidegger, 'The Question Concerning Technology', in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. by William Lovitt (New York; London: Garland Publishing, 1977), pp. 3–35 (p. 21). (Hereafter, 'Frage'; 'Question').
[27] 'Frage' p. 5; 'Question', p. 4.
[28] The translator's footnote to this passage provides the definition of *instrumentum* as that which 'arranges,' 'builds up' and 'heaps upon'. Moreover, in this quest to find the *essence* of technology, Heidegger states that the 'true' meaning must be sought through the 'correct' meaning. And, one must first seek the correct meaning in a way which follows the proper logic of questioning: one cannot approach the subject randomly. But, once the 'correct' meaning is found, it is not a given that the essence, that which this essay aims to understand, has been found. In order to find the essence of technology, one must ascertain the true meaning in a 'free' and 'open' relationship to it, in a state of submission to it. Heidegger resorts to endlessly repeating his request for this mode of comportment: for openness. 'Frage', p. 6; 'Question', p. 5.
[29] Brenner and Jelinek, p. 23.
[30] 'Frage', p. 15; 'Question', p. 14.
[31] 'Frage', p. 15; 'Question', p. 14.
[32] 'Frage', p. 16; 'Question', p. 15.
[33] 'Frage', pp. 16-17; 'Question', pp. 15-16
[34] 'Frage', p. 17; 'Question', p. 16.
[35] 'Frage', p. 17; 'Question', p. 16.
[36] 'Frage', p. 17; 'Question', p. 17.
[37] Janz, p. 141.
[38] 'Frage', p. 25; 'Question', p. 24.
[39] 'Frage', p. 25; 'Question', p. 24.
[40] Ben Morgan, 'The Limits of Political Hope in 1988: Jelinek's *Wolken.Heim.* in Context', *Austrian Studies*, 22 (2014), 166–82 (p. 172).
[41] Hamacher, p. 28.
[42] 'Frage', p. 27; 'Question', p. 26.
[43] 'Frage', p. 27; 'Question', p. 26.
[44] 'Frage', p. 27; 'Question', p. 26.
[45] 'Frage', p. 28; 'Question', p. 27.
[46] 'Frage', p. 28; 'Question', p. 27.
[47] Theodor W. Adorno, *The Jargon of Authenticity*, trans. by Knut Tarnowsky and Frederic Will (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), p. 34.
[48] *Totenauberg*, p. 11; trans. p. 223.
[49] Martin Heidegger, *Off the Beaten Track*, trans. by Julian Young and Kenneth Hayes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. v.
[50] 'Schauen Sie, wie die Heutigen ihre Erholungsschlachten austragen! Und da wagen Sie zu sagen, die Natur ruhe aus, schamlos hingestreckt vor uns, die wir besser angezogen sind oder besser: ausgezogen. Zu ihr! Die Technik läßt sie ja nicht! Sie reißt den Bach aus seinem Bett und den Fluß der Geschichte wieder in seinen Lauf, aus dem er stets aufs neue hervorschießt. Wir sind das Ziel, der Mittelpunkt der Schutz-Scheibe. Doch wir ahnen die Ferne. Uns gehört sie ja längst. Wir sind doch ins unzureichende Grund-Buch eingetragen.' *Totenauberg*, p. 11; trans. p. 223.
[51] *Totenauberg*, p. 12; trans. p. 223.
[52] 'Der Mensch in die Stille gestellt.' *Totenauberg*, p. 12; trans. p. 223. (Translation amended).
[53] Jelinek and Brenner, p. 23.
[54] 'Denken ist Gebrauchtwagen-Handeln! Bitte lernen: die vielen Marken, die es gibt in einer Epoche.' *Totenauberg*, p. 12; trans. p. 223.
[55] 'Es genügt nicht, in dem aufzugehen, was man ist.' *Totenauberg*, p. 12; trans. p. 224.
[56] 'Ihr Denken erlahmt in Ihnen.' *Totenauberg*, p. 13; trans. p. 224.
[57] *Totenauberg*, p. 30; trans. p. 233.
[58] *Totenauberg*, p. 34; trans. p. 235.

[59] The stage directions state: 'For a long time, one simply sees, in black and white, people in old fashioned clothes who begin to gather in a square. Nothing brutal! The scene must come across as very simple, yet not quite ordinary! It might be quite harmless, if somewhat irritating'. *Totenauberg*, p. 37; trans. p. 236.
[60] *Totenauberg*, p. 41; trans. p. 238.
[61] Martin Heidegger, 'Abraham a Sankta Clara', in *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens 1910-1976* (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klosterman, 1983), pp. 1-3 (p. 3).
[62] Jelinek calls these figures '*Die Gamsbärtler*'. A '*Gamsbart*' is a feather worn as a decoration on the traditional hat. *Totenauberg*, pp. 45-7; trans. pp. 240-1. (Translation modified).
[63] *Totenauberg*, p. 48; trans. p. 242.
[64] 'Frage', p. 27; 'Question', p. 26.
[65] 'Frage', p. 29; 'Question', p. 28.
[66] Marc Crépon, 'Heimat', ed. by Barbara Cassin and others, *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, pp. 430-33 (p. 430).
[67] Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. by Anderson and E. Hans Freund (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 43. It is somewhat of an absurd and unthinking lecture and title, given that this lecture takes place in 1955 just ten years after the end of the war.
[68] Crépon, p. 430.
[69] *Discourse on Thinking*, p. 47.
[70] Crépon, p. 431.
[71] Crépon, p. 431.
[72] *Discourse on Thinking*, p. 48, cited in Crépon, p. 431.
[73] *Discourse on Thinking*, p. 48, cited in Crépon, p. 431.
[74] Martin Heidegger, *Philosophical and Political Writings*, ed. by Manfred Stassen (New York: Continuum, 2003), p. xvii. As if in direct response to this, in an interview where Jelinek discusses *Totenauberg*, she explains: 'I am a communist independent of any party system. Being a communist means nothing more or less than taking a stance against capitalism—a system which despises human beings—and believing in the necessity of another social arrangement. While I know about the horrors of Stalinism, which were as devastating as the horrors of fascism, I would not equate the two. […] The idea is still valid. Yet there's been the attempt to rob us of the idea. I for my part cannot accept the notion that a communist has to sanction everything that has been done in its name. Such positions are moralistic and usually uttered by people who never in their lives had risked anything at all.' Brenner and Jelinek, p. 34.
[75] Crépon, p. 430.
[76] Améry cited in Crépon, p. 431.
[77] Crépon, p. 431.
[78] *Totenauberg*, p. 46; trans. p. 243.
[79] There is a discrepancy concerning the dates of writing between the German and English translation. Martin Heidegger, 'Schöpferische Landschaft: Warum Bleiben Wir in Der Provinz? (1933)', in *Aus Der Erfahrung Des Denkens 1910-1976* (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klosterman, 1983), pp. 9-13 (p. 10); Martin Heidegger, 'Why Do I Stay in the Provinces? (1934)', in *Philosophical and Political Writings*, ed. by Manfred Stassen, trans. by Thomas J. Sheehan (New York: Continuum, 2003), pp. 16-18 (p. 16).
[80] Heidegger, 'Schöpferische Landschaft', p. 10; 'Why Do I Stay in the Provinces?' p. 17; *Totenauberg*, p. 53; trans. p. 244.
[81] Heidegger, 'Schöpferische Landschaft', p. 10; 'Why Do I Stay in the Provinces?' p. 17
[82] Heidegger, 'Schöpferische Landschaft', p. 10-11; 'Why Do I Stay in the Provinces?' p. 17. (Translation modified).
[83] *Totenauberg*, p. 59; trans. p. 247.
[84] *Totenauberg*, p. 62; trans. pp. 248-9.
[85] Hamacher, p. 25.
[86] Alexander García Düttmann, *The Memory of Thought*, trans. by Nicholas Walker (London: Continuum, 2002), p. 272.
[87] *Totenauberg*, p. 78; trans. p. 257. (Translation modified).
[88] '25 Adolf Hitler: Speech to Commemorate National Labor Day', in *The Third Reich Sourcebook*, ed. by Anson Rabinbach and Sander L. Gilman, trans. by Lilian M. Friedberg (California: University of California Press, 2013), Epub.
[89] *Totenauberg*, p. 79; trans. p. 257. (Translation modified).
[90] *Totenauberg*, p. 79; trans. p. 257.
[91] Perloff, p. 40.
[92] *Totenauberg*, p. 83; trans. p. 260.
[93] 'Frage', p. 18; 'Question', p. 18.
[94] *Totenauberg*, p. 84; trans. p. 260.
[95] 'Frage', p. 19; 'Question', p. 19.
[96] 'Frage', p. 26; 'Question', p. 25.

[97] ‘Frage’, p. 26; ‘Question’, p. 25.
[98] ‘Frage’, p. 26; ‘Question’, p. 25.
[99] ‘Frage’, p. 26; ‘Question’, p. 25.
[100] Adorno, AT, p. 398.
[101] *Totenauberg*, p. 22; trans. p. 229.
[102] ‘Frage’, p. 32; ‘Question’, p. 31
[103] ‘Frage’, p. 33; ‘Question’, p. 32.
[104] ‘Frage’, p. 36; ‘Question’, p. 35.