

Outcast Vienna 1900

The Politics of Transgression

WOLFGANG MADERTHANER

I

The Vienna of 1900 has been mythologized in recent decades. It has become a historical signet, a highly successful trademark recognized around the world. Its posthumous success has been promoted by masterpieces of historiography such as Carl E. Schorske's *Fin de Siècle Vienna*¹ as well as by a series of spectacular exhibitions at the Vienna Künstlerhaus, the Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris, and the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Nikolaus Sombart, in one example among many, has attributed to the Vienna of 1900 paradigmatic significance for the twentieth century as a whole.² According to Sombart, central problems of modernity were articulated here more precisely and radically than elsewhere; they were perceived and conceptualized in a more intelligent and original way as they took on the form and the attitude of cultural innovations such as Arnold Schönberg's anti-music, Karl Kraus's linguistic criticism, Arthur Schnitzler's fictional psychology, Wittgenstein's dismantling of metaphysics, Ernst Mach's empirical criticism, and Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis.

Vienna 1900 was indeed a peculiar and somehow solitary conglomerate of some of the most divergent yet mutually dependent social, political, and cultural developments of the time. While a liberal bourgeoisie was favoring the monarchy, democratic movements were afflicted with a traditional bureaucracy, populism was associated with Catholicism, and the *Late Enlightenment* was occupied with the conditions of the human soul and the basic psychological conditions of the individual. In the heart of the city, the Hofburg, the aging emperor

1 Cf. SCHORSKE, 1981.

2 Cf. SOMBART, 1987, p. 52-54.

Franz Joseph sought desperately to uphold his autocratic regime as well as the myth of the old German *Reich*. On the gorgeous newly constructed Ringstraße Boulevard an economically powerful bourgeoisie showcased the success of a late-coming capitalism in the form of magnificent, historicist architecture. In the lower-middle-class districts, a petite bourgeoisie suspicious of modernity mourned the loss of the “Old Vienna” that had epitomized pre-modern contentment and clarity. In the industrial suburbs which encompassed the inner districts like an iron ring of workers’ quarters, serious housing misery, social squalor, mass immigration, and potential political upheavals gathered.

Vienna’s symbolic body was distorted in many ways. It was socially segregated and yet contradictorily homogenized by the aesthetic standards and facades of the Ringstraße that dominated the outer appearance of the tenement blocks even in the proletarian outskirts. While the nobility had long passed the zenith of their political power, its cultural heritage dominated the fantasies and longings of a bourgeoisie still striving for social recognition. The liberal and predominantly Jewish bourgeoisie, which only recently had acquired political power, was almost immediately challenged (and finally defeated) by an anti-Semitic, lower-middle-class populism that proved able to combine cultural reaction and municipal modernity. At the same time, an egalitarian utopianism, promoted by progressive Jewish upper-class intellectuals, was unfolding among the masses of suburban proletarians as a reaction to the unfulfilled humanitarian promises of liberalism. In the city’s coffeehouses and salons, writers, artists, and scientists searched for a common denominator to all these contradictions and seemed to detect it in psychoanalysis, psychophysics, expressionism, and an aesthetically sophisticated nervousness.³

The Vienna of 1900 was at once a laboratory of the Apocalypse and the birthplace of epoch-making modern trends and achievements. It was the place of the last of the Habsburgs as well as that of the young Adolf Hitler, and of Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism. It was the place of the patriarchal major Karl Lueger, who shaped modern anti-Semitism into a political mass movement, and it was the place of one of the founding fathers of democratic socialism, the Jewish poor man’s doctor, psychologist and social reformer Victor Adler. It was the first metropolis in which organized anti-Semitism was able to seize power and it was to become, after the municipal franchise had been democratized, the first city with over one million inhabitants under a social-democratic administration. In Robert Musil’s words, Vienna 1900 resembled a boiling blister of

3 Cf. MADERTHANER/MUSNER, 1999(2).

initiations and emergences, one gigantic beat and the eternal dissonance and determent of all rhythms against each other:

“No one knew exactly what was in the making; nobody could have said whether it was to be a new art, a new humanity, a new morality, or perhaps a reshuffling of society. [...] There were those who loved the overman and those who loved the underman; there were health cults and sun cults and the cults of consumptive maidens; there was enthusiasm for the hero worshipers and for the believers in the Common Man; people were devout and skeptical, naturalistic and mannered, robust and morbid; they dreamed of old tree-lined avenues in palace parks, autumnal gardens, glassy ponds, gems, hashish, disease, and demonism, but also of prairies, immense horizons, forges and rolling mills, naked wrestlers, slave uprisings, early man, and the smashing of society. These were certainly opposing and widely varying cries, but uttered in the same breath.”⁴

II

Since the 1980s, a specific practice of cultural analysis and discourse on the *Vienna Modern* has been established. This practice was exclusively concerned with the culture of the elites, and was dominated by a discussion of the artistic and intellectual avant-gardes – projecting an embellished image of *Vienna 1900* as an icon of an innovative multiculturalism. The extreme disparities between the social classes and the spatial and cultural segregation that resulted, as well as the nascent anti-Semitism and populist mass politics, are mentioned, if at all, only marginally. This romanticized picture, by focusing on singularities instead of processes, thus obscures an understanding of that long-term logic that led from *fin-de-siècle* Vienna with the posthumously admired creativity of its assimilated Jewish community to the brutal persecution of Jews during the Nazi dictatorship.

Instead of making Carl Schorske’s perspective ever more dynamic, *fin de siècle* was ontologically conceptualized as the sum of its intellectual and artistic achievements, and was thus stylized into a kind of precious treasury of high culture. The life-worldly cultures of the suburbs, the worlds of the immigrants, proletarians, and urban pariahs, were persistently ignored in high modern Viennese literature. If the suburbs were mentioned at all they came to be, according

4 MUSIL, 1995, p. 53.

to respective ideological dispositions, either places of divergence and disorder, misery, and immorality, or a terrain of utopian prospect, the forthcoming social basis of interwar *Red Vienna*.⁵

On the other hand, the suburbs and outskirts had always been present as a central trope of a popular discourse about the essence of Viennese nature. They had been present in traditional popular songs (*Wienerlied*) and above all in an oral canon of legends and myths. There were rumors about extensive and violent hunger revolts, about a dissipated, lustful *joie de vivre* even under the most miserable living conditions, about frightening and simultaneously idolized juvenile gangs, about grand gangsters or small-time crooks posing as social rebels, supported without reservation by their local neighborhoods. There are numerous reports of the legendary lower class soirees of the washer-girls, the so-called ‘freakers’ balls’ (*Lumpenbälle*), notorious orgiastic feasts at run-down pubs and low dives. And we are told about self-contained territories of insubordination, which were not to be disciplined by any political and social regime whatsoever.

To decipher and decode these popular myths or, to be more precise, to decipher their marginalization by contemporary as well as retrospective elitist cultural discourses, turns out to be an intriguing perspective. This becomes even more fascinating if we take into account one specific feature of Vienna’s urban form; poverty and social squalor is, and always has been, hidden behind a facade of impressive beauty that suggests a homogenous urban body inspired by the classical architectural standards of the *Ringstraße*. Judged by their outer appearance, the proletarian tenement blocks of the suburbs were (and are) indeed magnificent buildings, in some cases hardly second to the famous palaces along the *Ringstraße*. Thus they did not constitute an obvious contrast to the center, but rather obscured a characteristic double-folded social and spatial segregation. The Vienna topography unfolded along a concentric pattern by which inner and outer suburbs were clustered around the center according to their respective social status. The actual demarcations were not defined as clearly by architectural or aesthetic differences, but by the social signification of urban territories. Cultural practices, as much as material urban forms, served to locate different social classes and determine the divergent perceptions and appropriations of the urban terrain as well as the extent of communication or separation between these classes.

Against this background it seems promising to focus on the outskirts of Vienna 1900. The ‘Other’ of suburban culture manifests itself in the popular land-

5 Cf. MADERTHANER/MUSNER, 1999(1); HORAK et al., 2000; HORAK et al. 2001; MADERTHANER/MUSNER, 2008.

scapes of pleasure (such as the Prater or the Neulerchenfeld), in beer gardens, saloons, and other sites of indulgence. It becomes manifest in the urban no-man's-land of small crime, gangs, and prostitution – a no-man's-land that does not only signify social and cultural deviance, but is indeed part of a more comprehensive life-worldly spectrum of suburbia. This spectrum combines miserable living conditions with strategies of material and ideal survival, industrial and disciplined work with punctual, short-lived dropouts, and rebelliously veiled criminality with politically articulated insubordination. The tensions inscribed in the town body between high and popular culture, hegemony and social difference, mass identity prescribed, and the disobedience of these very masses, are key for developing an understanding for the modern metropolis. To decipher these concepts means attempting to read the metropolis as a social text.

III

In approaching the literary artifacts of high Viennese modernism as a starting point for such a reading, it soon becomes clear that the misery and scantiness of proletarian, suburban life is neither noticed nor reflected upon, very much in contrast to the literary production in comparable modern metropolises. In this respect Arthur Schnitzler's *Traumnovelle* can be taken as a paradigm. The protagonist undertakes a nightly, mysterious trip to a noble villa situated on the outskirts of the city, where members of the nobility meet in masks for erotic trysts.⁶ The track of his coach leads along the Alserstrasse next to the center and heads for an elegant villa at the edge of the forest. Between these lies a terra incognita: the proletarian quarter of Ottakring. Schnitzler comments on Ottakring with only one laconic sentence: "They drove along the Alserstrasse, then underneath a viaduct towards the suburbs and on through badly-lit small side-lanes."⁷

We can detect from Schnitzler's fictions of the urban – and this is the case with an overwhelming majority of his contemporary writers – an urban segregation of *territories intimate* and *territories forbidden*. The mental maps underlying those fictions seem to have constituted an *imaginaire* of the urban that was not only characteristic for the authors but for middle-class patterns of perception as a whole. The other Vienna of the poor and downgraded proletarians, day laborers, servants, and outcasts was obviously beyond that perception and re-

6 Stanley Kubrik, by the way, transferred this framework into the New York of the late twentieth century for his last movie *Eyes Wide Shut*.

7 SCHNITZLER, 1992, p. 39.

moved from the world it created. Notions oriented along the standards of courtly and bourgeois culture definitively excluded the suburbs from city life, construing them merely as places best avoided: places of crime, indecency, deviance, and unpredictability. It was left to the new genre of urban reportage by figures such as Emil Kläger⁸ or Max Winter⁹ to take the minutes of outcast Vienna, thus introducing it to public awareness.

In those records, or in the literary artifacts of writers for whom the outskirts formed the background of a personal experience as a migrant or social outsider, the magnificent Middle-European metropolis is portrayed as a broken and distorted urban space. Ivan Cankar, nowadays generally deemed the founder of modern Slovenian literature, lived in Ottakring during the first decade of the twentieth century. This bohemian and boozier without means found accommodation at the flat of a seamstress, and made his suburban everyday experience the substance of his novels and short stories. We could not conceive of a greater contrast than that of Cankar's world to the splendor and shine of the inner city. Cankar's suburbia is a world of darkness and dirt, a dungeon that cannot be escaped from, as depicted in his 1900 short story *Mimi*:

“The heavenly sun never shines here. There is smoke from the industrial plants around the roofs and if you stroll along the lanes, soot will fall into your face. The tenement blocks are high and boring; the people you meet are badly dressed, with hollow cheeks, their glances expressing discontent. This dreary suburb is extending over a huge area, no end to the east, no end to the west. I knew a man with a gray beard and a crooked back that had not once in his life reached the end of that seemingly endless street that leads into a world more lucid. The suburbs are a gigantic penitentiary; not one single free man does live there. Every now and then I was reflecting on what crimes these prisoners had committed. One morning I was crossing that street and watched them coming up in long rows, with heavy, tired steps and sleepy eyes; I thought I could hear iron chains jangling under their clothes. They got lost in large, gray buildings without windows, and the doors were heavily closing behind them...”¹⁰

Cankar's emphatic and personally affected view is paralleled very specifically by the social text inscribed onto suburbia by the medical, distanced, objectified

8 Cf. KLÄGER, 1908.

9 Cf. WINTER, 1925; IBID., 1905(1); IBID., 1905(2).

10 CANKAR, 1995, p. 7-8.

diagnosis of the municipal government. Thus given expression, the instrumentality of the Modern takes minutes of a total archeology of desperate housing and living conditions, social deviance, and pathology. Victor Adler first directed, in a very spectacular way, attention to those conditions. In December 1888 Adler published the results of hidden inquiries he had undertaken at the grounds of the Wienerberger brickworks.¹¹ The series of articles under the title *The Situation of the Brick Layers* in his weekly “Equality” (*Gleichheit*) came as a sensation and a scandal. It disclosed a genuine glance into a hitherto inconceivable social abyss and revealed a counter-world: the hidden, filthy, other side of the fin de siècle coin, the ousted, repressed, forgotten ‘Other’ of a widely praised metropolis, a world of exploitation, estrangement, and dulling apathy.

Adler reported on the “poorest slaves the sun has ever shed its light upon”. Tied to a complex system of hierarchies and dependencies, bricklayers were totally subject to the Company and a carefully conceived truck system. Their salaries, scandalously low to begin with, were not paid in ‘normal money’ but given out in the form of metal coupons. These coupons were accepted as a means of payment exclusively by the canteen keepers of the Company. The quality of the goods offered was poor, the prices excessively high, and each worker was assigned to one of the canteen keepers as an object of exploitation. “Well aware of his power”, Adler wrote, “such a keeper responded to a complaining worker: ‘Even if I was going to shit into your dishes you ought to eat it up.’ And the guy is right, they would have to.”

While the workers were forbidden to purchase anything outside the works premises, they were nonetheless allowed to beg. Adler writes about hordes of people who would set upon the nearby Inzersdorfer cannery every evening, scrounging for waste products. Whoever could arrange it undertook a one-and-a-half hour walk to get hold of one of the eighty portions of vegetable soup the hangman of Vienna distributed daily: “There is more mercy with the hangman than with the Company and its paid slave-drivers.”

As if this weren’t enough, the bricklayers were forced to live on the premises. Up to ten families lived in every single room of the workers’ houses, “men, women, children wildly mixed up”. There were so-called sleeping halls for others, where fifty to seventy persons would be herded together on old straw, body next to body. In one of these halls a woman gave birth to her child “in the presence of fifty half-naked, dirty men. We should not talk about modesty, however,

11 PARTEIVORSTAND DER SOZIALDEMOKRATISCHEN ARBEITERPARTEI DEUTSCHÖSTERREICHS, vol. 4, 1925, p. 11-35. The citations following are taken from the first article published in *Gleichheit* 49 (1888).

as this is a luxury reserved for property owners only. The life of a mother is actually threatened under those circumstances. But who cares about a poor broad.” The main factory grounds at the Laerberg were even more distinguished in that respect. Whole bunches of mainly single workers had to sleep on top of the huge industrial brick ovens, partly exposed to the night freeze, partly almost burnt from below, and covered only meagerly by filthy rags. The prisoners in Siberia, Adler summed up, were better off than these poor sods whose only crime was to work for the profits of the Company.

Adler’s sensational revelations led to an epilogue in Parliament without any consequences, while his journal *Gleichheit* was confiscated and Adler himself was fined for non-licensed distribution of a periodical. Yet he was to produce further sensational pieces of investigative journalism. For his most important one, an April 1889 article on the living and working conditions of the tramway drivers, he was sentenced to four months’ imprisonment.¹²

IV

In spite of these revealing indicators it would be misleading to regard the urban periphery and the suburbs only as zones of enduring misery or as mere function of the new and rigid industrial paradigm of production. Such a view would ignore essential dimensions of the social and cultural configurations of these areas. The following two scenarios elaborate suburban life-worlds and contexts as emblematic examples of social contradiction and cultural antagonism.

On September 17, 1911 a hunger revolt took place in the proletarian district of Ottakring. Entire quarters and most houses, windows, and streetlamps were damaged. A state of emergency was proclaimed, barricades were erected, streetcars were burned, and street fights with rapidly deployed army units took place. Young men and women, central agents of this revolt, seized and devastated school buildings and set fire to books and papers. For the first time since the revolutionary upheavals of 1848 army units fired on the civilian population, killing four, and the sub-proletariat looted shops and pubs. The young Austro-Marxist librarian of Parliament, to later become chancellor and president of the Austrian Republic, Karl Renner, stated that the most desperate, alienated, and seedy people had left their homes to demonstrate and thereby to protest the conditions held in place by the social order.¹³

12 Cf. BRAUNTHAL, 1965, p. 59-64.

13 Cf. RENNER, 1911, p.1-4.

The Vienna Police Department stated in its report that the police units were unable to stop devastation and pillage since the looters and plunderers were anywhere and nowhere and disappeared quickly when confronted by force. According to the department it would have taken all army units stationed in Vienna in order to secure public order and to control the undisciplined crowds in the streets. It took many hours to restore order due to the fact that the revolting crowds were supported and egged on by large segments of the civilian population. From windows and houses stones, glasses, iron pieces and the like were thrown at police and army units.¹⁴ On the side of the young mob, women and mothers, whose objective according to the “Workers’ Daily” (*Arbeiterzeitung*) should have been to think clearly and rigorously, took part in street fighting and provided the young mob with stones.¹⁵

This short day of anarchy stood for more than the harsh political economy of suburban life and more than a battle about power and the hegemony over public space. The “grotesque” character of the hunger revolt, frequently diagnosed by police and media reports, refers to a cultural articulation of difference and antagonism. Those crowds were not only composed of the old urban underclass but also of the many new migrants who brought with them their desire for a better life in the city – something not to be fulfilled in the contemporary urban context of devastating work and poor consumption.

These migrants had left their oral, pre-modern, and rural cultures of origin in order to find a new perspective and better life chances in the metropolis. Still mentally attached to an imaginary village of the past, they searched for a home in a different urban geography that was increasingly linearly and fragmentarily configured by technology, science, and rational conduct. Pushed towards the social margins, they were unable to find a new habitat but ended up in poverty and collective alienation. The seemingly irrational and grotesque character of the hunger revolt and the anarchic strength of its violence, however, reveal an obscure, ambivalent logic and rationality of its own: A largely hopeless venture to call into question the new symbolic order of modernity, modernization, and the metropolis.¹⁶

One-and-a-half years after the hunger revolt the same crowd showed up in the same Ottakring location but expressed itself in a different way: disciplined and with dignity. But before examining this outstanding event yet to come, a

14 Cf. AUSTRIAN STATE ARCHIVES/ÖSTERREICHISCHES STAATSARCHIV, Ministerium des Inneren, Präsidium, 9798, 19.09.1911.

15 Cf. ARBEITER-ZEITUNG, 19.09.1911, p. 2.

16 Cf. MADERTHANER/MUSNER, 1999(1), p. 34-37.

short excursion into the urban development of this proletarian district might be useful. During the so-called *Gründerzeit* in the 1860s and its capitalist restructuring, the preindustrial villages of Ottakring were turned into industrial suburbs, and a 'hard texture' of factories and tenement blocks, of traffic and communication lines was imposed, thereby rationalizing and disciplining everyday life. In parallel, the suburb became a projection screen of power in which economic interests blended with fantasies about the alien 'Other'. The speculative building boom as well as a massive influx of migrants condensed the suburbs into zones of extreme social and spatial density. While the facades of the hastily built tenements imitated the neo-baroque architecture of the center, their interior was characterized by pure capitalist rationality of minimal space sheltering a maximum of tenants. In his 1894 investigation of housing conditions in the Viennese suburbs, the famous Austrian social reformer Eugen von Philippovich concluded that tenants live under spatial circumstances which do not even meet the basic standards of army barracks.¹⁷

A prototypical example of the capitalist mode of suburban urban development was the so-called *Schmelz*, a former army training ground. In one of the most spectacular undertakings in Vienna's architectural history, the northern part of it was turned into a drawing-board structure of 'Americanized' urban housing characterized by standardized tenement blocks. In spite of the fact that this urban no-man's-land appeared like a final disposal site of the low classes, it became the location of the largest mass demonstration ever held in Vienna. This happened on the occasion of Franz Schuhmeier's funeral on February 16, 1913. Schuhmeier, a popular leader of the workers' movement, had been assassinated shortly before. The social-democratic workers' party had mobilized its already significant organizational apparatus, which covered all the suburbs, but the turnout surpassed all expectations and was to prove almost uncontrollable. Nearly half-a-million people came, literally every fourth inhabitant of Vienna. The funeral service assembled high-ranking representatives of the political, bureaucratic, military, and diplomatic elite. A large choir, composed of court opera and workers' singers, intoned Franz von Suppe's *Ruhe, Müder Wanderer* when the coffin was closed, and the end of the service was marked by Richard Wagner's pilgrim chorus of *Tannhäuser*. A horse-drawn carriage and horsemen in old Spanish costume brought the corpse to its final place of rest, where tens of thousands of mourners covered the grave with a sea of red carnations.

This grandiose funeral was no accident since Franz Schuhmeier was not only the most popular social democrat in Vienna at the turn of the century, but also a

17 Cf. FELDBAUER, 1977.

mass politician of the new style, an agitator as talented as he was populist and a stirring speaker; a man of the people who had risen from the poorest background into the highest levels of politics. Unlike any before him, Schuhmeier had managed to lead the politically and socially deprived of the suburbs out of their isolation to form an organized, politically aware, and thus identity-shaping mass movement. With this funeral it was not only a hero of the people who was paid homage according to tradition, the *people* in their new social organization and political expression turned into a public force. The funeral thus became the exposition of a political counterculture, which opposed the dominance of the petty-bourgeois radicalism that the Christian-Social mayor Karl Lueger had two decades before formed into the dominant local political force and brought to municipal power.¹⁸

Lueger's great political achievement at the time was the creation of an anti-liberal middle-class bloc which reunited the groups that had been split following the Revolution of 1848, the petty bourgeois on one hand and the wealthy middle classes on the other, into a clerical, antisocialist and anti-Semitic citizens' group.¹⁹ Lueger was to prove to be a master of rewriting political history. He created the idea of the *true, authentic Viennese* as a new phenomenon in political life and thus gave the city its own new tradition. He cast the ostensibly true and real Vienna of the lower middle class as opposite to the experience of alienation and the working-world shock of modernity. Lueger created a patriarchal image of Vienna as a *Vaterstadt*, an imagined community of the petite bourgeoisie. Therein he forged an image of the capital city as the paragon of a pre-industrial, middle class, familial, and 'evangelized' city based on authority, paternalism, patrimony, and Christian-Catholic values. Lueger recognized in Schuhmeier a worthy opponent, his congenial popular counterpart. Their clashes in the municipal council were legendary. With both, repartee, wit, sarcasm, and scorn could suddenly turn into profound enmity. But their shouting matches and invectives just as often ended in theatrical gestures of reconciliation, and in such cases Lueger especially would always allude to the *Vienna-ness* so innately a part of the both of them.

Franz Schuhmeier and Karl Lueger, both literally "children of the suburbs", were prototypical exponents, actors and at the same time directors of a period of transition that followed the end of the liberal era in Vienna and of the reformation of political power relations. The period between 1890 and 1910 initiated the politics of the masses, reacting to the unfulfilled social promises of liberalism

18 Cf. MADERTHANER/MUSNER, 1999(1), p. 176 - 208.

19 Cf. SCHORSKE, 1981, p. 116.

and at the same time signaling its end. Though social democracy, by creating a modern mass party, successfully managed to take up the unfulfilled political agenda of liberalism, it was largely excluded, on account of a municipal electoral law in force until 1919, from any real political influence in the city. Lueger and his party of Christian Socials, however, destroyed the political power of the liberals, primarily via their “municipalization” (*Verstadtlichung*) projects and by building up a loyal power-base among the municipal civil servants, while leaving the social and political structures intact. Lueger enthroned the lower-middle-class citizen as the new political ruler on a local level; in place of liberal ideology, his own ideas became the basis for a policy agenda.²⁰

Social democracy as a mass movement, by contrast, was restricted to proclaiming the city as the site of a different *future* politics, a different society, and a different culture. In this way it developed the idea of a utopia of equality, one that was to take on concrete form after World War I in *Red Vienna*. Lueger, by contrast, relied on a policy of xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Instead of addressing the welfare of the city as a whole, he reinforced social tensions and divisions. His policy was one of ‘evangelizing’ the poor and excluding those who had recently migrated to the city. If Franz Schuhmeier also played on an anti-Semitic resentment that was already deeply embedded in the attitudes of all the various social groups comprising Viennese society at the turn of the century, this remained fundamentally distinct from Lueger’s outright hatred of Jews.²¹

Lueger’s marginalization and defamation of Jews as a group was aimed at covering up the problems inherited from liberalism and making the social tensions it had left behind the basis for a xenophobic populism. In this way, his anti-Semitism became not only an instrument of mass mobilization but also an integral component of a new kind of political culture, one that incited the masses against the old elites, and the *integrated* against the *outsiders*. Schuhmeier and the social democrats, by contrast, made the social tensions and contradictions their point of departure; overcoming them became the basis of their political agenda. Lueger used the ‘Others’, Jews and foreigners as outsiders, to satisfy symbolically the disparate interests of his clientele and thus to remain in power. The social democrats aimed at integration in order to come to power and to create, via an alliance of the working class and the assimilated intellectual Jewish community, a social order in which both would be citizens instead of outsiders, in the center instead of on the periphery. Yet, however different these new forms

20 Cf. BOYER, 1995, p. 236, 154.

21 Cf. PULZER, 1988; POLLAK, 1997.

of mass politics were articulated, in their collective dimension they reflected Robert Musil's *common breath*.

Literature

- Arbeiter-Zeitung, 19.09.1911.
- Boyer, John W., Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna. Christian socialism in power 1897-1918, Chicago 1995.
- Braunthal, Julius, Victor und Friedrich Adler. Zwei Generationen Arbeiterbewegung, Vienna 1965.
- Canker, Ivan, Pavliceks Krone. Literarische Skizzen aus Wien, Klagenfurt 1995.
- Feldbauer, Peter, Stadtwachstum und Wohnungsnot. Determinanten unzureichender Wohnungsversorgung in Wien 1848 bis 1914, Vienna 1977.
- Horak, Roman et al. (eds.), Metropole Wien. Texturen der Moderne, 2 vols., Vienna 2000.
- Id. et al. (eds.), Stadt. Masse. Raum. Wiener Studien zur Archäologie des Popularen, Vienna 2001.
- Kläger, Emil, Durch die Quartiere der Not und des Verbrechens. Wien und die Jahrhundertwende, Vienna 1908.
- Maderthaner, Wolfgang/Musner, Lutz, Die Anarchie der Vorstadt. Das andere Wien um 1900, Frankfurt/Main/New York 1999(1);
- Id., "Aufstand der Massen", in: Damals. Das aktuelle Magazin für Geschichte und Kultur 3 (1999)(2), p. 12-19.
- Id., Unruly Masses. The other side of Fin de Siècle Vienna, New York/Oxford 2008.
- Musil, Robert, The Man without Qualities, translated from German by Sophie Wilkins, New York 1995.
- Parteivorstand der Sozialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei Deutschösterreichs (ed.), Victor Adlers Aufsätze, Reden und Briefe. 11 vols., Vienna 1922-1929, here vol. 4, Vienna 1925.
- Pulzer, Peter, The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria, Cambridge, Mass. 1988.
- Pollak, Michael, Wien 1900. Eine verletzte Identität, Konstanz 1997.
- Renner, Karl, Soziale Demonstrationen, in: Der Kampf 1 (1911), p. 1-4.
- Schnitzler, Arthur, Traumnovelle, Frankfurt am Main 1992.
- Schorske, Carl E., Fin-de-Siècle Vienna. Politics and culture, New York 1981.
- Sombart, Nikolaus, Nachdenken über Deutschland. Vom Historismus zur Psychoanalyse, München/Zürich 1987.

Winter, Max, Das goldene Wienerherz, Berlin 1905(1).

Id., Im unterirdischen Wien, Leipzig/Berlin 1905(2).

Id., Im dunkelsten Wien. Wiener Schilderungen aus der Luegerzeit, Vienna, 1925.

Austrian State Archives/Österreichisches Staatsarchiv:

- Ministerium des Inneren, Präsidium, 9798, 19.09.1911.