

The Idea of America in Austrian Political Thought 1870-1960

David Wile
Advisor: Dr. Alan Levine, School of Public Affairs
University Honors
Spring 2012

Abstract

Between 1870 and 1960, the United States of America and Austria experienced two opposite political paths. The United States emerged from the wreckage of the Civil War as a more centralized republic and at the turn of the century became an imperial power, a status that the First and Second World Wars only solidified. Meanwhile, Austria ended the nineteenth century as one of Europe's largest empires, yet after World War I, all that remained of the intellectual and cultural center of the Habsburg Empire was a tiny remnant cut off from its breadbasket in Hungary, its industrial center in Bohemia, and its seaports in the Balkans. Against the backdrop of a dying empire observing a nascent one, this project examines the discourse through which prominent members of the Austrian, and especially Viennese, intellectual elite imagined the United States of America, and attempts to determine which patterns emerged in that discourse. The Austrian thinkers and writers who are the major focus of this work are: the psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, the Zionist Theodor Herzl, the feuilletonist and satirist Karl Kraus, two of the most prominent members of the Austrian School of economics, Ludwig von Mises and F.A. Hayek, and an economist of the Historical School, Joseph Schumpeter. To a lesser extent, the work refers to writers Stefan Zweig, Albert Kubin, and Arthur Schnitzler, philosophers Otto Weininger and Franz Brentano, and two more Austrian School economists, Carl Menger and Friedrich von Wieser. Repeated themes depict America as a haven of economic freedom and prosperity, as a technological powerhouse, as a destination for emigration, and eventually as a world power. American culture is criticized on economic, sexual, and religious grounds, yet in only a few exceptional instances do the Austrians refer to American political institutions and ideals. In general, the project's analysis shows that at the turn of the century, the Austrians viewed American freedom and technical advancements with a reserved respect, although they tended to view the culture which had emerged in that freedom much more critically.

Introduction

Between 1870 and 1960, the United States and Austria found themselves on two opposite stages in the life-cycle of an empire. America rose from the ashes of its Civil War and first tasted imperialism after quick victory in the Spanish-American War of 1898. The Habsburg Empire, on the other end of the spectrum, had existed for almost four hundred years and was tottering on the verge of disintegration with military defeats steadily accumulating and nationalist discontent reaching a fever pitch in Eastern Europe. After the First World War, the United States first took on the responsibilities of a world power while the Allies had only left Vienna and an alpine hinterland to reassume the name Austria. After the World War II, the United States was the most powerful nation in the world while Austria was left to cope with finding itself for the second time on the defeated end of global conflict.

Yet in the years between the turn of the century and the outbreak of the First World War – known as the “Gay Apocalypse” because of the hedonism embodied in Viennese culture before the Empire’s imminent collapse – Austria, and its capital Vienna especially, enjoyed remarkable economic growth, creative output, and intellectual achievements. While the Austro-Hungarian Empire crumbled politically, Vienna remained one of the major centers of European intellectual life. The combination of the Viennese coffeehouse culture, political instability, and steady economic growth worked to foster the development of a prolific intellectual class with far-reaching ideas in physics, economics, art, and philosophy.

Austrian observers of the United States during this epoch did so from the perspective of an empire on its last legs, giving us a historical window through which we can see a dying empire examining, analyzing, and interpreting a nascent one. The Austrians saw America as a land of economic opportunity at the cutting edge of technology and modernity. From afar, they

cast judgments on the culture that such a country produced. They attempted to discern the allure of the New World for Europe's emigrants. The Austrians analyzed the new fact in international politics of American power and extrapolated on the meaning of that power for the global community. Conspicuously, they attributed very little to the political institutions of the United States. Between 1870 and 1960, Austrian thinkers viewed American freedom and technical advancements with a reserved respect, although they tended to view the culture which had emerged in that freedom much more critically.

I. Economic Prosperity

Austrian thinkers at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the nineteenth century concerned themselves immensely with what they perceived to be the unique economic conditions of the United States. Most Austrian observers interpreted the United States as a haven for economic freedom and prosperity. The economists of the Austrian school viewed this economic freedom favorably, but also with a measured caution towards its future. This caution would increase substantially after the economic reforms of the New Deal passed into American law.

At the outset of the First World War in 1914, Austrian School economist Friedrich von Wieser published *Social Economics*. In this work, he expounded upon the uniquely American conditions which allowed trusts to originate specifically in the United States. Population growth and immigration create such a large demand for manufactured goods that plants continually improve. With new modern technologies continually at their disposal, entrepreneurs also find themselves with access to virgin soil for further industrial production and able to experiment with productive conditions whose merits have yet to be determined and prejudged. A bold entrepreneur can use these conditions to his advantage to form a trust. These "peculiar conditions

which are not relevant to the European states and which in the course of time may not be relevant to the United States either” allow this economic unit of organization to flourish in the United States as opposed to elsewhere.¹ Not only do bold entrepreneurs have the opportunity to prosper in America, but laborers in America earn more than those in Europe. Wieser points out that the disparity between the wages of American workers and those of their European counterparts was too great for the flow of European emigrants across the ocean to level out.² In a preface added to this work in 1927, Wieser remarked on the “flourishing America of today,” but did so with caution. He predicted that Bolshevism, which had already taken over Russia and influenced European politics, would soon also become a force in the United States once its rapid economic progress slowed down.³ Once that progress eventually did slow down in the form of the Great Depression, Wieser’s Austrian School disciples would echo these fears.

One such disciple, F.A. Hayek, in *The Road to Serfdom*, published in 1944, detailed the degeneration of civil freedoms which emerges once citizens begin trusting their economic welfare to their government. While Hayek wrote that independence, self-reliance, and local responsibility were “virtues” of the Anglo-American people,⁴ he feared for the economic regulations which had quietly crept into British and American public policy. He pointed out that, although the United States and Britain remained more liberal than most countries, they had followed on a slow path of governmental economic regulation and had departed from a *laissez-faire* economic doctrine since before World War I.⁵ In both America and Britain, Hayek saw the growing influence of restrictionist economic policies as a potentially destructive force to Anglo-American freedom. Certain restrictions, such as price stabilization and output limitations, work

¹ Friedrich von Wieser, *Social Economics*. New York: Adelphi Co. 1927, p. 227.

² Ibid. p. 444.

³ Ibid, p. xviii-xix.

⁴ F.A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*. University of Chicago Press, 1944, p. 219.

⁵ Ibid, p. 66.

mainly to guarantee the position of a certain group of producers, and hence they reduce the opportunities open to others outside that group. Those less well-off cannot share in the relative prosperity of the controlled industries because they have been barred by the established producers, constituting what Hayek, invoking a Marxian phrase, called the worst “exploitation of one class by another.”⁶ Like Wieser, Hayek brought up American trusts to argue that they are specific to American circumstances; Hayek attributed their appearance not to the inevitable machinations of capitalism, but rather to the country’s protectionist policies at the time.⁷

These restrictionist and protectionist economic policies, which undermine competition and freeze social mobility, suggested to Hayek that “at least some of the forces which have destroyed freedom in Germany are also at work here.”⁸ Unless the United States adopted more liberal economic policies, then the danger of slipping into future totalitarianism remained an ever-present threat. Not only was democracy at stake to Hayek, but the entirety of Anglo-American civilization. If America and Britain “abandon the supreme ideals of the freedom and the happiness of the individual” and “follow the path along which the Germans have led,” they would, according to Hayek, “implicitly admit that their civilization is not worth preserving.”⁹ To Hayek, Anglo-American civilization is worth preserving, and the means by which to preserve it lie in the return to traditional Anglo-American economic freedoms.

Throughout Ludwig von Mises’ writings, America features as the most prosperous country in the world, a prosperity Mises attributed to the fact that the United States took the longest among civilized nations to depart from the classical liberal economic model. Writing in the years after World War II, Mises attested that “the average American worker enjoys amenities

⁶ Ibid, p. 153-4.

⁷ Ibid, p. 93.

⁸ Ibid, p. 58.

⁹ Ibid, p. 221.

for which Croesus, Crassus, the Medici, and Louis XIV would have envied him.”¹⁰ Furthermore, as a result of what Mises perceives to be the “anti-profit mentality of our age,” the majority of the world looks upon America “with the same feelings of envy, hatred, and hostility with which, stimulated by the socialist and communist doctrines, the masses everywhere look upon the capitalists of their own nation.”¹¹ While America was still “the richest of all countries,” Mises believed that the “trend of American politics,” if left unchecked, would create a situation in which public policies would soak the wealth of the rich until their funds were exhausted.¹²

Mises was under the impression that America and Europe were ruled by parties “hostile to capitalism” who sought to inflict harm on capitalists and entrepreneurs in a misguided attempt to benefit the rest of society.¹³ These parties come to dominate within democratic governments because individuals have contradictory demands; because market phenomena are the results of each individual’s active contribution, the individual is unwittingly both a consumer and a producer. He demands as a consumer to be protected from the producer, but as a producer he insists that he be able to protect himself from consumers. From these contradictory demands arise modern methods of governmental economic interference. For Mises, “the most outstanding examples” of this interference were the “*Sozialpolitik* of imperial Germany and the American New Deal.”¹⁴

Mises saw within Roosevelt’s New Deal the reactionary collectivist mindset from which socialism and central planning spring. For this reason, he argued that the “antagonism between the Communists on the one hand,” who saw the New Deal as a contrivance to prolong capitalism, and “the Socialists, New Dealers, and Keynesians on the other” is merely an

¹⁰ Ludwig von Mises, *Human Action*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1949, p. 265.

¹¹ Ludwig von Mises, *Planning for Freedom*. South Holland, Illinois: Libertarian Press, 1952, p. 140.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 183-4.

¹³ Mises, *Human Action*, p. 273.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 312.

argument over means to the same end, specifically “the establishment of all-round central planning and the entire elimination of the market economy.”¹⁵ Mises believed that it was the “avowed objective...of all present-day governments and political parties to prevent the emergence of new millionaires.” Echoing Hayek, Mises argued that restrictionist policies stunt both economic and technological growth.¹⁶ To Mises, “the comparatively greater prosperity of the United States is an outcome of the fact that the New Deal did not come in 1900 or 1910, but only in 1933.”¹⁷ The American worker earned a higher wage not because he was more industrious, but because in the United States there was more capital invested per employee and the American government traditionally left the American entrepreneur unhindered compared to how foreign governments treated their entrepreneurs.¹⁸ It was sheer fortune that the United States only first departed from such policies in the 1930s.

To Mises, the shortage of capital was the greatest obstacle to economic improvement. In this regard, he rebuked the ideas of Keynes who argued that the state should fill in wherever private enterprise was unable to do so. The Tennessee Valley Authority represented a slippery slope in Mises’ thought: “there are still many valleys left for further action.” Once governments begin spending money that they do not have, it “becomes unnecessary to adjust the amount of expenditure to the means available, there is no limit to the spending of the great god State.”¹⁹ American labor unionists need to understand that their fate is inextricably bound with that of their employers, and the taxation systems they vote for to usher in an “age of plenty” take away capital from their employers that could have been saved and invested anew. Conditions can only improve with better production, and better production only occurs with increased saving and the

¹⁵ Mises, *Planning for Freedom*, p. 98-9.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 135.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 136.

¹⁸ *Ibid*.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 90.

accumulation of capital. Thus Mises struck upon a solution to the impending socialization and communization of the capitalist economy: “the preservation and ... improvement of what is called ‘the American way of life’ ... depends on the maintenance and the further increase of the capital invested in American business.”²⁰ Mises, who so dearly admired this “American way of life,” and who so greatly feared that it would disappear under the circumstances of American politics, saw the solution to this crisis of economic liberalism in American business.

Writing at the outset of World War II, Joseph Schumpeter, an economist of the Historical School rather than the Austrian School, argued that there existed already within American society a trend away from the free-enterprise system. In 1941, Schumpeter noted that the United States “economically has substantially all it needs.”²¹ Yet there existed two dangers to American society. The first of these was inflation. In an address given in Boston, Schumpeter warned that inflation “would bring in this country more than in other countries moral breakdown.”²² After the New Deal, which Schumpeter called “ten years of unofficial and halfhearted class warfare” and a “process of rapid disorganization,” any post-war inflation would put “serious strains and disturbances on the social fabric that cannot be undone.”²³ The second perceived danger was a general shift in American values. To Schumpeter, “the free-enterprise system is not just a technical economic arrangement...it is a particular scheme of values and a particular way of life.” This scheme of values and way of life were “rapidly vanishing from the American scene,” accelerated by the inflationary pressure resulting from the country’s participation in the two world wars.²⁴ Thus the first danger abets the second. In Schumpeter’s estimation, America did

²⁰ Ibid, p. 92.

²¹ Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter: The Economics and Sociology of Capitalism*, ed. Richard Swedberg. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991, “The Lowell Lectures,” p. 394.

²² Ibid, p. 395.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, “American Institutions and Economic Progress,” 1991, p. 443-4.

not have to fear “bolshevism or Hitlerism,” but rather “a growth wearing the color and flavor of the soil.”²⁵ If America descended into totalitarianism, it would do so through a political movement totally American in origin and nature.

Similarly to Mises, Schumpeter saw the New Deal as a fundamental shift in American domestic economic policy. “The New Deal was able to expropriate the upper income brackets” to such an extent, argued Schumpeter, that “a tremendous transfer of wealth has actually been effected...that quantitatively is comparable to that effected by Lenin.”²⁶ In fact, according to Schumpeter, “the present distribution of disposable incomes compares well with the one actually prevailing in Russia.”²⁷ However, unlike Mises, Schumpeter was not so quick to label this shift in policy with any positive or negative value judgments, nor to even predict America’s future economic system. In his last written words before his death in 1950, Schumpeter opined that “the questions of whether the process will lead to socialism and whether this socialism will be democratic or dictatorial...are questions for a prophet to answer, but not for an analyst, who can only list tendencies and possibilities.”²⁸ Therefore, unlike Hayek and Mises, Schumpeter could not unequivocally equate a perceived “socialist tendency” with a definitive move towards dictatorial socialism; he instead viewed such tendencies as widespread changes in socioeconomic values brought on by changes in socioeconomic conditions. The effects of those changes and their results were by no means set in stone.

Writer Stefan Zweig further bore witness to the economic freedom and opportunity which America offered. Zweig, in his autobiography *The World of Yesterday*, published after his suicide in 1943, recalled coming to the United States around 1910 at the insistence of the Jewish

²⁵ Ibid, p. 397.

²⁶ Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, 1942, p. 381.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, “American Institutions and Economic Progress,” p. 444.

industrialist and German nationalist Walter Rathenau that, in order to better understand Europe, he leave it. During a short stay in New York City, he found himself alone and bored, and decided to play a “game” whereby he took on the character of a European emigrant and searched for jobs. As he recalled, “after two days of job hunting I had theoretically found five jobs by which I could have made my living.”²⁹ The amount of economic opportunities which America offered “anyone willing to work” astounded the young traveler. Without a word regarding his nationality, religion, or origin, without even bringing along his passport, Zweig reveled in the “divine freedom of the country” which thrived “without the hindering interference of the State or formalities....”³⁰ In America, he marveled, “jobs...but waited for takers.”³¹ Perhaps because he was a writer by profession rather than an economist, Zweig did not portend any doom for American economic prosperity; however, there is perhaps a bit of nostalgia as he qualifies that freedom wherein “the deal was made in a minute” as a “now legendary” part of America’s past.³²

In fact, it appears that only the psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, for whom a general negativity towards America will prove a running theme, did not see America as a prosperous country. In a commentary through which he sought to debunk his former colleague Otto Rank’s assertion, outlined in *Das Trauma der Geburt* (1924; English: *The Trauma of Birth*), that the true source of neuroses was the pre-Oedipal act of birth, Freud argued that such a psychoanalytic misinterpretation arose “under the stress of the contrast between the post-war misery of Europe and the ‘prosperity’ of America.”³³ However, both Rank’s theory and America’s “prosperity”

²⁹ Stefan Zweig, *The World of Yesterday*. New York: Viking Press, 1943, p. 149.

³⁰ Ibid, p. 149.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Sigmund Freud, *Freud – Complete Works*, ed. Ivan Smith, 2011, “Analysis Terminable and Interminable,” p. 5014, <<http://www.datafilehost.com/download-df582934.html>>.

(quotation marks are Freud's) "are now things of the past."³⁴ Although the essay in which this passing remark appears, "Analysis Terminable and Interminable," was written during the tail-end of the Great Depression in 1937, Freud certainly seems to interpret the post-war prosperity of the United States as the economic anomaly and the country's interwar depression to represent the regression to the financial mean.

Although, Freud excluded, Austrian intellectuals generally maintained a positive view of American economic prosperity, the American economic character and the cultural peculiarities which allowed it to thrive were much more thoroughly scrutinized. What emerges in the Austrian discourse is a caricature of purely economic, greedy character, with neither time nor thought spared for anything which does not yield immediate financial benefit. However, although the Austrian School economists present a remarkably similar personality, they were quick to praise the merits of such an individual.

The economic culture of America was largely critiqued in *Die Fackel* ("The Torch"), the personally edited and published newspaper of feuilletonist, journalist, and satirist Karl Kraus, which ran from 1899 through 1936. One of the contributors to this newspaper, the architect Adolf Viktor Loos, who had spent time in America while developing his architectural style, expressed concern in an article in a 1902 volume of the newspaper over the newest technological invention, the Italian inventor Guglielmo Marconi's long-distance radio transmission. This innovation enabled signals to be sent for the first time wirelessly across the Atlantic. However, Loos was not terribly concerned with what Europe would send to America, but with what would come eastward over the ocean.

Nach einiger Zeit exportiert Amerika einen gewissen Mr. Washington nach den europäischen Grossstädten, der fett, fuchsig und selbstbewusst in den teuersten

³⁴ Ibid.

Hôtels wie ein Nabob lebt. Er radebrecht die Sprachen jener Länder, die Patente ertheilen und technischen Erfindungen gegenüber Respect und Leichtgläubigkeit bezeugen. Die Patente für das elektrische Riechen ohne Draht hat er bereits in Amerika – wie fingierte Kaufverträge beweisen – dann in Australien, Indien, Japan und Kamtschatka verkauft. Beeile dich also, Europa! Mr. Washington ist bereit, dich in Mark, Kronen, Francs, Rubeln zu betheiligen! Die Nullen an der eingezahlten Beträgen werden sich wie bei einer Quaterne ver-n-fachen, sogar die Actionäre der Auergesellschaft werden neidvoll erblassen!³⁵

To Loos, the American was a jack-of-all-trades, an economic juggernaut more flexible, more business-savvy, and less scrupulous than the European. If Europe wanted to open itself unhindered to America, even its capitalists would have to learn to do business like the Americans, or risk putting themselves at an inherent disadvantage of capabilities from which they could not recover.

In expressionist painter and illustrator Alfred Kubin's only work of literary fiction, *The Other Side*, first published in 1908, the American antagonist is presented in a similar light to that feared by Loos. His constant action directly contrasts with the passivity of the protagonists. The novel tells the story of an older man, whose name is never revealed, whose friend from his youth, Claus Patera, has stumbled upon one of the most massive fortunes anyone has ever possessed. Patera has decided to use this fortune to create a Dream Realm, where "everything is geared

³⁵ Adolf Loos, "Der technische Impresario," *Die Fackel*, 4 Feb. 1902, vol. 93, p. 13, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

"After some time, America exports a certain Mr. Washington to the great states of Europe, who lives fat, mad, and self-confident in the most expensive hotels like a nabob. He brokenly speaks the languages of those countries that grant patents and attest to technical inventions rather than respect and gullibility. The patent for wireless electrical smelling he has ready in America – as forged sales contracts prove – and then sells it in Australia, India, Japan and Kamchatka. Well, hurry up, Europe! Mr. Washington is ready to deal in marks, crowns, francs and rubles! The zeroes on the deposit slips will increase n-fold like a lottery prize; even the Auergesellschaft's stockholders will eat their hearts out!" –My translation. All subsequent translations from *Die Fackel* are mine.

towards giving life the deepest possible spiritual dimension.”³⁶ Only certain people, those who can “see relationships to the outside world which...simply do not exist for the average person,” can be invited to come live in the Dream land, for it is “precisely these ‘non-existent’ things...which are the essence of [the Dreamlanders’] endeavors.”³⁷ It is thus a realm built on impracticality and spirituality. The buildings are all old European buildings transported brick by brick; nothing new is allowed within the Dream Realm’s walls. The state is governed by a kind of shadow totalitarianism by which the people trust their entire livelihoods to Patera, who is able to control aspects of the Dream Realm in an almost divine manner. No one may see him, giving him a distant divine mysticality. Of course, this state only persists until an American by the name of Hercules Bell forces his way inside, after which the country begins crumbling until it apocalyptically implodes upon itself.

The first we hear of Hercules Bell is almost exactly halfway through the novel as news of his arrival spreads through the city of Pearl, the capital of the Dream land. A full chapter before the American’s appearance, he is introduced with the following phrase: “You know, the American. A man with lots of money.”³⁸ When he finally does appear, he floods the Dream Realm with gold. Pearl becomes “gripped with a frenzy of mindless extravagance,” and everywhere toasts are offered to the American’s generosity.³⁹ However, this generosity is nothing more than a pragmatic and political calculation. He would constantly offer cigars, and “if you took one you were already halfway to belonging to him.”⁴⁰

The American is blatantly not the type of person concerned with the “‘non-existent’ things” on which the Dream land is based. The narrator wonders how such activity that runs “so

³⁶ Alfred Kubin, *The Other Side*, trans. Mike Mitchell. Sawtry: Dedalus, 2000, p. 16.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 15.

³⁸ Ibid, p. 130.

³⁹ Ibid, p. 143.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 147.

openly counter to the principles by which the Dream state had been governed until now” is allowed to continue.⁴¹ The American has no use for art; when the narrator’s artistic rival in the Dream land offers Bell an allegorical work *The Albino Leper Killing the Proto-Brain* for a reduced price of five thousand dollars, the American throws him out.⁴² In this manner, Kubin depicts the incompatibility which inherently exists between a life of American economic pragmatism and one of spiritual fulfillment.

Kubin’s American is a picture of activity and vitality. His features resemble a “combination of bull and eagle.”⁴³ He wears coattails, and by walking into a room he attracts the immediate attention of all those present. The American is “athletic”⁴⁴ with “broad shoulders and...healthy complexion, so rare in the Dream Realm.”⁴⁵ He is every bit the jack-of-all-trades envisioned by Loos. He easily masters his horse and its fear of water.⁴⁶ After escaping from the wreckage of the imploding Dream country, Bell quickly changes from the 1860s Viennese mode of style which was the fashion of the Realm into a modern, elegant suit, prepared to meet the advancing European military leaders to whom he has divulged the secret country’s location.⁴⁷ Even escaping from apocalyptic conditions, he maintains the American conditional flexibility noted by Loos. In fact, he attributes his very survival from the wreckage of the Dream Realm to the triumph of “bold American enterprise.”⁴⁸

The American Bell favors style to substance, as evidenced by the newspaper he purchased immediately upon his arrival in the Dream Realm. What had previously been a respectable journalistic enterprise became a tabloid which “appeared exclusively in special

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 150.

⁴² Ibid, p. 210.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 145.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 147.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 150.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 147.

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 242.

⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 222.

editions and reported the events of the day in a style that seemed to consist entirely of headlines.”⁴⁹ To the American, it is not the product that matters, but the profit that can be gained from it. Yet even to the spiritual dwellers of the Dream land, this lifestyle contained a recognizable allure. The narrator himself ventures to say that, rather than the soul-nurturing Patera, “it is *the American* who possesses *true life*.”⁵⁰ It is this attraction of the financially-obsessed American way of life, not just its mere presence, which facilitates and accelerates the complete implosion of the Dream land. Just as Loos imagined Europe would be threatened when faced with the arrival of an American businessman, Kubin shows the complete apocalyptic destruction of the spiritually deep Dream Realm as it fails to cope with the sudden injection of irreconcilable American values.

Freud as well maintained that the active, profit-obsessed American economic character was ultimately detrimental to both society and the individual. In the introductory paragraph of *Analysis Terminable and Interminable* in which he criticized Rank’s theory of a pre-Oedipal birth trauma, Freud claimed that such a simplistic notion, wherein “one small piece of analytic work would save the necessity for all the rest,” arose in order to “adapt the tempo of analytic theory to the haste of American life.”⁵¹ Thus, according to Freud, the careless inattention to detail which inherently resulted from the impulsive restless activity of the American had leapt across the Atlantic to disrupt even the thoroughness of scientific inquiry.

One aspect of this haste was the specifically American tendency to “shorten study and preparation and to proceed as fast as possible to practical application.”⁵² These observations of the 1930s echo those of the nineteenth century political thinkers Alexis de Tocqueville and John

⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 187.

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 182.

⁵¹ Freud, *Complete Works*, “Analysis Terminable and Interminable,” p. 5014.

⁵² Freud, *Complete Works*, “Introduction to the Special Psychopathology Number of *The Medical Review of Reviews*,” p. 4612.

Stuart Mill. Almost a century before Freud bemoaned American carelessness, Tocqueville had already warned that “it is no good looking in the United States for...minute care of details.”⁵³ Furthermore, Tocqueville observed, “the Americans can devote only the first years of life to general education; at fifteen they start on a career, so their education generally ends...when ours begins.”⁵⁴ In 1836, just one year after Tocqueville’s initial insights were published in *Democracy in America*, Mill too brought up the American’s “general indifference to those kinds of knowledge and mental culture which cannot be immediately converted into pounds, shillings, and pence.”⁵⁵ To Freud, this indifference towards detail and shortened educational period were the factors primarily responsible for the scientific superficiality which thrived within the American psychoanalytic movement.

According to Freud, financial obsession such as that which dominated in America was the byproduct of a psychic underdevelopment whereby the libido became fixated on monetary gain. The theories of Freudian psychosexual development maintain that there are four stages of childhood development, each named after the particular body part most sensitive to erotic stimulation during that developmental stage. Chronologically, these are the oral stage, the anal stage, the phallic stage, and the genital stage. In a short essay first published in 1908, *Character and Anal Eroticism*, Freud argued that people who were obsessed with money had sublimated their anal fixations from sexual aims towards the object of money.⁵⁶ He noted that “wherever archaic modes of thought predominate or persist...money is brought into the most intimate relationship with dirt” and defecation.⁵⁷ It is possible, wrote Freud, that this identification of gold

⁵³ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. George Lawrence, ed. J.P. Mayer. New York: HarperPerennial Modern Classics, 2006, p. 92.

⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 55.

⁵⁵ John Stuart Mill, *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, vol. XXI, Essays on Politics and Society: “State of Society in America.” Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977, p. 101.

⁵⁶ Freud, *Complete Works*, “Character and Anal Eroticism,” p. 1943.

⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 1944.

with feces arose from “the contrast between the most precious substance known to men and the most worthless.”⁵⁸ Therefore, according to Freud, the character produced by American capitalism is essentially a neurotic reaction-formation against an anal eroticism which our “present civilization” has made “unserviceable for sexual aims.”⁵⁹ In Freud’s interpretation, the United States was a country of anal retentive personalities.

While the Austrian School economists recognized these same personality traits as particularly American, they condoned the same characteristics which Loos, Kubin, and Freud criticized. To Friedrich von Wieser, competing American multimillionaires were responsible for driving the prices of artwork by the old European masters “to figures which the European nabob may not approach.”⁶⁰ Yet such Americans did not value these pieces of art for their artistic merit, but rather as “possessions suitable to gratify the desire of ostentation.”⁶¹ The price of these “specific luxury-commodities” represents not their value as art *per se*, but rather their ability to “differentiate their possessor from the multitudes who go without them.”⁶² The purchase of ostentatious goods like paintings was, according to Wieser, a trait of all upper classes, and as such not uniquely American. Yet the mere fact that *nouveau riche* American capitalists had priced out Europe’s highest classes meant to Wieser that they had become the planet’s highest income stratum, and as such had earned the ability to set their own price standards.

If America’s wealthy classes acted in a similar manner to Europe’s, Wieser believed that the personal character and skills which allowed the Americans to obtain their wealth differed remarkably from those of their European counterparts. American trusts were the “creations of

⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 1945.

⁵⁹ Ibid, p. 1943.

⁶⁰ Wieser, *Social Economics*, p. 187.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

men of extraordinary abilities in practical business pursuits.”⁶³ These men must possess “the insights, the knowledge, the energies, required to plan and organize the giant enterprises of modern commerce and industry.”⁶⁴ While Wieser agreed with Loos and Kubin that American capitalists left those less economically skilled in their wake, he did not necessarily view this condition as inherently detrimental to those left behind. While “the ranks of independent entrepreneurs are greatly cut down by the trusts,” the organizers of trusts “are compelled to surround themselves...with a staff of collaborators.”⁶⁵ In fact, Wieser regards “properly estimating the abilities of fellow-workers” as one of the most important talents of a leader of a trust. The independent entrepreneurs otherwise unable to access a market share in a particular trust’s industry form a labor pool from which trust organizers can choose their subordinates. The resulting situation, wherein the trust leaders can use their unique abilities to identify specific talents and organize them in a manner most conducive to maximize profit and achievement, is, to Wieser, “more effective than any that could be brought about by other means.”⁶⁶ Therefore, the ruthless personality of the American capitalist feared by Loos and Kubin is in Wieser’s estimation the most economically efficient disposition in existence.

The later Austrian School economists Ludwig von Mises and F.A. Hayek also praised the American disposition. Mises believed that American prosperity had a great deal to owe to the economic character of Americans prior to the imposition of the economic reforms of the New Deal. While American workers attributed their high standards of living to their “own excellence,” Mises argued that they were “neither more industrious nor more skillful” than western European workers. Instead he claimed that this high living standard originated in the

⁶³ Ibid, p. 227.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 227-8.

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 228.

“rugged individualism” to which America traditionally had clung.⁶⁷ To Hayek, America and England were “countries of free and upright, tolerant and independent, people.”⁶⁸ Therefore, the Austrian economists on the whole admired not just American wealth, but also the American predilection towards maximizing profit which came with that wealth.

American prosperity was a fact only disputed by Freud in the first half of the twentieth century. Although Austrians generally admired the prosperity itself, the financially-obsessed temperament which the United States produced was viewed much more controversially in Austria. While creating an almost undoubtedly financially prosperous country, American economic freedom had also created a human being admired only by those whose profession it was to ascertain the conditions necessary for maximizing large-scale wealth and profit, and feared, if not outright disparaged, by all else.

II. Technology and Industry

Austrians interpreted America in the early part of the twentieth century as an industrial and technological powerhouse. Not only did the economists admire America’s technological prowess, but the rapidity with which the United States became fully industrialized also left non-economical thinkers awestruck, an amazement leading to a range of both positive and negative interpretations for the future of mankind. To the economists, America was at the forefront of what was economically possible; to the artists and writers, the country was exploring the frontiers of what was humanly possible, for better or for worse.

In *Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre* (English title: *Principles of Economics*), originally published in 1871, economist Carl Menger not only wrote the work credited with founding the Austrian School of economics, but also attested to the pre-industrial state of the

⁶⁷ Mises, *Planning for Freedom*, p. 136.

⁶⁸ Hayek, *Road to Serfdom*, p. 222.

Reconstruction-era United States. The very first reference to America made in the time period this study establishes for itself characterizes the country as a supplier of cotton. In a discussion of complementary goods, Menger recalled that during the American Civil War, Europe lost its primary cotton supply; as a result, the quality of goods deteriorated even though the performance of European workers remained the same.⁶⁹ In a subsequent discussion of economic exchanges, Menger conjured up the image of two American frontiersmen exchanging cows for horses.⁷⁰ In the years immediately after the Civil War, America was not associated with anything remotely technological, but was rather presented as a land of plantations and frontiers. Its economy was undeveloped to the point that it was used in an economic treatise as a barebones example in order to simplify newly-introduced concepts. This association of the American economy with simplicity would change drastically by the twentieth century.

In *The Road to Serfdom* the liberal economist F.A. Hayek connected the United States with technological advancements. In context, Hayek was countering the notion “that technological changes have made competition impossible...and that the only choice left to us is between control of production by private monopolies and direction by the government.”⁷¹ The proponents of this idea pointed to America and Germany as two technologically advanced nations which also had a number of industries monopolized.⁷² Hayek argued that the technological advancements of America and Germany did not guarantee monopolies, but rather the anti-capitalistic restrictions within those countries did. He pointed out that monopolies developed relatively early in both countries’ respective industrialization periods.⁷³ As mentioned

⁶⁹ Carl Menger, *The Collected Works of Carl Menger*, vol. I, “Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre.” London: University of London, 1934, p. 15.

⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 160.

⁷¹ Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 91.

⁷² Ibid, p. 93.

⁷³ Ibid.

above, Hayek felt that monopolistic conditions in the United States were the result of protectionist policies; in Germany, monopolies resulted from the deliberate policies of central planning itself.⁷⁴ To Hayek, then, technology itself, and the process of American industrialization, contained nothing inherently negative and anti-competitive.

To Ludwig von Mises, the technological advancements of the United States represented the progress inherent within a free-market economic system. Like Hayek, Mises brought up the state of technology in America in order to decry a particular Marxist claim. The Marxist notion that capitalism “has an inevitable tendency to impoverish the workers” was empirically foolish in Mises’ estimation. In *Human Action*, Mises pointed out that the American industrial worker has better amenities thanks to technology than any feudal lord of medieval Europe. To this end, he argued that in the pre-capitalist Middle Ages, “even the wealthiest people led an existence which must be called straightened when compared with the average standard of the American or Australian worker of our age.”⁷⁵ Rather than impoverish the worker, “capitalism has poured a horn of plenty upon the masses of wage earners” who fought against the very technological advances “which render their life more agreeable.”⁷⁶ Because technological innovation improves everyone’s lives, argued Mises, attempts to stifle it only served to sabotage one’s own well-being.

Yet the American worker is not just better off compared to a medieval lord; he also earns a higher wage than his counterparts in Europe and Asia. In an address given in 1950 entitled “Middle-of-the-Road Policy Leads to Socialism,” Mises argued that these wage conditions prevailed because “the American worker’s toil and trouble is aided by more and better tools.”⁷⁷ To Mises, the accumulation of capital was “required for the improvement of technological

⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 95.

⁷⁵ Mises, *Human Action*, p.612.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Mises, *Planning for Freedom*, p. 28.

methods of production;”⁷⁸ only an economy with no government interference could guarantee that accumulation. American pre-New Deal capitalism and technological advances were, therefore, inextricably linked. With the imposition of the New Deal, however, Mises foresaw a stunting of American innovation. Had the New Deal come into effect a mere fifty years earlier, according to Mises, “motorcars, refrigerators, radio sets and a hundred other less spectacular but even more useful innovations would not have become standard equipment of most of the American family households.”⁷⁹ In Mises’ interpretation, American technology was inextricably bound with American economic conditions.

It is perhaps interesting that, like Marx, Mises interpreted the American Civil War from a specifically economic viewpoint. To Marx, the Civil War was a “general holy crusade of property against labor” where even the “past conquests” of the “men of labor” were at stake.⁸⁰ In this regard, “the star-spangled banner carried the destiny” of the proletariat.⁸¹ Similarly, Mises remarked that “it was in the Civil War that, for the first time, problems of the interregional division of labor played a decisive role.”⁸² However, Mises did not interpret this division as one of labor and property, as in Marx’s estimation, but rather as one of industry against agriculture. Therefore, to Mises, the technological advantage of the North made its victory almost inevitable. The wartime South depended on manufactured goods arriving from Europe; once the North blockaded the Southern coast, the technologically backward South “soon began to lack needed equipment.”⁸³ The Civil War represented to Mises the martial advantage of capitalist-driven innovation. While Marx interpreted it as a necessary step in the transition from capitalism to the

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 135.

⁸⁰ Karl Marx, *Marx and Engels: Collected Works*, vol. 20: 1864-68, 1985. New York: International Publishers, p. 20.

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 19.

⁸² Mises, *Human Action*, p. 825.

⁸³ Ibid.

proletariat dictatorship Mises considered the war a testament to the benefits of capitalism itself.

To the historicist economist Joseph Schumpeter, the technological situation of the United States was almost incredible. Writing in 1946, Schumpeter was left in awe of “the colossal industrial success” taking place in America over the last fifty years. This success had not only won the Second World War, but it had also kept American labor from destitution.⁸⁴ Without atrocious mismanagement, and “without violating the organic conditions of a capitalist economy,” American industrialization would create such a large gross domestic product by 1950 “to eliminate anything that could possibly be described as suffering or want.”⁸⁵ America’s technological advantage would, according to Schumpeter, create a unique socioeconomic situation that no other government in history had as yet enjoyed. This situation he framed in the following manner:

In the United States alone there need not lurk, behind modern programs of social betterment, that fundamental dilemma that everywhere else paralyzes the will of every responsible man, the dilemma between economic progress and immediate increase of real income of the masses.⁸⁶

The American government no longer needed to concern itself with the negative transition periods which the alteration of the conditions for economic progress had always previously created. American technology had stretched the limits of what had heretofore been considered within the bounds of economic possibility.

Writer Stefan Zweig was similarly impressed by American technological innovation, although his awe did not originate from an economic standpoint. He recalled in his autobiography *The World of Yesterday* visiting the Panama Canal just before its completion to

⁸⁴ Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, p. 382.

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 384.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

fulfill a wish from childhood to see the Pacific Ocean. After “thousands of years” apart, thirty years of labor and mere “pressure on an electric button” would unite the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans “for eternity.”⁸⁷ American ingenuity would finally conclude centuries of European dreams and unite the two oceans. As “one of the last of this day to see them separate while fully aware of what was to come,” Zweig called the canal America’s “greatest creative accomplishment.”⁸⁸ This American creativity had allowed mankind to master nature and alter even the earth itself to its desires. Because of American ingenuity, the frontiers of human capability were expanding, and the personal experience of these new frontiers of possibility amazed the young novelist.

Alfred Kubin’s novel *The Other Side* depicted technological progress as something distinctly related to American pragmatism. Only used goods are allowed within the walls of the Dream Realm.⁸⁹ Upon the American antagonist’s arrival, he issues the complaint that the Dreamlanders “have no part in the glorious discoveries of our modern age” and “are shut off from the countless inventions which spread order and happiness.”⁹⁰ In Kubin’s thought, there existed an apparent incompatibility between technological innovation and spiritual depth. Hercules Bell had also earned his fortune as a “king of the canned-meat trade.”⁹¹ His entire fortune is based on an industry which simply could not exist without technological innovation, and it is telling that his entrepreneurialism combines technical advances and food. Even human eating, the thing most fundamental to life, has been affected by technology. American technology has not only expanded the range of possibilities of human activity, but also expanded the range of possibilities within those activities humans have always performed.

⁸⁷ Zweig, *The World of Yesterday*, p. 150.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Kubin, *The Other Side*, p. 40.

⁹⁰ Ibid, p. 154.

⁹¹ Ibid, p. 159.

Karl Kraus' publication *Die Fackel* expressed a range of admiration, reservation, and denunciation of American technological advancements. As discussed earlier, in the first decade of the twentieth century, architect Adolf Loos contributed to the journal a number of articles regarding the Italian Marconi's invention of transatlantic radio transmission. In these pieces, the technology itself was not viewed as the problem, but rather the author was concerned that Americans would be able to use it to their advantage much more capably than the Europeans who had invented it.⁹² Thus, in Loos' estimation, Americans possessed almost a natural affinity towards any technological advancements which would further their economic goals. American technology, or the American's more efficient use of European technology for that matter, was in itself neither beneficial to the world nor destructive, but just an extension of the American economic character.

In 1909, Kraus interpreted the discovery of the North Pole by American Robert Peary as representative of two separate aspects of American technology. In the first case, the discovery showed the inevitable direction in which progressive advancements were headed. To Kraus, "*die Entdeckung des Nordpols war unabwendbar.*"⁹³ If such a discovery had to happen, then it chose the most propitious moment possible, "*da der Geist zur Erde strebte und die Maschine sich zu den Sternen erhob, da der entseelte Fortschritt in der Begleitung einer lustigen Witwe zu Grabe ging.*"⁹⁴ First machines conquered the air; the rest of the few remaining untouched parts of the globe were naturally the next to come. America returned the favor of its own discovery by fulfilling this destiny. At long last, America had shown itself "grateful" [*"erkenntlich"*] for its

⁹² Loos, "Der technische Impresario," *Die Fackel*, vol. 93, p. 12-3.

⁹³ Karl Kraus, "Die Entdeckung des Nordpols," *Die Fackel*, 16 Sept. 1909, vol. 287, p. 13, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

"The discovery of the North Pole was inevitable."

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 4.

"...for the spirit aspired to the earth and the machine rose to the stars, for soulless progress went to the grave in the company of a cheerful widow."

own discovery.⁹⁵ Because of the inevitability of the discovery of the North Pole, once the event had actually happened it came as a relief to Kraus. However, from Kraus' viewpoint, this relief was perhaps the only positive to come from American technical progress.

The second aspect of technological innovation which Kraus believed the discovery of the North Pole revealed was the constant, vain attempt of mankind to conquer nature with progress. Unlike Zweig, who believed that American technology had reached the point where humans could finally control nature, Kraus felt that progress merely "*belästigt [die Nature] und sagt, er habe sie erobert.*"⁹⁶ Progress has only to this point celebrated "Pyrrhic victories" [*"Pyrrhussiege"*] over nature. Kraus saw all innovation as a comforting illusion against the power which nature possesses over mankind.

Die Natur kann sich auf den Fortschritt verlassen: er rächt sie schon für die Schmach, die er ihr angetan hat. Sie aber will nicht warten und zeigt, daß sie Vulkane hat, um sich von lästigen Eroberern zu befreien. Ihre Weiber verkuppelt sie mit den Todfeinden der Zivilisation, zündet mit der Moral die Wollust an und schürt sie mit der Rassenfurcht zum Weltbrand. Man tröstet sich und erobert den Nordpol. Aber die Natur klopft ihnen an die Tore der Erde und rüttelt an ihrer angemäßen Hausherrlichkeit. Man tröstet sich und erobert die Luft.⁹⁷

This constant struggle between nature and progress, which human innovation eternally loses, affects the human spirit detrimentally. From Kraus' perspective, it was neither perseverance nor

⁹⁵ Ibid, p. 3.

⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 11.

"...pesters [nature], and says it has conquered it."

⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 12.

"Nature can rely on progress: progress is already avenging nature for the ignominy that it did nature. Nature does not want to just wait and show that it has volcanoes to liberate itself from inconvenient conquerors. It marries off its women to the deadly enemies of civilization, lights lust with morality, and it fuels racial terror to a conflagration of the world. One comforts oneself and conquers the North Pole. But nature knocks on the gates of the earth and jolts the presumed glory of its house. One comforts oneself and conquers the air."

American technological ingenuity which allowed humans to reach the North Pole, but “stupidity” [“*die Dummheit*”].⁹⁸ In response to the conquest of the North Pole, “*die Eisfelder des Geistes aber begannen zu wachsen und rückten immer weiter hinunter und dehnten sich, bis sie die ganze Erde bedeckten. Wir starben, die wir dachten.*”⁹⁹ American technology, Kraus argued, might push the limits of the humanly possible and, in doing so, convince mankind that it has put nature under its command, but nature recovers easily from any setback brought on by human progress; human souls, on the other hand, are left irreversibly harmed.

Kraus also attributed the sinking of the *Titanic* to this eternal power nature held over man. Writing in April of 1912, Kraus interpreted the ship’s demise as a sacrifice necessary to change people’s understanding of nature. In Kraus’ mind, people had “*Gott an die Maschine verraten.*”¹⁰⁰ Kraus saw the ship’s capsizing as a *deus ex machina* which would finally convince mankind, in spite of all previous tendencies pointing towards the further development of and dependence on technological progress, to alter its spiritually destructive course.¹⁰¹ The sinking of the *Titanic* to Kraus functioned as a proof of his theory that, regardless of humanity’s and, specifically, America’s attempts to control nature with technology, nature simply will always establish itself as the more powerful force.

As they had praised the American economic character, the Austrian economists hailed the economic efficiency of American technological prowess. Through technological means, America was able to enter unknown territories of economic strength and growth. The non-economic thinkers also noticed a trend of American technology to expand what pursuits human beings had

⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 14.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

“But the ice fields of the spirit began to grow and advanced farther and farther down and expanded until they covered the entire earth. We died, we who thought.”

¹⁰⁰ Karl Kraus, “Großer Sieg der Technik: Silbernes Besteck für zehn-tausend Menschen,” *Die Fackel*, 27 April 1912, vol. 347, p. 6, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

“...betrayed God to the machine.”

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

previously been capable of. Aside from Stefan Zweig, however, none of these writers interpreted this expansion as truly beneficial to mankind spiritually. Once again, then, we see somewhat of a divide between those who viewed the effects of the American way of life from an economic standpoint and those who interpreted them from a more spiritual perspective.

III. Social Criticism

Austrian writers and thinkers made numerous attempts to interpret the social state of America in the early part of the twentieth century. While the economists are conspicuously absent from such social critiques, the critiques the rest of the thinkers made were overwhelmingly negative. Their critiques can be subdivided into the subjects of race relations, sexuality, religion, violence, and equality.

i. Race Relations

In the first decade of the twentieth century, two Austrian thinkers, Otto Weininger and Karl Kraus, attempted to explain the obvious racial divide within American society. The former would attribute the racial tensions in America to the nature of African-Americans; the latter would place the blame squarely on the unreasonable fears of the white American populace.

In his opus *Sex and Character*, first appearing in 1903, philosopher Otto Weininger interpreted the issue of race in America from his generally racist, misogynistic, and anti-Semitic perspective. In Weininger's thought, during the American Civil war the North was morally justified to fight a war for the purpose of liberating the slaves.¹⁰² However, he still regarded this emancipation as a "reckless stroke."¹⁰³ Because the "negroes" made such a "bad and wretched use of their freedom," the white Americans had to "completely segregate themselves" from

¹⁰² Otto Weininger, *Sex and Character*, trans. Robert Willis, 2005, p. 441, <<http://www.theabsolute.net/ottow/geschlecht.pdf>>.

¹⁰³ Ibid, p. 394.

them.¹⁰⁴ To Weininger, African-Americans were morally degenerate, and there had “perhaps hardly ever been a genius among them.”¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, “it is with the emancipation of women as with the emancipation of the Jews and the negroes,” Weininger argued, in that all three groups have always been “treated as slaves” and, thus, have no “strong need for freedom as the Indo-Germans.”¹⁰⁶ In this manner, Weininger presents the contemporary racial situation in the United States as the result of the granting of freedom to a race undeserving of it. Under this interpretation, neither white nor black benefited from the emancipation of the slaves, despite that emancipation’s moral justification. Therefore, although freedom itself was a morally lofty cause in Weininger’s estimation, only white Christian males in America possessed the disposition to truly deserve it.

On the other end of the spectrum, Kraus used the platform of *Die Fackel* to denounce the ongoing mistreatment of African-Americans by whites in the southern American states. To this end, Kraus in 1910 published excerpts of an article circulating in American newspapers which aimed to depict lynching as humane punishment interspersed with his own commentary. The article reported the lynching of a certain “Negro Curl” [*Neger Curl*] who was being lynched ostensibly for having written an offensive letter to a white woman.¹⁰⁷ Shortly thereafter, Kraus wrote, “*wurden tausend Neger gelyncht und der Grund, hieß es, war ein Sieg im Boxen, den ein Neger über einen Weißen errungen hatte.*”¹⁰⁸ Kraus mocked what the author of the original article had presented as a moment of true kindness, wherein he had physically supported “Negro

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 441.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, p. 394.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, p. 441.

Note: The term “*die Indogermanen*” can also be understood as “Indo-Europeans.”

¹⁰⁷ Karl Kraus, “Vom Lynchen und vom Boxen,” *Die Fackel*, 20 July 1910, vol. 305, p. 41, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

“...a thousand Negroes were lynched, and the reason, it was said, was a boxing victory which a Negro scored over a white man.”

Curl” when Curl’s legs were trembling too much to support him. Lynching, to Kraus, was no “act of Christian charity” [*Akt christlicher Nächstenliebe*], but rather an act merely inspired by the sexual insecurities of the southern American white male. For this reason, bankers, lawyers, farmers, shopkeepers, and all of the socially “distinguished men” [*vornehmen Menschen*] participate in the lynching, “*und werden dann sagen, daß sie doch besser boxen können.*”¹⁰⁹ To Kraus, the “*Neger der weiblichen Phantasie*” would always haunt the very group Weininger had singled out for their strong and powerful dispositions.¹¹⁰

While to Weininger the problems of racial integration were rooted in the fundamental nature of oppressed minority, Kraus claimed that the fault rested solely within the extreme psychological fears of the oppressive majority.

ii. Sexuality

Sigmund Freud and Karl Kraus both observed fundamental differences between American and European sexuality. The discourse among these writers generally involved interpretations of a perceived American “prudishness.”

According to Freud, America was a country of the sexually repressed. Recalling his lone visit to the United States, Freud wrote of his complete surprise that even in “prudish America,” sexuality could be discussed “freely and scientifically,” at least in academic circles.¹¹¹ Later in his writings, Freud called a life lived without any fear of death “as shallow and empty as...an American flirtation.”¹¹² Both parties understand “from the first that nothing is to happen.”¹¹³ He contrasts such an “American flirtation” with a “Continental love-affair, in which both partners

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

“...and will then say that they, in fact, can box better.”

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

“...Negro of the female fantasy...”

¹¹¹ Freud, *Complete Works*, “On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement,” p. 2897.

¹¹² Freud, *Complete Works*, “*Thoughts for the Times on War and Death*,” p. 3082.

¹¹³ Ibid.

must constantly bear its serious consequences in mind.”¹¹⁴ Americans merely flirt and go no further; Europeans make love. As Freud told a frequent American visitor Joseph Wortis, he attributed this prudishness to the “rule of women,” an “anticultural phenomenon” which existed uniquely in America.¹¹⁵ This female domination forced American men to “step into marriage without the least experience for so complicated a business,”¹¹⁶ explaining the United States’ high divorce rate. The position of women in American society thus created a nationwide sexual repression, Freud determined, which adversely affected the social state of the entire country.

Kraus, on the other hand, had a much different interpretation of America’s more conservative sexual nature. In a 1906 volume of *Die Fackel*, Kraus wrote regarding the differences between American and Austrian approaches to courtship. To Kraus, what was perceived as American “prudery” [*“Prüderie”*] was merely the preservation of the woman’s “sexual right” [*“sexuellen Anspruch”*] by protecting her from sexual advances.¹¹⁷ This situation contrasts with that which existed in Austria, where men “*dürfen Frauen anpöbeln, die von ihnen nicht beglückt sein wollten.*”¹¹⁸ One only had to experience the “penetration of the glazed eyes” [*“Zudringlichkeit verglasten Blicke”*] a few times to realize that this so-called “prudery” was more civilized than constant harassment from the central European man, which Kraus felt amounted to the “outlawing of the erotic woman” [*“Verfehlung sinnlicher Frauen”*].¹¹⁹ Kraus argued that the European idea of an American aversion to open sexual advances was merely a chauvinistic misinterpretation of women who were actually repelling assaults on their sexual self-determination. The respect which both American men and women had for the American

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Freud, qtd. in Joseph Wortis, *Fragments of an Analysis with Freud*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954, p. 98.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Karl Kraus, “Antworten des Herausgebers,” *Die Fackel*, 11 Dec. 1906, vol. 213, p. 22, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

“...are allowed to harass women, who do not want to be pleased by them.”

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

woman was, according to Kraus, misconstrued by Europeans as sexual conservatism.

Remarkably, Kraus' interpretation of American sexuality is the only unequivocally positive analysis which any of the authors of this study accorded to any particular aspect of American society.

While Freud understood the power of the American woman to be a social detriment, Kraus believed it to be a beneficial innovation of American sexual relations. What was prudishness in Freud's perspective was something akin to empowerment in the eyes of Kraus.

iii. Religion

Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Austrian thinkers had a wide range of different interpretations of American religion and religious freedom. While Freud saw America as a country of religious fanatics, Theodor Herzl, the father of political Zionism, bemoaned that anti-Semitism had also arisen on the other side of the Atlantic. While the Austrians recognized that religion was a defining characteristic of American society, they also made the important distinction that not all religions in America were granted equal freedoms.

According to Freud, religious fervor was a defining characteristic of American society. In 1927 he wrote that the claim of "pious America" to being "God's own Country" "is undoubtedly valid."¹²⁰ Freud argued that, while "the scientific spirit in the higher strata of human society" had everywhere increased and had proven itself the antithesis to religious matters, most nations of the European Christian tradition had accomplished the "inevitable transition" from religious to science by mere "half-way measures and insincerities."¹²¹ The Americans alone, however, by instituting the Scopes Monkey Trial at Dayton (1925), had "shown themselves consistent;"¹²² only in the United States had religious doctrines not gone down without a fight. To Freud, the

¹²⁰ Freud, *Complete Works*, "The Future of an Illusion," p. 4431.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4447.

¹²² *Ibid.*

religious fervor of American society proved his opinion that “the effect of religious consolations may be likened to that of a narcotic.”¹²³ Americans, he wrote, “are now trying...to deprive people of all stimulants, intoxicants, and other pleasure-producing substances, and instead, by way of compensation, are surfeiting them with piety.”¹²⁴ Interestingly, Freud attributed this replacement of physical stimuli with religion to the same *Frauenherrschaft* (“rule of women”) ¹²⁵ which had destroyed American marriage.

The following year, 1928, Freud published a letter from an American physician and his commentary thereon in the essay “A Religious Experience.” The American had seen within the face of a cadaver a reason to question the existence of God, but in the days since God had proven his existence “by many infallible proofs” to the young doctor.¹²⁶ In Freud’s analysis, the American had merely been reminded of his mother in the cadaver, and his oedipal response invoked within him a “desire to destroy his father,” represented by God. After a “hallucinatory psychosis” involving inner voices, the “fate of the Oedipus complex” had almost preordained that the American ultimately succumb to the “submission to the will of God the Father.”¹²⁷ In this manner, an American served Freud as a quintessential example of religious epiphany and conversion.

While Freud observed the breadth of the scope of religious belief in America, Zionist leader Theodor Herzl was more inclined to discuss its boundaries. In an address given to the Conference of American Zionists in 1898, Herzl considered it “incredible” that “even in free America,” the “old hatred” of anti-Semitism had “raised its head.”¹²⁸ Therefore, Jewish

¹²³ Ibid, p. 4456.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Translated in this edition as “petticoat government,” although it is the same word quoted above by Wortis.

¹²⁶ Freud, *Complete Works*, “A Religious Experience,” p. 4548.

¹²⁷ Ibid, p. 4550.

¹²⁸ Theodor Herzl, *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*, trans. Harry Zohn, vol. I: Jan. 1896-June 1898, “To the Conference of American Zionists,” New York: Herzl, 1973, p. 228.

immigrants could not escape anti-Semitism merely by crossing the ocean. In Herzl's eyes, "every luckless Jewish proletarian who sets foot on the soil of the New World brings over a bit of anti-Semitism in the wretched tatters of his beggar's garb."¹²⁹ The Jews needed their own state they could escape to for safety, because not even the institutionalized religious freedom of America could protect the Jew from the European demons from which he ran.

As Freud noted the growth of American piety, Herzl observed the limit of American religious freedom. A religious country, therefore, did not guarantee a religiously tolerant country.

iv. Violence

In artist Alfred Kubin's fiction work *The Other Side*, the American antagonist Hercules Bell's entrance into the spiritually deep Dream Realm signals the beginning of the Dream land's destruction. This American's personality contains a violent characteristic which is unique among the inhabitants of the Dream land.

Kubin shows the violent disposition of the American character immediately from Bell's arrival. Once Bell enters the capital city of Pearl, one of his first actions is to put a gun to the side of a newspaper editor's head in order to coerce the editor into printing his proclamation declaring the changes he intends for the realm.¹³⁰ The American's personality has an immediate effect on the Dream Realm's inhabitants. "Incredibly bloody knife-fights in the taverns" characterize the "riotous living" of the Dreamlanders which the injection of an American personality into the naïve social structure of the Dream Realm had brought on.¹³¹ Kubin thus shows American violence as a contagion. In the last days of the Dream country, Bell discovers that the bank in Pearl never had any deposit boxes, and he immediately finds himself surrounded by an incensed

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Kubin, *The Other Side*, p. 152.

¹³¹ Ibid, p. 156.

mob, former supporters who had turned against him after realizing he thus could not pay them.¹³² Bell immediately kills the first would-be assassin with his club, and then “coolly” backs into a corner and pulls out two Browning pistols. The American is the only person who has brought guns with him to the Dream Realm. After calmly asking, “Which of you wants to be the first sixteen?” he fires his handguns, “leaving a wall of corpses” piled around him. He has a “satanic look” on his face.¹³³ The use of firearms is perhaps not an uncommon occurrence for the American. Although Dreamlanders prove themselves capable of violence, the origin of this violence and the most brutal purveyor of it is unquestionably the American capitalist.

In this manner Kubin depicts violence as a fundamental aspect of the selfish, profit-obsessed, superficial personality, a personality unique to Americans. However, just like all the other negative aspects of the American personality, violence too could infect even those with more profound spiritual and artistic concerns.

v. Equality

To Sigmund Freud, there existed a pervasive equality within American society. Much like Tocqueville, Freud believed that equality held hidden dangers within itself which created “imperfections”¹³⁴ within the civilizations that idealistically clung to it; unlike Tocqueville, Freud did not bring up any possible ideals, like liberty, which could temper these debilitating effects.

In Freud’s eyes, equality presented a larger danger to civilization than the restriction of instinct, because at least people could prepare for the latter. In the United States, according to Freud, there was an excess of both. Freud expounded upon these views in a brief remark in *Civilization and Its Discontents*, published in 1930. Within civilizations where equality is a

¹³² Ibid, p. 199.

¹³³ Ibid, p. 200.

¹³⁴ Freud, *Complete Works*, “Civilization and Its Discontents,” p. 4507.

dominant ideal, eventually society is only bound together by the fact that everyone is equal to each other; everyone can identify with everyone else only because they live under equal conditions. Under such a state, “individuals of the leader type do not acquire the importance that should fall to them in the formation of a group.”¹³⁵ Freud named such a condition of society the “psychological poverty of groups.” According to Freud, the “present cultural state of America” provided a perfect case study of the negative effects “to be feared” from such a social phenomenon.¹³⁶ This concept of the “psychological poverty of groups” possesses clear similarities with the concept of “individualism” as feared by Tocqueville. Tocqueville too believed that equality could lead to a social state wherein people have no ties to each other outside of their equal conditions.¹³⁷ Even the wealthiest and most powerful people are “neither rich nor powerful enough to have much hold over others,” yet they have enough wealth to look after themselves.¹³⁸ Thus these people withdraw from society, isolating themselves under the impression that “their whole destiny is in their own hands.”¹³⁹ Though the period between their observations spanned almost a century, Freud and Tocqueville both perceived within American equality dangers to society at large.

Freud thus expressed a general contempt for the equality of conditions, and recognized this equality as most advanced in American society. In Freud’s interpretation, even great individuals who by nature should hold positions of power and leadership could not rise above the generally base level of the simple masses.

Fin de siècle Austrian thinkers made a number of judgments regarding the social condition of the United States, almost all of which were negative. Depending on the

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, p. 507.

¹³⁸ Ibid, p. 508.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

interpretation, the North had been too kind to blacks by granting them freedom while the Jim Crow-era South was excessively cruel. It was a country of sexual prudes addicted to religious piety. The American pragmatic disposition reinforced by American capitalism created a uniquely American brand of violence. The nation was held back from advancement by its own insistence upon equality. Although each of these interpretations – except for Weininger’s, of course – held some merit, each critique of American society can be understood not only as a criticism of the United States, but as a lesson for European society as well. Later in this study, we shall see that Austrians predicted American culture to conquer the globe and create a uniformly monotonous Americanized culture. It is precisely the perceived troubles and ills omnipresent within American society which make the prospect of that global Americanization so terrifying to the Austrian thinker.

IV. Immigration Destination

At the turn of the century, the United States was increasingly becoming the destination for millions of European migrants. This function of America as a destination for European emigration was not lost on Austrian observers.

In 1900, Viennese author and dramatist Arthur Schnitzler referred to America’s role a receptacle of Europe’s emigrants in two separate works of fiction. In doing so, he showcased the range of rationales which drove Europeans across the Atlantic. In the short story “Leutnant Gustl” (“Lieutenant Gustl”), a baker insults the young officer Gustl after an opera performance. Gustl, unable to seek retribution through the traditional duel because of the difference in social standing between artisan and army officer, resolves to commit suicide the next morning. As he walks through Vienna that night, his stream-of-consciousness thought wanders to America “where no one

knows me.”¹⁴⁰ America offers Gustl, and presumably millions of other migrants, the chance to start life over again from scratch. Gustl ends up rejecting the notion only because he feels “much too stupid to make a new start” and because he knows that in his heart he cannot forget the insult leveled against him, even should he “live to be a hundred.”¹⁴¹ In America, one can hide from everyone but oneself. In the novel *Bertha Garlan*, published the same year as “Leutnant Gustl,” Schnitzler described the title character as “almost out of touch with her relations.”¹⁴² She had no contact with one of her brothers because he “had gone to America to seek his fortune as merchant.”¹⁴³ Here Schnitzler presented a second motivation for embarking for the United States: the economic opportunity for which, as previously discussed, America was quite renowned. Thus Schnitzler depicted American immigration as only for the brave and independent, those who felt confident beginning anew and cutting ties with family and friends.

Economist Friedrich von Wieser attested to the economic benefits which immigration bestowed upon the United States in his 1914 work *Social Economics*. Wieser described “United States of America and a number of other colonial settlements” as “the termini of the great migratory highways by which the surplus population of Europe seeks new homes.”¹⁴⁴ Wieser naturally attributed this migration to economic conditions, as higher wages created by “the demand of American entrepreneurs” lured European workers to the New World.¹⁴⁵ Yet the population increase which resulted from this immigration provided a valuable economic benefit. “The uninterrupted influx of immigration” increased demand, Wieser’s argument ran, and to

¹⁴⁰ Arthur Schnitzler, “Leutnant Gustl,” *Five Great German Short Stories*, trans. and ed. Stanley Appelbaum, New York: Dover Publications, 1993, p. 139.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 141-3.

¹⁴² Arthur Schnitzler, *Bertha Garlan*, produced by Charles Aldarondo, Mary Meehan, and the Project Gutenberg Online Distributed Proofreading Team, 2006, <<http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/9955/pg9955.html>>.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁴ Wieser, *Social Economics*, p. 441.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 455.

satisfy this demand new plants and factories were constantly being built.¹⁴⁶ The reader may recall from an earlier discussion that, for Wieser, this constant improvement of economic infrastructure constituted the first step in the development of the distinctly American production unit of the trust, which Wieser argued formed the most economically “effective” labor organization model possible.¹⁴⁷ This chain of events, then, amounted to an interesting cycle in which immigrants came to America for economic prosperity, the basis of which was population growth ignited by the influx of the immigrants before them.

Author Stefan Zweig, in his autobiography *The World of Yesterday*, conducted the experimental job search described earlier in this study from the perspective of an immigrant. Upon his arrival in New York, he pretended he was “a jobless emigrant with [his] last seven dollars in [his] pocket.”¹⁴⁸ Bearing in mind the volume of people coming to the United States in even more dire circumstances needing employment, Zweig imagined that, like an immigrant, he was “forced to earn [his] own living after three days.” He found no less than five jobs well within that timeframe.¹⁴⁹ To Zweig as well, then, immigration seemed intricately bound with economic opportunity.

Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, however, was displeased with the American reaction to this sudden influx of immigrants and turned this displeasure into an argument in support of his Zionist goals. Herzl presented the flight from anti-Semitism as another reason for European migration to America, yet he bemoaned that this prejudice could not even be escaped across an ocean.¹⁵⁰ Furthermore, in testimony given before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1902, Herzl signified the he was “not at all in favor of these restrictive laws” which had been

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 227.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 228.

¹⁴⁸ Zweig, *The World of Yesterday*, p. 148.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 149.

¹⁵⁰ Theodor Herzl, *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*, vol. I, p. 228.

passed in the United States regarding immigration.¹⁵¹ Herzl found it “astonishing” that a “country which has been made by immigration” would try to deter the very source which built it.¹⁵² These restrictive measures, coupled with the anti-Semitism which he felt had crept into American society, indicated to Herzl that the waves of Jewish immigration which had given New York “the greatest Jewish population of all towns in the world”¹⁵³ were “probably unwanted.”¹⁵⁴ To this end, the “Zionist solution,” the creation of a Jewish state, would serve to divert some of this “unwanted wave of immigration” and ease the burden America felt as the primary destination of European migrants.¹⁵⁵ To Herzl, if the American government wanted to restrict immigration, rather than “placing obstacles upon the road to America,” it should “help to make the road to Zion easier.”¹⁵⁶ Herzl thus saw within the surging numbers of immigrants to America a means by which to build support for the establishment of a Jewish state.

Austrian writers at the turn of the twentieth century, therefore, expressed a range of possible incentives for immigration to the United States. Yet each one of these motives – be it economic, religious, or personal – contained at its core the simple desire of the emigrant to improve his or her life *vis-à-vis* that which would have to be endured by staying in Europe.

V. Global Influence

The Austrian thinkers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reflected in their writings the growing political and economic influence which the United States was gaining in global affairs. From 1896 to 1941, these writings track the rise of America in the Austrian mindset from a somewhat influential voice in international politics to the most dominant power

¹⁵¹ Theodor Herzl, *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*, trans. Harry Zohn, vol. II: Aug. 1898-May 1904, “The Tragedy of Jewish Immigration,” New York: Herzl, 1973, p. 214.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 215.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

¹⁵⁴ Theodor Herzl, *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*, vol. II, “Zionism,” p. 118.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

in the international community.

In the last years of the nineteenth century, Zionist leader Theodor Herzl attested to influence which the United States first garnered on the global political scene. In an address delivered in November of 1896, Herzl described the impatience with which Europeans had awaited the outcome of the American presidential election held four days prior. “So much depends on it,” Herzl told his audience, “the most terrible crisis could break out, and you know Europe watched the outcome of the election with some trepidation.”¹⁵⁷ Just two years later, at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, Herzl remarked that Europe looked “with even great suspense than usual to the young political giant across the sea.”¹⁵⁸ By 1899, Herzl could declare that “the voice of America is heard in Europe and in the Orient as well.”¹⁵⁹ America’s position in international affairs had grown in just thirteen years from a country observed when its policies might affect Europe itself (i.e., William Jennings Bryan’s free silver campaign of 1896) to one whose voice held legitimate sway everywhere within the global community.

After World War I, Sigmund Freud as well noticed this trend of the United States’ increasing international influence. In *Thomas Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study*, Freud and his co-author, American William C. Bullitt, remarked upon the unprecedented international political power which the relatively costless victory had granted the Americans. After three years of constant fighting, by 1917 the Allies had grown completely “dependent on the United States for munitions and financial assistance.”¹⁶⁰ At the peace conference in Paris, “the physical assistance of the United States was vital to the Allies,” and Britain and France “had the greatest

¹⁵⁷ Herzl, *Zionist Writings*, vol. I, “Judaism,” p. 49.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 227.

¹⁵⁹ Herzl, *Zionist Writings*, vol. II, “Zionism,” p. 118.

¹⁶⁰ Sigmund Freud, and William C. Bullitt. *Thomas Woodrow Wilson, a Psychological Study*. Cambridge: Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967, p. 189.

respect” for President Wilson “as wielder of the physical strength of America.”¹⁶¹ In fact, the president, as the American head of state, had so much influence and importance during the peace negotiations that Freud went so far as to say that, at that time, “the fate of the world hung on his personal character.”¹⁶² The United States was now so powerful that “the future course of world events” came down to the actions of the American president.¹⁶³ The voice of America no longer merely held sway, but the very future of the world.

American power in the global community would only increase during the interwar years. Economist Joseph Schumpeter recalled that during this period, European “economic developments were to a great extent contingent upon the indefinite continuance of American lending.”¹⁶⁴ America itself had spent the years immediately after the First World War in general economic prosperity and followed a largely isolationist foreign policy, creating a stable social and political situation.¹⁶⁵ In 1941 Schumpeter discussed the “privileged position” of the United States. America “economically has substantially all it needs.”¹⁶⁶ The United States “cannot be attacked.”¹⁶⁷ To Schumpeter, these factors gave America a “natural weight” in global politics. Thus the development of American influence in global affairs from a mere point of interest to the most powerful country in the world had completed itself in less than fifty years.

As a result of this expanding American power and influence, the Austrians predicted a future world that was entirely Americanized. Austrian thinkers prophesied that this impending Americanization would monotonize economics, ethics, and culture on a global scale.

One of the earliest Austrian predictions of imminent Americanization was a 1902 article

¹⁶¹ Ibid, p. 199.

¹⁶² Ibid, p. 236.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, “The Lowell Lectures,” p. 346.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 394.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 394.

in Karl Kraus' newspaper *Die Fackel* by the architect Adolf Loos, quoted and discussed earlier in the study. Loos warned Europe of the dangers to which transatlantic radio transmission opened the continent up. America would come to Europe, rather than the other way around.¹⁶⁸ The American capitalist had advanced his ability to turn a profit beyond any skills the European capitalist possessed, and did so without scruples to hold him back. With the invention of wireless transatlantic transmissions, Europe had essentially invited the American entrepreneur across the ocean and opened up a new market for him. Europe would be left with two choices: either Europeans would adopt the American business spirit or be overrun by the American capitalists who crossed the Atlantic with greater business acumen and less business ethics. To Loos, Europe faced the unsavory option either to Americanize or to be Americanized.

To author Stefan Zweig, the individual cultures of every society on the planet were being Americanized into a single monotonous force. Zweig perceived a pervading "uniformity" in dance, fashion, cinema, and radio.¹⁶⁹ In his view, "America is the source of that terrible wave of uniformity."¹⁷⁰ The "countless different rhythms" that denoted location and style throughout the world had been reduced to "the same short-winded, impersonal melodies."¹⁷¹ If New York declared short hair the fashion for women, then women everywhere would cut their hair "as if...by the same scythe."¹⁷² Within this uniformity, Zweig foresaw the "complete end of individuality."¹⁷³ While Europe remained "the last bulwark of individualism," America would play the Rome to Europe's Greece and wipe it "from the table of time."¹⁷⁴ Culture offers

¹⁶⁸ Adolf Loos, "Der technische Impresario," *Die Fackel*, vol. 93, p. 13

¹⁶⁹ Stefan Zweig, "The Monotonization of the World," *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*, ed. Anton Kaes, et. al., 1994, p. 397-8.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 399.

¹⁷¹ Ibid, p. 397.

¹⁷² Ibid, p. 398.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 399.

“amusement without demanding exertion,” “cinema delights the illiterate.”¹⁷⁵ “Against such comfort,” wrote Zweig, “even the gods would fight in vain.”¹⁷⁶ This Americanization is inevitable because the mass of humanity prefers boring, monotonous, herdlike living. To Zweig, the Americanization of culture constituted the second phase, after the First World War, of mankind’s “rush into servitude.”¹⁷⁷ America had destroyed culture for the amusement of the simple masses, and it had destroyed human individuality in the process.

According to economist Joseph Schumpeter, the United States was actively Americanizing the world’s ethics. Schumpeter did not see this “ethical imperialism” until right before World War II. In 1918 he even argued that “among all countries the United States is likely to exhibit the weakest imperialist trend.”¹⁷⁸ He cited arms limitations treaties concluded with twenty-two states and the continued independence of the all-but-defenseless Mexico and Canada on its borders as proof of this anti-imperialist mindset.¹⁷⁹ Yet by 1941, Schumpeter had recognized a less obvious form of imperialism which America was perpetrating: that of “ethical imperialism.” To Schumpeter, ethical imperialism was “an imperialism whose ethos it is to put the world into order according to American ideas.”¹⁸⁰ In Schumpeter’s interpretation, “the ethical imperialism of America and the national imperialism of Germany are only different ideological forms for the same thing.”¹⁸¹ To Schumpeter, American foreign policy was not built around expanding political boundaries, but around spreading American ethical values to the farthest corners of the globe. Thus the economist argued that the ultimate goal of the United States on the international stage was the Americanization of international ethics.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid, p. 399-400.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, “The Sociology of Imperialisms,” p. 194.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, “The Lowell Lectures,” p. 394.

¹⁸¹ Ibid, p. 387.

Thus, with the escalation in American power in the first decades of the twentieth century, Austrians escalated their concerns for a worldwide Americanization. Beginning with fears for their economic well-being, Austrians then began to fear for the preservation of their unique culture; finally, they deemed their very ethical values under American assault. As American influence increased, so did the societal realms which Austrians considered to have been infiltrated by that influence. The Austrians also feared American conquest of the economic, cultural, and ethical spheres because of the generally low regard in which they held the economic character of the pragmatic, profiteering American and the state of American society. If America spiritually conquered Austria, the Austrians could look across the ocean and predict what to expect for their future; gazing across the Atlantic into the future, they did not like what they saw.

Another result of the growth of American influence in international politics was an Austrian fascination with the character of President Woodrow Wilson. Both Karl Kraus and Sigmund Freud attributed Wilson's actions in Paris in 1918 as endemic to his religious convictions. To Freud, Wilson's psyche identified him with Jesus Christ; to Kraus, Wilson saw himself as Moses the Lawgiver.

Karl Kraus interpreted President Wilson's conditions for peace as the noble principles of an idealistic statesman. He thus tried to convince the Viennese to maintain an open mind towards the peace negotiations. Kraus believed that "*wir müssen versuchen, in Wilson uns hineinzudenken.*"¹⁸² To this end, he pointed out Wilson's "Puritan qualities" [*"puritanische Eigenschaften"*]. With this in mind, Kraus remarked:

Wir müssen uns vorstellen, daß Wilson aus seinem innersten Gefühle sich für
berufen hält, den demokratischen Gedanken zur Regierungsform der

¹⁸² Karl Kraus, "Österreichs Fürsprech bei Wilson," *Die Fackel*, 20 Nov. 1918, vol. 499, p. 16, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

"We have to try to understand Wilson."

Weltgemeinschaft zu erheben, und daß er für diese Politik, die sich bei ihm bis zum Glaubenssatze steigert, genau so einen Feldzug unternimmt, wie Gustav Adolf über die Ostsee nach Deutschland gekommen ist, um für die protestantische Religion im dreißigjährigen Kriege zu kämpfen.¹⁸³

Kraus interpreted Wilson's Fourteen Points to be the American president's "new law tables" [*neuen Gesetzestafeln*] for the "democratic age" [*demokratische Zeitalter*].¹⁸⁴ Writing before the events of the Versailles peace conference had transpired, Kraus recognized the dangers of a peace developed by France and Britain, and thus optimistically argued that the American president should have the upper hand in the negotiations. He posited that the president immensely desired to experience the "high feeling of a success" [*Hochgefühl eines Erfolges*].¹⁸⁵ Wilson could easily approach the negotiations from a position of strength, because "*ohne seine Truppen, seine Lieferungen, sein Geld und seine Nahrungsmittel wäre [die Entente] jetzt in starker Bedrängnis.*"¹⁸⁶ Thus Kraus approached the Versailles conference with a wary optimism, relying on a strong presence from an idealistic Woodrow Wilson.

In *Thomas Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study*, Freud showed why, psychologically, the conference envisioned by Kraus never materialized. After the Treaty of Versailles devised the boundaries of Central and Eastern Europe's nation-states, Freud likened Wilson to "the benefactor who wishes to restore the eyesight of a patient but does not know the construction of

¹⁸³ Ibid.

"We have to imagine that Wilson considered himself summoned from his innermost feelings to elevate democratic thought to the form of government of the global community, and that for this policy which he raised to a dogma, he took up a campaign like Gustavus Adolphus come over the Baltic into Germany to fight for the Protestant religion in the Thirty Years' War."

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

"...without his troops, his shipments, his money, and his foodstuffs, [the Entente] would still be in severe distress."

the eye and has neglected to learn the necessary methods of operation.”¹⁸⁷ Wilson did not know of the three million Germans in Bohemia, nor was he aware that German-Austrians populated South Tyrol, which he gave to Italy.¹⁸⁸ Wilson had almost no knowledge of European geopolitics, and made remarkably little effort to change that circumstance.

Freud interpreted Wilson’s actions as those of a man with an “unconscious identification with Christ.”¹⁸⁹ In his own unconscious mind, Wilson was “the Son of God going forth to war to give the whole world perfect peace.”¹⁹⁰ Wilson “went to Paris as the delegate of God,”¹⁹¹ and the Covenant of the League of Nations would “lead the world to lasting peace and himself to immortality.”¹⁹² Yet time and time again during the peace conference, Wilson refused to fight for causes he truly believed in. His mental life began to “divorce from reality.”¹⁹³ He eventually persuaded himself that “by compromise he might achieve all...he might achieve by fighting.”¹⁹⁴ He first convinced himself that the mere presence of the League of Nations would alter in the future any unjust provisions of the final treaty.¹⁹⁵ Next he convinced himself that compromises were necessary to uphold the principle of international cooperation, even those that “would make international cooperation impossible.”¹⁹⁶ Finally he persuaded himself that Bolshevism was such a great threat to Europe that it required he compromise rather than withdraw from an unjust peace.¹⁹⁷ Through these rationalizations, Wilson was able “both to surrender and to remain in his

¹⁸⁷ Freud and Bullitt, *Thomas Woodrow Wilson*, p. xii.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid, p. 154.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid, p. 184.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid, p. 201.

¹⁹¹ Ibid, p. 204.

¹⁹² Ibid, p. 210.

¹⁹³ Ibid, p. 240.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid, p. 261.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid, p. 262.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid.

own belief the Saviour of the World.”¹⁹⁸ In this manner, according to Freud, Wilson’s identification with Christ and his ability to suppress fact for his own conception of reality allowed the very man who charged himself with designing an everlasting peace to have a hand in one of the most lopsided, humiliating, and untenable peace treaties in modern history.

The similarities between the Mosaic Wilson presented by Kraus and the Messianic Wilson depicted by Freud are remarkable, especially considering Kraus’ distaste for psychoanalysis.¹⁹⁹ In both cases, he is presented as a religious figure seeking to revolutionize the international system. However, Kraus was still writing with the hope that the peace conference could bring about a just and lasting peace; Freud, with the advantage of having written later, already knew otherwise. Yet the attention on the American president and the general consensus that, in Paris in 1918, Woodrow Wilson was the most important man in the world manifests the full extent to which the United States had become one of the most influential powers in global politics in the mere twenty years since the outbreak of the Spanish-American War.

Behind the Austrian concern for Americanization and examination of President Wilson’s character lurked a fear of what the United States as an imperial force was capable of. The Austrian interpretation of globalization as an American-led worldwide monotonization evinced their fears that the almost universally negative characteristics they associated with the American social situation would work their way across the ocean. In their analyses of Wilson, the Austrians feared too much power, or lack thereof, in the hands of a single man. President Wilson presented Central Europeans with the hope that they might escape out of the First World War without a soul-crushing peace treaty. His personal weaknesses prevented any such peace from forming,

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, p. 261.

¹⁹⁹ For instance, Kraus wrote: “*Psychoanalyse ist jene Geisteskrankheit, für deren Therapie sie sich hält*,” which translates to “Psychoanalysis is the very mental illness for which it purports to be the therapy.” Karl Kraus, “Nachts,” *Die Fackel*, 30 May 1913, vol. 376, p. 21, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

and the fate of Central Europe could not be saved from the revenge of Clemenceau.

VI. Institutions

Conspicuously absent from most of the *fin de siècle* Austrian writers' interpretations of the America and Americans is any detailed discussion of the political institutions of the United States. A discussion of the handful of instances where these authors ventured so far so as to refer to an American institution follows.

The economist Ludwig von Mises fervently expressed his admiration for the American Constitution in an essay written in 1952 entitled "Economics Teaching at the Universities." A certain Dr. Paul M. Sweezy from Harvard University had published an introductory textbook on socialism, and had equated the Soviet and American constitutions as statements of ideals which are not always met.²⁰⁰ Mises jumped at the chance to draw the differences. Unlike the Soviet Constitution, the American Constitution was "not merely an ideal but the valid law of the country."²⁰¹ Specifically, vital to the American system of government was the independence of the judiciary, which prevented the Constitution from "becoming a dead letter."²⁰² The American's right to invoke habeas corpus separated him from "the millions languishing in the Soviet prisons."²⁰³ Furthermore, Dr. Sweezy himself had "the right – precisely because the American Bill of Rights is not merely an ideal, but an enforced law – to transform every fact into its opposite."²⁰⁴ Not only did Mises display an impassioned support for the political institution of the United States Constitution, but each rationale for that support was an aspect political rather than economic freedom. This polemic was perhaps the most passionate reference to an American political institution an Austrian made during the time period this study covers.

²⁰⁰ Mises, *Planning for Freedom*, p. 164.

²⁰¹ Ibid, p. 164-5.

²⁰² Ibid, p. 165.

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

Economist Joseph Schumpeter also made reference to the American Constitution, yet he did so without the ardent support evinced by Mises. To Schumpeter, both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution embraced the “general principles of classical democracy” which had been important aspects of American political culture from the colonial era. America had institutionalized the doctrine of inalienable rights and hostility towards aristocracy. The “prodigious development” of the United States immediately after the Constitution’s ratification “seemed to verify the doctrine embalmed in the sacred documents of the nation.”²⁰⁵ Schumpeter respected the flexibility of the Constitution. Over the last two hundred years, he claimed, it had been continually reinterpreted, though never rewritten. The United States might yet become a totalitarian state, but Schumpeter even under this circumstance felt that the Constitution would not be rewritten, “only the whole thing will be completely different.”²⁰⁶ Thus Schumpeter was more impressed by the Constitution’s longevity as a legitimate governing document than by the any political freedoms the document actually granted.

Other institutions Schumpeter briefly addressed were the American bureaucracy and Congress. Regarding American bureaucracy, Schumpeter contended that it was “more powerful than any European one” because it had “been particularly successful in impressing the values and attitudes of the public servant upon the mind of the nation.”²⁰⁷ While Schumpeter considered the American bureaucracy successful in its effort to condition the public to a standard set of values attitudes, he was less than pleased with bureaucratic waste. Both the “bureaucracy and Congress,” Schumpeter felt, “are ready enough to save pennies while squandering billions.”²⁰⁸ In this manner Schumpeter disregarded both bureaucratic and Congressional spending. To the

²⁰⁵ Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, p. 267.

²⁰⁶ Schumpeter, *Joseph A. Schumpeter*, “The Lowell Lectures,” p. 397.

²⁰⁷ Ibid, “American Institutions,” p. 443.

²⁰⁸ Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, p. 385.

economist Schumpeter, the ill-advised spending of these political institutions was representative of governmental economic mismanagement.

Sigmund Freud as well mentioned an American political institution, that of religious freedom, in passing in an essay written in 1926, “The Question of Lay Analysis.” As the title suggests, Freud attempted to answer the question of whether lay analysts should or should not be denounced. In a strikingly rare instance, Freud pointed to an aspect of American political culture as a model for his scientific movement. To handle this question, Freud appealed to the toleration and freedom accorded to adherents of the Christian Science movement in the United States. In America, people are allowed to make mistakes in order to learn from them and base their future decisions accordingly. For this reason, Freud felt it beneficial to “allow patients themselves to discover that it is damaging to them to look for mental assistance to people who have not learnt how to give it.”²⁰⁹ Therefore, Freud believed that there was no logical ground on which to forbid lay analysts, because their own mistakes will expose them and drive clients away until they become obsolete. The one aspect of American culture worth the emulation of Europe, to Freud, was, therefore, the personal freedom to make mistakes and learn from them.

In Alfred Kubin’s work of fiction *The Other Side*, the wealthy American’s arrival sparks not only economic changes in the society of the Dream Realm, but political ones as well. Kubin presented the political shuffle generated by the American in Pearl in a single, yet vivid image:

Groups and organizations started springing up like mushrooms, and they all had different aims: free elections, communism, the introduction of slavery, free love, direct contact with outside countries, stricter isolation, the abolition of border controls...The inhabitants of Pearl split up into societies, often with no more than three members, based on a wide variety of political, commercial and intellectual

²⁰⁹ Freud, *Complete Works*, “The Question of Lay Analysis,” p. 4377.

points of view.²¹⁰

Here Kubin showed again how the Dream Realm, a land for people with dispositions diametrically opposed to that of the American, becomes infected by aspects of American society merely because of the presence of an American. This scene also echoes the observations Tocqueville made in the United States regarding the American affinity for association:

Americans of all ages, all stations in life, and all types of disposition are forever forming associations...of a thousand different types – religious, moral, serious, futile, very general and very limited, immensely large and very minute. Americans combine to give fêtes, found seminaries, build churches, distribute books, and send missionaries to the antipodes. Hospitals, prisons, and schools take shape in that way.²¹¹

The nearly spontaneous activity of these associations shows the formation of a political culture in the Dream land where previously there had been none; that it follows a distinctly American model of political organization is owed to the presence of a single charismatic American. To Kubin, then, the most conspicuous American political institution was the freedom of association and the liberal utilization thereof. That these associations cause no direct damage to the Dream Realm certainly does not amount to Tocqueville's unambiguous admiration of this liberty, yet it does, perhaps, reveal a certain degree of approval which the other effects of the American's arrival are spared.

While the Austrians did not discuss American political institutions very much or very deeply, there emerges in a majority of the cases in which they do appear a respect for America's institutionalized political freedoms. Furthermore, the Constitution is viewed favorable by those

²¹⁰ Kubin, *The Other Side*, p. 148.

²¹¹ Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, p. 513.

who mention it. The only negative critiques, actually, are Schumpeter's leveled against the bureaucracy and Congress for a perceived inefficient appropriation of funds. However, it is obvious that neither the criticisms nor the compliments which the Austrians leveled towards America in the previous sections of this study had any basis in the political institutions of the United States. Instead, when Austrian thinkers analyzed perceived problems or advantages within American culture, they generally placed the brunt of the responsibility for that circumstance on the American economic and social institutions of the time.

Conclusion

Between 1870 and 1960 numerous Austrian thinkers expressed their opinions and analyses regarding the United States, the growing economic and political force across the Atlantic. The Austrian School economists were by far the most unequivocal supporters of American economic freedom and technological progress. Yet for most of the other thinkers, the type of person this constant progress produced was not worth its economic benefits. These thinkers expressed a general contempt for American culture, and the constant threat, if not inevitability considering the United States' ever-increasing influence in world affairs, that this debauched culture would take over Europe horrified all the Austrian thinkers who did not primarily concern themselves with economic prosperity. The Austrians did not bemoan the loss of their empire so much as mourn it; they had, after all, done precious little to save it. Yet as he watched the restless American across the ocean building his empire from scratch, even the Viennese poet in his coffeehouse was roused to action to convince his fellow Austrians and Europeans of the degeneration which that American restlessness must yield. The loss of an empire did not threaten Austrian culture, but rather the encroachment of a new one.

Annotated Works Cited

Freud, Sigmund. *Freud – Complete Works*, ed. Ivan Smith, 2011, <<http://www.datafilehost.com/download-df582934.html>>.

This is a free copy of the complete works of Sigmund Freud. It specifically contains the works *Analysis Terminable and Interminable*, a review for the *Medical Review of Reviews*, *The Future of an Illusion*, *On the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, *Thoughts for the Times on War and Death*, *A Religious Experience*, and *Civilization and Its Discontents*, wherein Freud explicitly mentions America and Americans.

Freud, Sigmund, and William C. Bullitt. *Thomas Woodrow Wilson, a Psychological Study*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

In this book, Freud uses Woodrow Wilson's personal writings and the personal accounts of those close to him to attempt a psychological biography of the president. The work depicts Wilson as an almost tragic figure too psychologically weak to fight for the conditions of the peace which would prevent the relapse of Europe into war.

Hayek, F.A. *The Road to Serfdom*. University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Hayek wrote this work to warn the English and the Americans that centralized economic planning had precipitated the rise of both fascism in Germany and Stalinism in the Soviet Union. Arguing that this planning inevitably would destroy the freedoms inherent in Anglo-American ideals, Hayek aimed to discredit the political forces growing in strength in the United States and the United Kingdom.

Herzl, Theodor. *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*. trans. Harry Zohn, Vol. I: Jan. 1896-June 1898. New York: Herzl, 1973.

Herzl, Theodor. *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*. trans. Harry Zohn, Vol. II: Aug. 1898-May 1904. New York: Herzl, 1973.

In these two collections of the writings of Theodor Herzl, Herzl argues the case for the creation of a Zionist state. In his appeals to Jewish Americans and the American government, the growing strength of the American voice on the world stage is increasingly evident. He details how the creation of a Zionist state will ease the immigration burden on the United States, while also lamenting that Jews could not even escape anti-Semitism in "free America."

Kraus, Karl. "Antworten des Herausgebers," *Die Fackel*, 11 Dec. 1906, vol. 213, p. 22, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

Kraus writes in this piece that the so-called "prudery" of the Americans is, in reality, the result of the respect which American men show American women. Instead, Kraus critiques European sexuality, writing that the leers of the central European men towards every woman they see are disgusting and tantamount to harassment.

Kraus, Karl. "Die Entdeckung des Nordpols," *Die Fackel*, 16 Sept. 1909, vol. 287, p. 13, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

Kraus considers the implications of the discovery of the North Pole, and writes that its discovery was inevitable. He argues that the incessant desire of humanity to conquer nature with technology is a manifestation of exactly how powerless we are compared to nature.

Kraus, Karl. "Großer Sieg der Technik: Silbernes Besteck für zehn-tausend Menschen ," *Die Fackel*, 27 April 1912, vol. 347, p. 6, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

Kraus interprets the sinking of the Titanic as divine punishment for our increasing reliance on technology. It is thus proof of the power of nature over mankind's attempts to conquer nature.

Kraus, Karl. "Nachts," *Die Fackel*, 30 May 1913, vol. 376, p. 21, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

In this article of *Die Fackel*, Kraus writes of his distaste towards the psychoanalytic movement.

Kraus, Karl. "Österreichs Fürsprech bei Wilson," *Die Fackel*, 20 Nov. 1918, vol. 499, p. 16, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

In this article of *Die Fackel*, Kraus expresses the hope that Wilson will succeed in achieving his goals at the Paris Peace Conference in the conclusion of the First World War because, if Wilson is unsuccessful, Clemenceau and Lloyd George will make the peace a punishment rather than a remedy. He writes that Wilson sees himself as Moses.

Kraus, Karl. "Vom Lynchen und vom Boxen," *Die Fackel*, 20 July 1910, vol. 305, p. 41, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

In this piece, Kraus responds to an article published in the mainstream Viennese newspaper *Die Neue Freie Presse* as a defense of the practice of lynching in the American South. Kraus points out the terrible aspects of the practice, and he argues that lynching is the expression of feelings of sexual and athletic inadequacy of the white American Southerner towards the African-Americans.

Kubin, Alfred. *The Other Side*, trans. Mike Mitchell. Sawtry: Dedalus, 2000.

This is the only work of fiction of expressionist painter Alfred Kubin. It tells the story of a man invited to live in a Dream Realm, which aims to foster the growth of the soul rather than any materialistic desires. When a wealthy American capitalist enters the Realm, it descends into chaos before an ultimate apocalypse destroys any trace of the place.

Loos, Adolf. "Der technische Impresario," *Die Fackel*, 4 Feb. 1902, vol. 93, p. 13, <<http://corpus1.aac.ac.at/fackel/>>.

This is an article contributed to *Die Fackel* by architect Adolf Loos. Loos writes of the technological prowess of the American businessman, describing him as a profiteering juggernaut which the invention of transatlantic radio signals will bring over to Europe.

Marx, Karl. “Address of the International Workingman’s Association to Abraham Lincoln.” *Marx and Engels: Collected Works*, vol. 20: 1864-68. New York: International Publishers, 1985.

This is a letter to Abraham Lincoln written by Marx, wherein Marx interprets the American Civil War as a triumph of labor over the landed class.

Menger, Carl. *The Collected Works of Carl Menger*, vol. I, “Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre.” London: University of London, 1934.

First published in 1871, this work both established and defined the Austrian School of Economics. In regard to this study’s concern, examples of America are used which depict it as a simple agricultural society.

Mill, John Stuart. *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, vol. XXI, *Essays on Politics and Society: “State of Society in America.”* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

This work expressed an admiration for the pragmatism of American society while appreciating the economic opportunity which pervaded it.

Mises, Ludwig von. *Human Action*. Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1949.

This is Mises’ magnum opus. In it, he mentions his admiration for pre-New Deal American economic freedom, and argues that the New Deal has hindered progress. He also opines that American innovations, only possible because of capitalism, have raised standards of living.

Mises, Ludwig von. *Planning for Freedom*. South Holland, Illinois: Libertarian Press, 1952.

This is a collection of twelve essays. Like *Human Action*, it expresses Mises’ distaste for the American New Deal and defends classical liberalism and American technology as a manifestation thereof. It also includes a short but passionate defense of the American Constitution.

Schnitzler, Arthur. *Bertha Garlan*, produced by Charles Aldarondo, Mary Meehan, and the Project Gutenberg Online Distributed Proofreading Team, 2006, <<http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/9955/pg9955.html>>.

This novel is a depiction of love, lust, and female naïveté. For our study’s purpose, one of the circumstances framing the title character’s initial loneliness is the fact that her brother immigrated to America in order to seek a fortune as a merchant.

Schnitzler, Arthur. “Leutnant Gustl,” *Five Great German Short Stories*, trans. and ed. Stanley Appelbaum, New York: Dover Publications, 1993.

In this short story, Lieutenant Gustl is insulted by a baker and decides to kill himself in shame. At one point in his stream-of-conscious thoughts, Gustl considers immigrating to America, yet decides against this because he thinks himself too stupid to start anew and it cannot change his own knowledge of the incident.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. *Joseph A. Schumpeter: The Economics and Sociology of Capitalism*, ed. Richard Swedberg. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

In this collection of Schumpeter's writings, we see a depiction of America as an economically prosperous country. However, Schumpeter also details his interpretation of American foreign policy as "ethical imperialism." There is a brief discussion of American institutions, although it is no more than a short outline of a lecture that was never given because of the economist's untimely death the night before it was to be delivered.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.

In this work, published first during World War II and again with additions afterwards, Schumpeter is amazed by the economic possibilities which technology allows for, and he notes that the flexibility of the American constitution will allow the country to develop with the times, but also could open it to the threat of a distinctly American brand of totalitarianism.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*, trans. George Lawrence, ed. J.P. Mayer. New York: HarperPerennial Modern Classics, 2006.

This is the seminal work of Tocqueville, wherein he interprets the social, political, and economic forces present within American society in an attempt to understand the unstoppable movement towards equality which will inevitably grip Europe too. He emphasizes generally unforeseen dangers which equality presents to liberty, and explains the importance of liberty in tempering those dangers.

Weininger, Otto. *Sex and Character*, trans. Robert Willis, 2005, <<http://www.theabsolute.net/ottow/geschlecht.pdf>>.

This is Weininger's only major work, published just before his suicide. It details his misogynistic, racist, and anti-Semitic interpretations of society. He sees within African-Americans a disposition towards slavery.

Wieser, Friedrich von. *Social Economics*. New York: Adelphi Co., 1927.

This is one of Wieser's two major works. He establishes within it many of his economic principles, such as marginal utility. Regarding this study's concern, he explains the unique growth of American trusts and expresses his fear that bolshevism will become a force in American politics.

Wortis, Joseph. *Fragments of an Analysis with Freud*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954.

This is an autobiographical account of an American man's personal relationship with Sigmund Freud. It includes some quotes Freud makes regarding American culture which he never put into writing.

Zweig, Stefan. "The Monotonization of the World," *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*. Ed. Anton Kaes, Martin Jay, and Edward Dimendberg. Berkeley: University of California, 1994.

In this short piece, Zweig contends that the world is conforming culturally, where everywhere has the same fashions, dances, music, and art. Zweig considers America to be the source of the globalization of culture.

Zweig, Stefan. *The World of Yesterday*. New York: Viking Press, 1943.

This is Zweig's autobiography. In one chapter, Zweig comes to America and experiences firsthand the economic opportunity it offers. Before leaving the New World, he goes to the Panama Canal and is overawed by its symbolism as the very image of man's domination of nature.