

is opposed to such a clash).

What is amiss, is Esposito's treatment of the Inevitable Clash thesis, as simply the mistaken viewpoint of a colleague, Samuel P. Huntington. But, Huntington cannot be understood from his published words alone, nor can he be taken in isolation. Bernard Lewis of Princeton (who first promoted the Inevitable Clash to the American public), Huntington, and Zbigniew Brzezinski work together to promote the Clash, despite the sprinkling of words they use to cover themselves.

Brzezinski, who praised Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations*, oversaw the operation that trained and armed a global Afghansi network of itinerant fighters and terrorists who were encouraged to act in the name of Islam *and* to hate the West. They were used to provoke the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and then to push the Soviets out. It doesn't matter much what Brzezinski says about how it "just happened." By their fruits ye shall know them.

It is wrong—untrue—to cover for Brzezinski and his friends, by treating them singly as the authors of mistaken

texts. It is wrong to cover for them by referring simply to a "growing propensity among senior government officials, political commentators, and the media to see a new 'evil empire' replacing the communist threat."

When we are faced with a handful of policymakers who insist on policies that will surely set civilization itself on fire, a high standard of truthfulness is required to push them aside. Does academic collegiality stand in the way? Is Dr. Radovan Karadzic my esteemed colleague?

—David Cherry

Mozart's Age of Republican Enterprise

In the decade after the American Revolution, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was probably the most crucial individual in attempting to create a similar transformation in Europe. In the autumn of 1791, Europe, and in particular, France and Austria, had their last, best chance to wrench historical developments away from what we today know as the rage-driven, oligarchy-controlled French Revolution, a mockery of the American Revolution.¹ Mozart's powerful and beautiful presentation in his opera, *The Magic Flute*, of the "republican" proof—that every man or woman whose heart could feel love, also had the capacity to develop the mind, and to self-govern—was capturing and uplifting the general population of Vienna. His collaborators in this project, Emanuel Schikaneder's theater troupe, have been the subject of ongoing investigation by researcher David Buch.

The team of David Buch, the Boston Baroque ensemble, and Director Martin Pearlman, has once again done all friends and lovers of Mozart a service. Earlier, in 1999, this team recorded the world premiere of *The Philosopher's Stone*, composed in 1790 by the musical leaders of Schikaneder's troupe, which, as David Buch was able to prove, included Mozart. In reviewing the work at that time,² this author posed two major questions: "Why would Mozart work with a team of five composers?

And, what changes occurred in the 'sequel' [*The Magic Flute*], when Mozart assumed full control?"

Now, the Boston Baroque team brings us the world premiere recording of *The Beneficent Dervish*, created and performed (March 1791) by the same Schikaneder group, but with the exclusion of Mozart. Coming so nicely, halfway between *The Philosopher's Stone* (September 1790), where Mozart composed in collaboration with the other four, and *The Magic Flute* (September 1791), where Mozart composed alone, *The Beneficent Dervish* prompts a new, third question: "How well does this team of Mozart's collaborators do without him?"

Simply put, they do amazingly well. It is a delightful experience to hear this work. However, while my earlier comparison of *The Philosopher's Stone* to *The Magic Flute* put into relief the superior, scientific quality of Mozart's so-called "magic," the comparison of *The Beneficent Dervish* to *The Philosopher's Stone* allows the listener to hear Schikaneder's group play, as it were, while the teacher is out of the room. Without Mozart, they do veer more into the world of magic for the story-line, leaving the important transformations of the text, and of the music, for another time. But they are literate, occasionally a little inspired, and they do have fun. This is



The Beneficent Dervish
by Mozart's Circle
and
The Impresario
by W.A. Mozart
Boston Baroque, Martin Pearlman, Director
Telarc CD, 2002, \$17.98

both a happy group, and a group that fully needed Mozart's intervention. So, today's listeners, lovers of Mozart's *Magic Flute*, can now hear two different "trial runs" of the Mozart/Schikaneder team, setting into relief Mozart's profound transformation of somewhat similar material.

Schikaneder's Troupe

In reviewing *The Philosopher's Stone*, I provided an extensive history of the collaboration of Mozart and Schikaneder in

their republican mission, during and just after the American Revolution, of uplifting the cultural level—and the capacity for sustained joy and optimism—of the general population in Austria and Germany. This included the key role of the translations of Shakespeare into German by Christoph Martin Wieland. Increasingly, from the mid-1770's on, Schikaneder's theater troupes performed plays of Shakespeare, Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller. And between 1789 and 1791 in Vienna, Schikaneder had four of Wieland's fairy tales worked into operas for his Theater an der Wien—the three already mentioned, plus *Oberon*. Later, in 1791, Mozart himself evidently agreed to set Shakespeare's *Tempest* to music, although he did not live long enough to begin work on it.

David Buch has discovered that *The Beneficent Dervish* was performed before *The Magic Flute*, and can be usefully heard with that in mind. Previously, it had been thought (e.g., according to Schikaneder expert Kurt Honolka) that *Dervish* was first performed in September 1793. However, as Pearlman's helpful accompanying notes summarize, David Buch has located evidence for a pre-*Magic Flute* dating. His three most pertinent pieces of evidence are:

- A March 1791 diary entry, by the prolix Karl Zinzendorf, regarding his visit to Schikaneder's theater to see the opera;
- A 1791 book in the Austrian National Library, including some of the vocal texts; and
- Newspaper ads, offering for sale arrangements from *The Beneficent Dervish*, beginning in April 1791.

So, Buch, having properly re-situated this opera, has justified hearing this lighter work as a special window into the world of the *Magic Flute* troupe, not more than six months removed.

The Dervish

The Beneficent Dervish also preserves many of the same character roles as *The Philosopher's Stone* and *The Magic Flute*. The Prince Nadir/Sofrano/Tamino role (listed in the chronological order of the operas in which they appear), originally played by

The Granger Collection



Scene from "*The Magic Flute*" (left to right): Tamino, Pamina, Papageno.

Benedikt Schack, always has a comical sidekick, Lubano/Mandolino/Papageno, played by Emanuel Schikaneder, with his sweetheart/wife, Lubanara/Mandolina/Papagena. The prince, of course, seeks to win his princess, Nadine/Zenomide/Pamina (the part that Mozart most thoroughly transformed). Another of the composers, Franz Xaver Gerl, sang the bass role, Eutifronte/Dervish/Zarastro (another role that underwent serious development).

Perhaps the most striking connection of *The Beneficent Dervish* to *The Magic Flute*, is the aria of the dervish at the opening of Act III, "So bald der Mann." It is, for this reviewer, the most substantial part of this lightweight opera, and it foreshadows Zarastro in *The Magic Flute*, when he sings to Pamina his warm and calming aria, "In diesen heiligen Hallen." The dervish, in this opera about the cold calculations of women's hearts and the consequent dangers to gullible men, gives loving, fatherly advice to the Prince: "Therefore before you love her, test her! Both the woman and the workings of her heart." This feature, the investigation of the inner workings of the heart, is seized upon by Mozart in *The Magic Flute*, where it takes on a

much fuller life.

The character of *The Beneficent Dervish* opera is established early on, in the hilarious duet of the peasant couple, Mandolino and Mandolina. She has caught him with a straying eye, and proceeds to beat him ("Pritsch! Pratsch!"). And when he tries to escape ("Watch out! I'll jump in the water and drown myself"), she jumps into the water after him—to use the rudder to keep hitting him. As he promises to reform, she has him repeat after her, "Dearest, only, best of wives!"—although he still needs more of the "Pritsch! Pratsch!" Finally, with his repeating "I'd like to live with you alone!," forgiveness is effected. Within a mere two-minute period, the brawl, with believable percussive effects, has turned into a tender conclusion: "Seldom are man and wife as close as we two, we live like children and are one soul and body!" The games men and women play are succinctly and ludicrously portrayed.

The scene was designed for Schikaneder's comic specialty. (I might add, that, after hearing Kevin Deas' singing in Schikaneder's original roles of Lubano and Mandolino, I am persuaded that his is actually Schikaneder's voice! He seems both quite com-

fortable, and convincing, in Schikaneder's role.)

The paradoxical plight of male-female relations doesn't get resolved at a higher level in this opera, however. We hear a women's chorus ("Enslaving men is what we enjoy!"), followed by a lovely aria by Princess Zenomide, the object of Prince Sofrano's love. She begins "Sofrano, had you felt my pain since our last bitter parting . . .," then she questions his commitment, claiming that "If you feel nothing more for me, so be it, I shall gladly die for you." There is seemingly nothing insincere in the words or the musical setting. Any man in the audience would want to believe the maiden. However, when they next meet, she is singing to Sofrano an entrancing ballad-story, only to distract him and steal his wealth from him!

One would think the Prince might learn a lesson from this. But not this prince, and not in this comedy. Earlier, in the opening of the opera, the Prince was certainly good-hearted enough to take in, and care for, the dervish, who had appeared at the Prince's door as an ill beggar. Sofrano explains that it was simply his duty as a human being. But Sofrano, after his duty is done, is shown to be mainly excited by money and love, singing: "Truly I can't contain myself. Money and love smile upon me." In this opera, it will take the beneficence of a guardian angel, some liberal doses of magic, and, of course, some peasant cleverness, to deal with the evil hearts of women.

Mozart, March 1791

Mozart might have made his thoughts known to Schikaneder at the time. At the same time that this happy farce was playing on stage (March 1791), Mozart popularized Schikaneder's troupe by composing a set of eight variations upon "Ein Weib ist das herrlichste Ding!" ("A wife is a wonderful thing!") This was a selection from an earlier production of the troupe, created by Benedikt Schack and Franz Xaver Gerl. But, instead of simply spinning out eight variations to ornament the sung theme, Mozart fashions something special. He creates variations, separately, upon both the intro-

ductory, instrumental music from the opera, and upon the vocal material. Then, in a coda section, he combines material from both parts together, contrapuntally. This is the sort of mind that addresses the higher forces at work, behind the "magical" moments of our lives.

It was also at this time (March 7, 1791) that Schikaneder asked Mozart to compose *The Magic Flute*. Further, the very next day, Mozart entered into his music catalogue a new work, "Per questa bella mano," a concert aria (K. 612) for the bass, Gerl, who sang the role of the dervish. The aria is notable for the string bass, written for Friedrich Pischberger, who played in Schikaneder's theater orchestra.³ Given the involvement of Mozart with the theater troupe, not only in the previous fall with *The Philosopher's Stone*, but during the March presentation of *The Beneficent Dervish*, I can't but think that the composers benefitted from Mozart's beneficence throughout.

During these same winter months of early 1791, Mozart, the third Court Composer, was being under-utilized by the Austrian Court. Emperor Leopold II had not yet settled on Mozart for the major commission of *La Clemenza de Tito*. He was being paid to write dance music, minuets. On a receipt for payment for some of these minuets, Mozart wrote: "Too much for what I did, not enough for what I could do." Which brings us to the other offering on this CD.

The Impresario

Mozart had done revolutionary work for Joseph II's Austria, back in 1781/2, when he had first come to Vienna. His *Abduction from the Seraglio* was the singularly successful operatic work for Emperor Joseph II's German-language national theater project. Joseph II had discussed and planned with the dramatist Gotthold Lessing, to launch such a project, as vital to uplifting his population, uplifting the language they spoke, and the thoughts capable of being expressed in the language. Outside of this project, the German-language entertainment in Vienna was fairly

banal (though surely not quite as insipid as what we've achieved in our own time).

In the wake of the victory at Yorktown, when America turned the world upside-down on the British oligarchy, brawls and controversies in Europe swirled around Mozart's revolutionary transformation of the *Abduction* libretto. Mozart dramatically altered the story-line by replacing the importance of blood-line descent, with the grace of agapic charity—and this, the most "Christian" action in the opera, was carried out by the feared Turkish pasha!⁴

Threats, palace intrigues, and arrests put an end, by 1783, to the German-language national theater project of Joseph II. So, for Joseph to arrange an elaborate, costly party on Feb. 7, 1786, with a German operetta by Mozart to be performed directly against an Italian operetta, one might assume that there was, very likely, something on the Emperor's mind. Evidently, Joseph himself had proposed to Johann Gottlieb Stephanie, Mozart's librettist from the *Abduction*, that he compose the story-line for *The Impresario*, taking as his subject, the problem of the egos of sopranos in a German-language opera company. Meanwhile, Joseph also proposed to Salieri that he compose something in Italian, dealing with the difficulties between the demands of a librettist, and of a composer.⁵ Joseph arranged for the two troupes to present their offerings to his dinner party, using two different stages, set at different ends of the hall. The elaborate party was in honor of Joseph's sister, the Archduchess Marie Christine, and her consort, Duke Albert, who was Joseph's Governor-General for the Austrian Netherlands.

Stephanie engaged his two lead singers from *The Abduction*, Valentin Adamberger and Caterina Cavalieri. Further, Mozart's sister-in-law, Aloysia Weber, was engaged as the soprano to duel with Cavalieri. Stephanie set the farce in Salzburg, probably reflecting Mozart's satiric attitude about the backwardness enjoyed by the ruler of his



Finale of the ecumenical "Abduction from the Seraglio."

hometown, Archbishop Colloredo.

Stephanie has a comic actor named Buff tell an impresario, one Herr Frank, to hire cheap actors and singers, so he can spend his money on bribing the critics: "Leave your good taste at home . . . The world wants to be deceived." Much fun is had with the dueling sopranos, as they have trouble fitting their egos in with the larger purpose of the theatrical presentation. Stephanie has the voice of reason try to calm the sopranos, arguing that "Harmony's the greatest virtue I can recommend to us." He brings back his non-singing comic actor, Buff, to deliver his joke at the expense of all the singers, upon which joke Stephanie seems to have hung his whole story.

Pearlman's Performance

Now, in a polemical work such as this, ridiculing the egos of singers, it is certainly not good form to have the singers simply display their voices in performance! Perhaps, only in such a semi-literate age as ours, could such a mistake occur, but occur they often do. Fortunately, this is not the case in this performance, as Pearlman's troupe seems happy to get into the spirit of the work.

Further, the recording is said to be the first one on period instruments, and, for what it is worth, it is quite clean. But the authenticity, fortunately,

seems to come not from the period instruments, nor from the unvibrated fingering, but from the top, from a conceptual level, which then carries through in the voices and instruments. The singers' voices convey the text and the interplay of the roles, leaving one almost hearing the visual images of actors on stage. The whole affair is quite good fun. Finally, Mozart seems to have composed the music to be its own character in the operetta, which more than once brings the egos back to reason, and Pearlman's orchestra properly recreates this role.

Nonetheless, the work is a curious matter, which somehow seems quite a distance from the issues Mozart was fighting out with Joseph II at that precise time. Mozart's music for *The Impresario* is marvelously better than the story deserves, and seems to reflect, more than anything else, the transcendent work he was then engaged in, the opera *The Marriage of Figaro*.

When the Stephanie/Mozart *Impresario* and the Salieri work were performed a few days later for the public, two different Vienna papers praised the former. One singled out Mozart's music as "containing some special beauties . . .," while another thought the German work "infinitely superior" to the Italian one, adding, "that is surely not the result of national pride." Meanwhile, at the

private dinner party, Count Zinzendorf, nothing if not snooty, thought *The Impresario* was very mediocre. However, what Emperor Joseph II intended by the affair, and what he thought of the result, is not known. What is known, is that he was in the middle of the most intense brawl of his life.

The Figaro Project

As of February 1786, Joseph II had been the sole ruler of the Austro-Hungarian Empire for just over five years. In brief, his reforms had attempted to break the Empire from its feudalism, and to develop its manpower. He freed the serfs; granted religious toleration to Protestants and to Jews; encouraged science, mining, metallurgy, and agriculture; allowed a freedom for public debate and for publishing; and established public hospitals, public works, and a broader public education. The entrenched Austro-Hungarian nobility resisted the development of their newly freed population, no less than did the embittered Confederate landowners after Lincoln's victories. They ridiculed Joseph's attempts to enrich the public mind by such means as his German National Theater. After Mozart's close collaboration with Joseph in 1781/2 with *The Abduction*, the massive political counter-attack kept Joseph away from his best collaborators during 1783 and 1784.

So, in 1785, when Joseph agreed to have Mozart compose *Figaro*, it was a major breakthrough, and Mozart focussed his creativity, and his recent musical-scientific discoveries,⁶ upon making operatic and political history. The conditions under which the Emperor proceeded, were that the *Figaro* play by Beaumarchais only be allowed on stage in Italian as opera. (The head of the Secret Police, Count Anton Pergen, had banned the play in German, in February 1785, when Schikaneder had proposed performing it. Pergen's defenders claim that he did this at the bequest of the Emperor; the behind-the-scenes brawl within the Court, however, can only be surmised.) Minimally, the Emperor very much wanted *Figaro*, as an Italian opera, to be

aimed at his reactionary nobility.

Just as the Count Almaviva in *Figaro* has agreed on paper to renounce the feudal *droit du seigneur* (the nobility's bestial "right of the first night" to every newly-wed on the property), but still spends most of the opera trying to re-assert that right *de facto*, so also the ridiculousness of the Austrian nobility was to be put on stage, having agreed to the Emperor's reforms on paper, but doing everything to re-impose feudal slavery, *de facto*. Their hearts were not reconciled to loving and developing their fellow man. The story of Mozart's transformation of opera in fashioning a comedy of such intense joy and *agapē*, remains for another time.

The Curious *Impresario*

Mozart composed *The Impresario* between Jan. 18 and Feb. 3, 1786, in the midst of his work on *Figaro*—which had begun seriously in the fall of 1785, and which was debuted on May 1, 1786. Mozart had an agenda for the Emperor that was larger than the compositional themes the Emperor had suggested to Stephanie and Salieri for the February contest. Mozart's *The Impresario* may well be a curious work, as it is the product of a curious situation. While Joseph II at least had on his mind the republican-vs.-oligarchic themes that were wrapped up in the controversy over German-vs.-Italian music, it remains unclear what he intended for this elaborate dinner. It would appear that Stephanie did not plan anything so revolutionary as the intervention that Mozart was planning for the spring; and that Mozart was content to shower his *Figaro*-like music upon the lesser vehicle, and wait another ten weeks or so for his major intervention in the Court.

However, the events of that winter and spring indicate that the feudal oligarchy was getting the upper hand on Joseph. By the beginning of 1786, the financial situation in Austria was turning ugly, as the Court was in over its

head to usury. (Joseph's brother-in-law, King Louis XVI of France, was in a similar situation. Neither country succeeded in following the lead of their friends in America, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Alexander Hamilton, who would deal with the 1785/6 crises, by organizing the Federal powers of the Constitutional Convention of 1787.)

The "Bruderschaften"—the equivalent of the "Savings & Loans" for the burgeoning middle class—were largely wiped out in Austria. Ignaz Born, the "Benjamin Franklin" of Vienna, who later was the model for Mozart's Zastro, was pushed out of control of the city's Masonic lodges, leaving them to lesser minds. Also, there are indications that Mozart knew that spring, that the Venetian agent Casanova was involved in an attempt to compromise Joseph II in a sexual entrapment. And, finally, Count Pergen, the man who had ordered the ban on *Figaro* as a drama, was given increased police powers, undermining the republican law efforts of Mozart's friend Sonnenfels.

Between the time the Emperor heard the two works, *The Impresario* and *Figaro*, one gory event situates the unravelling of the situation. Joseph either gave in to, or agreed with, the reimposition of the death penalty, which he himself had ended back in 1776. On March 10, 1786, one month after the *Impresario* party, 30,000 spectators turned out in Vienna for the execution of a nobleman, one Franz Zaglauer von Zahlheim, who had robbed and murdered an older woman whom he had courted.

The order, under the Emperor's signature, was that "in accordance with the regulations of the 'Nemesis Therresiana,' the death penalty described therein shall be administered without mercy to the delinquent . . . [G]lowing hot pincers shall be applied to the left and right sides of his chest . . . [H]is body shall be broken on the wheel from the feet

upward [maximizing the pain] and then displayed on a gibbet."⁷ Vienna was transfixed by the spectacle, and it would appear that nothing was so hotly debated that spring, as the execution. Joseph II seemed to be increasingly unable to control the "Pergen" faction, as they would succeed in getting their colonial war, and massively increased police powers.

Joseph had benefitted greatly from his joint operation with Mozart on *The Abduction* back in 1782, winning several years to push ahead on his reforms. He seems not to have reaped the marvelous benefits of Mozart's ever-so-much-more-powerful *Figaro* in 1786. Looking back upon that curious February party, with Mozart's *Impresario*, one hears a fascinating mix: beautiful, dramatic music upon a modestly funny libretto, drawn from a theme chosen by an Emperor, which seems most poignantly, too little, too late. Mozart's previously cited 1791 comment—that he was being paid by the Court for his ballets, "too much for what I did, not enough for what I could do"—has its 1786 corollary: He did more than anyone had ever done, but was paid too little attention, too late.

—David M. Shavin

1. Pierre Beaudry, "Why France Did Not Have an American Revolution," *Executive Intelligence Review*, Jan. 18, 2002 (Vol. 29, No. 2).
2. David Shavin, "A Mozartian Warm-Up for *The Magic Flute*," review of *The Philosopher's Stone, or The Enchanted Isle, Fidelio*, Spring 2000 (Vol. IX, No. 1).
3. H.C. Robbins Landon, *1791: Mozart's Last Year* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1988), p. 36.
4. See David Shavin, "Mozart and the American Revolutionary Upsurge," *Fidelio*, Winter 1992 (Vol. I, No. 4).
5. Robert W. Gutman, *Mozart* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1999), p. 652.
6. See Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "Mozart's 1782-1786 Revolution in Music," *Fidelio*, Winter 1992 (Vol. I, No. 4).
7. Volkmar Braunbehrens, *Mozart in Vienna, 1781-1791* (New York: Grove Widenfeld, 1990), p. 273.

Picture Credits, back cover montage (clockwise from top right): Woodrow Wilson, National Archives; KKK rally, SNCC; Mussolini and Hitler, National Archives; Hilaire Belloc, www.arttoday.com; John Crowe Ransom and Robert Penn Warren, Kenyon College website; Al Gore, EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Newt Gingrich, EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Zbigniew Brzezinski, EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Henry Kissinger and William F. Buckley, EIRNS/Philip Ulanowsky; Bertrand Russell, UNESCO/Claude Bablin; H.G. Wells, www.arttoday.com.